

Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction
Academic Year of Report: 2015/16
Date Submitted:
Report author: Peggy J. Saunders, Ph.D.

Contact Information:
Phone: (801) 626- 7673
Email: psaunders@weber.edu

A. Brief Introductory Statement:

Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if this information is current, please place an 'X' below. No further information is needed. We will indicate "Last Reviewed: [current date]" on the page.

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below. (This information was submitted last year and the page has not been corrected on the assessment site. Please update.)

Update:

Teacher Education: Graduate Programs

Master of Education

The Master of Education (MED) Program is the oldest master's program on the WSU campus. It began in 1978 as collaboration between WSU and Utah State University; although, all the courses were taught by WSU Teacher Education faculty. In 1988, it became the first stand-alone master's degree on campus, three years before Weber became a university. The program caters to practicing teachers, on-campus personnel wishing to pursue a master's degree, and to people in business and medical fields who teach as part of their jobs.

Contact Information

[Dr. Peggy J. Saunders](#)

1351 Edvalson St., Dept. 1306

Ogden, UT 84408

McKay Education Bldg, Rm 224

(801) 626-7673

Graduate Certificates in Teaching

In an effort to help those who already had bachelor's degrees and wanted to teach, the department added a licensure track for secondary education in 2007 at the post-baccalaureate level. This part of the program was immediately successful. The following year, due to popular demand, an elementary licensing track and a special education (mild/moderate) licensing track began. It is estimated that approximately two-thirds of the students admitted each semester are seeking a teaching license. By summer, 2015 all three post-baccalaureate licensing programs were accepted by the Utah Board of Regents as Graduate Certificate programs.

The licensing portion of the program gained accreditation through the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) arm of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) on May 21, 2015. The program is also approved by the Utah State Office of Education.

Because the GCT is a licensing program, all assessment data will be reported in the Teacher Education Department's annual report. These data are also part of the CAEP report.

Contact Information

[Dr. Nadia Wrosch](#)

1351 Edvalson St., Dept. 1306

Ogden, UT 84408

McKay Education Bldg, Rm 224

(801) 626-7410

B. Mission Statement

Please review the Mission Statement for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If the information is not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

The mission of the Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction (MEd) program is to extend the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators in schools, business, industry, and higher education through advancing the theoretical and practical applications of curriculum and instruction.

The program has a secondary mission of preparing post-baccalaureate students for an entry level teaching license in either elementary education, secondary education, or special education. The mission of this segment of the program aligns with the Teacher Education Department’s mission: We work within our communities to prepare caring, competent educators and to promote equitable, inclusive, and transformative education practices.

Community: We recognize that effective educator preparation is a cooperative endeavor involving faculty and staff members within the Teacher Education Department, the Moyes College of Education, and Weber State University. Our community also includes school districts, administrators, and teachers as well as professional organizations. Our success depends on effective and consistent collaboration between all groups.

Caring, Competent Educators: Our central aim is to ensure that teacher candidates develop necessary skills and dispositions as outlined in the Utah Effective Teaching Standards. We also acknowledge that it is of indispensable importance that each teacher develops an enduring ethic of care—the propensity and ability to meet the educational needs of each student.

Equitable, Inclusive, and Transformative Education Practices: We believe that processes and institutions of teaching and learning can and should become increasingly equitable, promoting the well being of all students, with special emphasis on underserved populations. To that end, we are committed, where necessary, to transforming the attitudes and beliefs of teacher candidates and to extending our research and professional outreach in shaping general educational practice and policy.

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If they are not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

Measurable Learning Outcomes

At the end of their study at WSU, students in this program will demonstrate the following knowledge and skills:

- 1) ...knowledge of the history and philosophy of education.
- 2) ...knowledge the issues related to differences among groups of people and individuals and the impact on teaching and learning.
- 3) ...knowledge of important theories of learning and development and the implications for education.
- 4) ...knowledge of principles of curriculum development and assessment.
- 5) ...knowledge of instructional strategies and practices that facilitate effective learning.
- 6) ...ability to use writing to meet scholarly and professional goals.
- 7) ...ability to use highly developed verbal communication in presentations, questioning, and discussions.
- 8) ...ability to analyze, critique, and summarize educational research.
- 9) ...ability to find and report on a significant educational question that has usefulness and applicability in educational settings.
- 10) ...ability to critically and reflectively synthesize personal and professional experiences.

