

**Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16**

**Due to your dean by June 1**

**Due from dean to assessment office by June 15**

**Degree Program Name:** EDLR PhD K-12 **Contact Name and Email** Dr. Terry McDaniel (Director) [terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu](mailto:terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu) and Dr. Ryan Donlan (Assessment Coordinator) [ryan.donlan@indstate.edu](mailto:ryan.donlan@indstate.edu)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

**Part One**

| <p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>  | <p><b>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome?</b><br/><b>(2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>                  | <p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>  | <p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>  | <p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b><br/>knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and<br/>Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><i><b>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</b></i></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>1.1</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>Score of 4: 10 (43%)<br/>Score of 3: 11 (49%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>1.1<br/>Score of 4: 5 (33%)<br/>Score of 3: 9 (60%)<br/>Score of 2: 1 (7%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b><br/>ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/><b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</b></p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and<br/>Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>1.2<br/>Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/>Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>1.2<br/>Score of 4: 9 (60%)<br/>Score of 3: 6 (40%)<br/>Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |
|--|---|---|--|--|

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   | <p><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
| <p><b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b><br/>ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and<br/>Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p>  | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>Prelims 2015<br/>1.3<br/>Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/>Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>1.3<br/>Score of 4: 5 (33%)<br/>Score of 3: 9 (60%)<br/>Score of 2: 1 (7%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |   | encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.   |  |
| <p><b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b> ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/> <b>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</b><br/> <b>and</b><br/> <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</b></p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and<br/> Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/> 1.4<br/> Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/> Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/> Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/> 1.4<br/> Score of 4: 5 (34%)<br/> Score of 3: 10 (66%)<br/> Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
|   |   |   | <p>for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
| <p><b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b><br/>ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims regarding application of research.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/><b>Students demonstrate professional</b></p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance</p>   | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|                                     |  |  |   |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| <p>communication proficiencies.</p> |  |  | <p>standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>2.1<br/>Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/>Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>2.1<br/>Score of 4: 1 (7%)<br/>Score of 3: 14 (93%)<br/>Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we</p> |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|



|  |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
|  |   |   | <p>typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b> facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</b></p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>2.2<br/>Score of 4: 10 (43%)<br/>Score of 3: 11 (49%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>2.2<br/>Score of 4: 4 (27%)<br/>Score of 3: 11 (73%)<br/>Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|  |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
|  |   |   | <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
| <p><b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b> ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting</p>  | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|   |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Student Learning Outcome:</b><br/> <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b><br/> <b>and</b><br/> <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</b></p> |  |  | <p>performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/> 2.3<br/> Score of 4: 11 (49%)<br/> Score of 3: 10 (43%)<br/> Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/> 2.3<br/> Score of 4: 10 (66%)<br/> Score of 3: 4 (27%)<br/> Score of 2: 1 (7%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading</p> |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|

|   |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |  |   | <p>practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>2.4 An Understanding of Research</b><br/> understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/> Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and<br/> Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/> 2.4<br/> Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/> Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/> Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/> 2.4<br/> Score of 4: 1 (7%)<br/> Score of 3: 14 (93%)<br/> Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   | <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
| <p><b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b> communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting</p>  | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:<br/> <b>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</b></p> |  |  | <p>performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/> 3.1<br/> Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/> Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/> Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/> 3.1<br/> Score of 4: 3 (20%)<br/> Score of 3: 12 (80%)<br/> Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/> Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we</p> |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|

|   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
|   |   |   | <p>typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b> theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>4.1<br/>Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/>Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>4.1<br/>Score of 4: 1 (7%)<br/>Score of 3: 14 (93%)<br/>Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   | <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development.</p> |  |
| <p><b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b> ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> | <p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> | <p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> | <p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>We believed that performance – all other factors of interrater reliability being consistent – on the Prelims would be at a higher level, as that assessment is more a summative assessment and the conceptual model is more a formative assessment. Yet, that said, faculty oftentimes will push students more in the prelims setting, so performance challenges can come about as faculty expectations rise for what is considered meeting</p>  | <p>Ryan Donlan was responsible for collecting and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel were involved in analyzing the results, and the results were shared intermittently when available (such as after each date of comprehensive exams) and were shared summatively with program faculty at the Spring 2016 Program Meeting and Academic Planning Session.</p> |



