

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program: Master of Curriculum and Instruction

Part One

What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	What method(s) did you use to determine how well you attained the outcome? In what course or other experience did the assessment occur?	What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	What were the actual results?	Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?
1. Successful completion of the CIMT 775 Action Research work sample.	As part of the capstone course – CIMT 775 – The students will develop and conduct a five chapter action research project.	3 – Target (Exceeds Expectations) 2 - Acceptable (Meets Expectations) 1 – Unacceptable (Does not Meet Expectations)	9 / 11 students (81.8%) either met or exceeded the recommended benchmark. 2 / 11 students did not meet expectation on their capstone project.	The program coordinator (Dr. Tinnerman). Results are shared at monthly Graduate committee meetings, particularly the first meeting in the fall and the first meeting in the spring.

Detailed assessment results and departmental meeting minutes are available upon request.

Part Two

In no more than half a page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, the departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinators feedback on last year's summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

In 2015-16, the department main assessment of its Master student population is the successful completion of the final work sample as part of the CIMT775 (Action Research). The rubric for this project is fairly detailed in scope and is divided into the five sections of the Action Research Report. Each section loosely corresponds to the chapters of a formal research project.

- 1) Introduction / Environmental Scan/Needs Assessment/ Problem Identification; 2) Problem Analysis/Literature Review; 3) Methods/Intervention Plan; 4) Findings & Analysis/ Data Collection & Analysis; 5) Summary & Discussion/ Reflection. Finally a Overall Impressions section was included. Each main section has between 3 and 6 subsections to be evaluated on the 3 point scale. A full rubric can be provided upon request. This instrument is currently used in the BCOE Assessment system.

In 2016-17, to better meet student needs as well as balance university expectation for class size, the following plans have been implemented across the entire Master level programing in the department of Teaching and Learning. 1. Identify courses from various programs that replicate content and reduce them to one consolidated course offering... For example CIMT660 and ELED660 both deal with curriculum fundamentals. With the consolidation of the departments into one, it is not efficient to offer both classes that often struggle to have acceptable number. Thus a new course EDUC660 will be developed to replace both courses. Three such courses have been identified. In addition, each program (Masters in Elementary Education, Masters in Curriculum and Instruction, Masters in Literacy, Masters in Special Education, and Masters in Assessment) often have duplicate required courses with a section of specialization courses. Plans are in process to combine the above Master level programs into one Master of Education program with the various concentrations to more effectively utilize departmental resources and staff. Core courses will be shared by the MEd. Specializations who will also offer at least 16 hours of specialization classes.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction Date: 7.21.16

	Level 0 - Undeveloped	Level 1 - Developing	Level 2 - Mature	Level 3 - Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if

				<p>necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p>

				<input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. <input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and

	<input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<p>interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 - Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 - Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 - Exemplary		

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Please be sure you are using the correct form (what's here is a truncated version). You'll find it at <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>.

This report was very difficult to evaluate since it does not identify the student learning outcome that was assessed (just the assessment method), and everything else hinges on that outcome. There is no way for me to determine whether the action research project is appropriate. There are no expectations for performance, so I can't judge whether the results are positive or not. And in general, no pertinent details about the assessment of this outcome are provided. Are results comparable to previous years? Is there evidence overall that students meet performance expectations? Is there evidence that student learning continuously improves?

In next year's report, please clearly identify the outcomes assessed and provide more detail in general to explain what you learned about what students know/can do and how you plan to act on this information. The rubric you used and minutes that substantiate the conversations you had about assessment this year can supplement these details, but please include them as links to a website or provide me access via a Blackboard site.

I look forward to learning more about your assessment program next year!