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed: [current data]”. No further information is needed.

If the curriculum grid is not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below

Curriculum Map

	Program Learning Outcomes									
	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Outcome 6	Outcome 7	Outcome 8	Outcome 9	Outcome 10
Core Courses in Master of Education Program										
6000 – Fundamentals of Graduate Study						I, E	I	I	I	I
6010 – Advanced Historical Foundations	E					E		E		E
6020 – Diversity in Education		E				E	E	E		E
6030 – Advanced Educational Psychology			E			E	E	E		E
6050 – Curriculum Design, Evaluation, & Assessment				E		E	E	E		E
6060 – Instructional Strategies					E	E	E	E		E
6080 – Conducting Educational Research						E	E	E	E	E
6085 – Developing the Project Proposal						E		E	E	E
6090 – Master’s Project						E	E	E	E	E
6091 – Graduate Synthesis Seminar						E	E	E	E	E

Note: I = Introduced and E = Emphasized

E. Assessment Plan – changed beginning 2015-2016 academic year

Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if the plan current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

Assessment plan:

Although the outcomes remain the same, the Masters Policy Committee decided that the assessments in most coursework were formative assessments and only the Portfolio and the Project/Thesis would be viewed as summative assessments for the program. Those two major assignments come at the end of the program. Additionally, outcomes 1-5 are seen as formative (giving background information); whereas, outcomes 6-10 are the summative requirements in the skills of writing, verbal communication, researching, and reflecting.

	Learning Outcomes									
	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Outcome 6	Outcome 7	Outcome 8	Outcome 9	Outcome 10
Core Courses in Master of Education Program										
6000 – Fundamentals of Graduate Study						F	F	F	F	F
6010 – Advanced Historical Foundations	F					F		F		F
6020 – Diversity in Education		F				F	F	F	F	F
6030 – Advanced Educational Psychology			F			F	F	F	F	F
6050 – Curriculum Design, Evaluation, & Assessment				F		F	F	F	F	F
6060 – Instructional Strategies					F	F	F	F	F	F
6080 – Conducting Educational Research						F	F	F	F	F
6085 – Developing the Project Proposal						F	F	F	F	F
6090 – Master’s Project						S	S	S	S	S
6091 – Graduate Synthesis Seminar						S	S	S		S

F. Report of assessment results for the most previous academic year:

A. Evidence of Learning: Core Courses within the MED Degree

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Degree						
Course	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
MED 6000	*Program Outcomes 6-10: (see listing below)	Final grade in the course	Because these outcomes are formative in nature, it was decided that final course grades would be used to determine the level of learning of each student. In the program, anyone who receives below a B- must retake the course, which becomes the "threshold" for learning.	During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 34 students completed the course: 25 earned an A, 5/A-, 3/B+, & 1/B	Given the grades that students are earning in each of the core courses, they are meeting the course objectives and doing well on the individual assessments created by the instructors.	Continue the program as designed.
MED 6010	Program Outcome 1: Knowledge of the history and philosophy of education & *Program Outcomes 6, 8, & 10.	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 37 students completed the course: 32 earned an A, 1/A-, 2/B+, 1/B, & 1/E		
MED 6020	Program Outcome 2: Knowledge the issues related to differences among groups of people and individuals and the impact on teaching and learning & Program Outcomes 6-10.	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 43 students completed the course: 41 earned an A & 2/A-		
MED 6030	Program Outcome 3: knowledge of important theories of learning and development and the implications for education & *Program Outcomes 6-10.	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 40 students completed the course: 33 earned an A, 5/A-, 1/B+, & 1/B		
MED 6050	Program Outcome 4: knowledge of principles of curriculum development and assessment & *Program Outcomes 6-10.	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 50 students completed the course: 50 earned an A		
MED 6060	Program Outcome 5: knowledge of instructional strategies and practices that facilitate effective learning & *Program Outcomes 6-10.	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 38 students completed the course: 35 earned an A, 1/A-, 1/B+, & 1/B		
MED 6080	*Program Outcomes 6-10: (see listing below)	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 32 students completed the course: 21 earned an A, 7/A-, 3/B, & 1/B-		
MED 6085	*Program Outcomes 6-10: (see listing below)	Final grade in the course		During summer, fall, & spring semesters, 48 students completed the course: 35 earned an A, 5/A-, 1/B+, 2/B, 2/B-, & 3/E (1 person failed twice)		