|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>performance standards and exceeding performance standards.</p> <p>Prelims 2015<br/>4.2<br/>Score of 4: 8 (35%)<br/>Score of 3: 13 (57%)<br/>Score of 2: 2 (8%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016<br/>4.2<br/>Score of 4: 1 (7%)<br/>Score of 3: 14 (93%)<br/>Score of 2: 0 (0%)<br/>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>Scores very much typified the fact that some of our candidates very much have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. It bears mentioning that the philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study, rather than a “got-ya” approach to strict, criterion-referenced grading</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|   |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
|   |  |  | practices, and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. |  |
| Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them). |  |  |   |  |

\* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

*If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.*

#### Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

#### Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, 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 coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

*If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.*

*Narrative in the following section, in answer to the questions above, is gleaned from department review of assessment results, which include informal, indirect feedback from candidates in our program and stakeholders in the field, as well as faculty program meeting reflections and conversations:*

(1) What do assessments and our assessment processes allow us to know about our Ph.D. students and their learning? Assessment reveals that our students are by default, successful K-12 educational leaders at the building and district level who are making successful strides with their coursework under the outcomes assessed. They experience daily pressures for student performance accountability and strongly desire, upon entry to our program, practical solutions to the problems and challenge they face. This is where it gets interesting, in that we ask them to – for a time – suspend the need for practicality and work to deepen their scholarship in terms of what we are assessing. This run counter to what they are being demanded to do by their employers, so it very much causes dissonance in their lives. We believe that true learning happens at the edge of discomfort, with a healthy level of positive anxiety, and our assessment of their performance bears out that they rise to our expectations for research and scholarship, under the performance standards we have established.

What do assessments and our assessment processes tell us about our curriculum?

This annual assessment opportunity is actually a more balanced representation than the end-of-course grade distribution, which results in mostly A's. We have through our assessment processes distributed their proficiency in a more balanced way. This is more helpful to faculty, in terms of curricular planning. If we look at the 3's and 4's, except for one area, they make up over 90% of the students, which tells us that we are meeting the needs of over 90% of our students.

With 1's and 2's, the program gives candidates the opportunity to improve on those competencies/learning outcomes. We have talked about the opportunity for candidates to come in and "do it again." Prelims – "mastery learning demonstrations" influence our teaching, so that there are a number of opportunities for students to demonstrate performance success. Candidates are at times asked to do additional written pieces to enhance and re-demonstrate the knowledge that they didn't have in prior assessment opportunities. We have talked about the possibility in the future of their coming back to campus, in order to demonstrate that they have learned to a sufficient level, yet in most all cases, we have left this, thus far, to the responsibility of Dissertation Chairs. Assessments show us that our curriculum is constantly evolving, and that it needs to do so. It is reflective of best practice and legislative mandate. It is based on the latest research, and it is also a balance between being faculty-driven and student-driven – We're working with existing practitioner/leaders. How on earth would we NOT use them for curriculum information? That is a gift we embrace. Whether on faculty or distance, we have clinical faculty who are aware of best practices in the field. The PhD is in part, a laddering of a practitioners' program – a scholarly extension of it.

What do assessments and our assessment processes allow us to understand and learn about our departmental processes?

Currently, we are using a mid-program assessment that is solely administered by one faculty member, as per course scheduling. This may have advantages in terms of inter-rater reliability, yet it may also have disadvantages as well. We have monthly program meetings to discuss changes to curriculum and processes.

(2) Changes -- Program changes in the last year have included the following: We have added a qualitative statistics course, and talked about what content goes in specific courses – content alignment. We have also infused distance and online components to programs. The involvement of

outside sources to bring in information is another evolutionary aspect of our program. For the coming year, we are expanding the preliminary exam experience to include multiple professors (practitioners and non-PhD faculty), offering multiple viewpoints and better triangulation of data. It is a collective process where everyone contributes. Prelims are currently heavy in oral defense and not as much in written defense evaluation; we are examining this as well. We may also be looking at a mid-program assessment.

