

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program: PhD Curriculum and Instruction

Part One

<p>What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p>	<p>What method(s) did you use to determine how well your attained the outcome? In what course or other experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>What were the actual results?</p>	<p>Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?</p>
<p>1. Successful completion of the written portion of the preliminary exam.</p>	<p>3 Day preliminary written examination followed by an oral defense of their written answers. Day 1- Teaching and Learning focused questions. Must answer 2 out of three. Day 2 – 2 questions focused on the area of specialization. Day 3 – 2 Questions focused on Curricular Theory.</p>	<p>0 points – Fail 1 point – Inadequate 2 points - Acceptable 3 points - Comprehensive 4 points – Scholarly</p> <p>Students must score at least a composite score of 2 to progress to the oral portion of the process.</p>	<p>14 / 14 students (100%) either met or exceeded the recommended benchmark. In addition, 14 / 14 students (100%) successfully defended their preliminary exam in the oral phase as well and have progressed on to the dissertation phase.</p>	<p>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.</p>

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 2016-16, the department assessed the preliminary process of its doctoral students. Faculty members expect 100% of the students to earn at least an "Acceptable" rating on their preliminary written exam with an equivalent pass rate on the subsequent oral defense. In regards to outcome 1, this expectation was met. However, it is noted that the mean score for all participants was 2.8 out of 5. It would be hoped that more students would approach a score of 4.0 or better. The range of scores was 2.5 – 4. The results were almost bimodal with the majority of scores being either 2.5 or 3.0. In the past, score distributions were much more inconsistent, and while inter-rater reliability is less of a concern, there is a concern that this one assessment may be inadequate in evaluating student preparedness for the dissertation phase of their program.

In 2016-2017 Currently, the following steps have been implemented or will be implemented as part of decisions made to upgrade the system.

Establishment of application cut dates for each entry point into the program – June 1st for fall, November 1st for spring and March 1st for summer

The application process will give greater consideration of GRE scores, with those scoring at least the 20th percentile for consideration and preferred consideration being given to those scoring close to or exceeding the 40th percentile GRE Ranking.

The requirement of a TOEFL score as the only measure acceptable for those students requiring documentation for graduate admission including a closer examination of TOEFL sub-scores. (Reading 21, Listening 16, Speaking 18, Writing 24). (Approved by Graduate Council – spring 2016)

In development with approval expected in the Fall 2016 starting the process for university approval – Replacing the 3 day preliminary exam with the following: Portfolio spanning all 3 years of course work with a minimum of 2 written work samples plus any scholarly publications or presentations included. A new assessment system will provide 2 formative assessments at the end of the first and second years leading to the final defense which will include the complete portfolio for committee evaluation plus the sitting for a one day cognate exam focusing on the area of concentration or research for the PhD student. Upon the passing of the written portion of the preliminary process the student will participate in a final oral defense of their portfolio as well as the answers from their cognate exam. The following elements from Blooms Taxonomy will be critical as part of the evaluation process. Evidence of advanced analytical reasoning, Evidence of understanding how to put theory into practice (Application), Evidence of Higher level thought (Synthesis and Evaluation). A rubric is under development .

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

Degree Program: PhD in Curriculum & 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 checked="" 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 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 necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.

				<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. <input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or

				<p>licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate

	<p>collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p>the validity of the assessment process.</p> <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.</p> <p><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.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and</p>

		results or plans.	student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
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

Again, 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>.

As was the case with the MEd program report, this one does not identify the outcome addressed or provide sufficient information about the measure, results, or plans for improvement. What knowledge and skills are you assessing? I am particularly interested in knowing the specifics of what you learned from this assessment, what you'll do differently as a result, and whether previous improvements have born fruit. You should also review your Outcomes Library, since the items listed there need significant revision to be considered "student learning outcomes."

And yes, I would like to see the rubric you used and minutes that substantiate the conversations you had about assessment this year, but please include these as links to a website or provide me access via a Blackboard site.

I look forward to seeing a much improved report next year.