(3) Assessment Plan for the Coming Year: We need also to re-evaluate whether the current Conceptual Model assignment is appropriately situated, temporally (doesn't fall mid-program any longer) and with respect to allow for more balance in instructor assessing. Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).

## APPENDIX 2

### PhD Master Assessment Rubric

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please evaluate and score your student's ability on each of the following outcomes, as they pertain to Doctoral Prelims:

|   | <b>Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), and Does Not Meet Expectations (1)</b>  |
|---|--|
| <b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                             | Displays knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.   |
| <b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                                 | Displays ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.                     |
| <b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                             | Displays ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.   |
| <b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                                 | Displays ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.   |
| <b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b><br><br><b>Score:</b> | Displays ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.  |
| <b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b><br><br><b>Score:</b> | Displays facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies. |
| <b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                 | Displays ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies. |
| <b>2.4 An</b>   | Displays understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Understanding of Research</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>                           | research proficiencies.   |
| <b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b><br><br><b>Score:</b> | Displays communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency. |
| <b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>       | Displays theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.   |
| <b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b><br><br><b>Score:</b>         | Displays ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.   |

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

Degree Program: PhD in Educational Administration/K-12 Leadership    Date: 7.20.16

|                                     | <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>                         | <b>Level 1 – Developing</b>   | <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>   | <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| <b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided. | <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.<br><br><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.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.<br><br><input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.  |
| <b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified. | <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.<br><br><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.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. | <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.<br><br><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.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what |



|   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
|   |   |  |   | <p>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>   |
| <p><b>3. Results</b></p>                      | <p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data 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 data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" 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><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate 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> |
| <p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p> | <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 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 type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</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</p>   |

|                       |   |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
|                       |   | about previous results or plans.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment. | <p>history and 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p> |
| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 – Developing (On<br/>borderline between Developing<br/>and Mature)</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>  |

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Please provide all important supporting materials via links to a website or on a Blackboard site.

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

Several of the outcomes are not written as outcomes (1.1. 3.1. 4.1.) but they easily could be; 2.4 uses the verb “understand,” which does not clearly describe how you expect students to demonstrate the related ability. Please revise the outcomes for next year’s report. Do you have the opportunity to reduce the number assessed each year and increase the number of measures you use to assess them?

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

You indicate that you’re using the same two measures to assess all outcomes. What is the Student Conceptual Model? What evidence is there that it is an appropriate tool with which to assess the outcomes? You did not include performance expectations or a rubric for this measure (or am I to understand that you’re using the same standards and rubric for both measures? If so, I would caution against a one-size-fits-all approach.) Clear standards are established for the Preliminary Exam, though its rubric should be expanded so that it identifies the specific traits you expect to see at each level, for each outcome. I appreciate your comment that the program’s emphasis is on mastery learning, but does knowing only that students are at level 2 give you enough information to help them improve? Wouldn’t it be more useful to know precisely, for example, which theories they do and do not grasp? Last, thanks for indicating you have plans to develop an indirect measure.

#### 3. Results

Students achieved the goals set for all eleven outcomes. Did you notice any significant changes in this year’s results? Also, instead of repeating the same narrative for each outcome, please include the pertinent comments in Part Two.

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

In Part Two you indicate that one person is responsible for administering the assessment program. I agree that this has some disadvantages and would encourage you to enlarge this responsibility in the future. Perhaps this will happen naturally as part of your plan to involve additional faculty in the preliminary exam experience and reconsider the placement of the Conceptual Model assignment. It is clear from the discussion that the program faculty as a whole engage in reflection on the learning outcomes and results, though I would appreciate more focus on the specific outcomes and results listed in Part One. You identify some improvements, such as giving students earning 1s and 2s remediation opportunities. Have you assessed the success of such initiatives? As you look back at student’s performance over the past few years, can you see evidence of improvement/continuous improvement?

Thank you! I look forward to learning more from next year’s report.