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Degree						
Course	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
MED 6090	*Program Outcomes 6-9: (see listing below)	**Project Rubric – holistically reported	A minimum of 80 pts on the 100 point rubric	31 students completed their projects/theses. 1 rubric sheet is missing and the mean for the other 30 is 95.3 pts. Range 84-100	Students are meeting the program outcomes by the end. They have each developed the core skills required and met the academic threshold for the program.	The new rubric that was created in spring, 2015 is producing the results desired by the department. The research strand of courses – 6000, 6080, 6085, & 6090 provides the necessary scaffolding that students need to be successful. No changes are indicated for the near future.
	Program Outcome 6	Rubric disaggregated	APA & Mech 15 pt	13.73 pts. – mean score Range 10-15		
	Program Outcome 7	Rubric disaggregated	Oral defense 20 pt	19.8 pts. – mean score Range 18-20		
	Program Outcome 8	Rubric disaggregated	Alignment 20 pt	19.43 pts. – mean score Range 18-20		
	Program Outcome 9	Rubric disaggregated	Results & Discussion 40 pt	38.43 pts. – mean score Range 34-40		
MED 6091	*Program Outcomes 10: (see listing below)	***Portfolio Rubric	A minimum of 40 pts on a 50 point rubric.	In the 3 semesters reflected in this report, 29 students completed this course. The mean score on the rubric was 49.59. The range was 45-50 pts.	The portfolio is meant as a culmination and reflection of the students' journey through the core courses in the MED program. Each student must reflect and synthesize their growth in research, writing, speaking, and knowledge.	A new rubric must be created that has better indicators of meeting the program outcomes.

***Program outcome 6:** ability to use writing to meet scholarly and professional goals.

Program outcome 7: ability to use highly developed verbal communication in presentations, questioning, and discussions.

Program outcome 8: ability to analyze, critique, and summarize educational research.

Program outcome 9: ability to find and report on a significant educational question that has usefulness and applicability in educational settings.

Program outcome 10: ability to critically and reflectively synthesize personal and professional experiences.

****MASTER'S PROJECT AND DEFENSE RUBRIC**

Candidate's

Name _____ Chair _____ Date _____

Title _____

Circle the number which best reflects the candidate's performance for each element:

Element	Acceptable	Target
APA Conventions (5 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APA conventions were used consistently. Reference list and APA conventions were followed but had four or more errors. <p align="center">2 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project consistently models the APA conventions. Electronic sources were correct. Reference list and APA conventions were followed with less than three errors. <p align="center">4 5</p>
Mechanics (10 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While there may have been minor errors (more than 5), the project followed normal conventions of spelling and grammar. Errors did not interfere with comprehensibility. Some transitions were awkward. <p align="center">5 6 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project was essentially error free. No more than three errors in mechanics. Writing flowed smoothly. Transitions were effective. <p align="center">8 9 10</p>
Required Format (See WSU MED Style Guide.) (5 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The format contained more than three errors. Margins (left margin is at 1.5 inches; all other margins are at 1 inch), spacing, page numbering, and headings followed the required format with errors. Headings and subheadings were not effective. The Title/Signature page, Table of Contents, and/or any figures or tables contained minor mistakes (more than five). <p align="center">2 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project was excellent in organization. The format contained fewer than three errors. Margins (left margin is at 1.5 inches; all other margins are at 1 inch), spacing, page numbering, and headings followed the required format. Headings and subheading were effective. The Title/Signature page, Table of Contents, and/or any figures or tables contained minor mistakes (no more than four). <p align="center">4 5</p>
Knowledge and Alignment of Proposal Sections (20 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review was connected to the Nature of the Problem. Knowledge was apparent and applied in the literature review. Literature review integrated findings each study cited. The research design reflected an understanding of the research question(s) (Purpose). The method and data analysis were supportive of the Purpose of the study. Arguments presented the writer's logic. <p align="center">15 16 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review was comprehensive and clearly connected to the Nature of the Problem. The gaps in current knowledge were identified. Depth of knowledge was apparent and clearly applied in the literature review to fill gaps in knowledge. Literature review integrated findings each study cited. The research design reflected an understanding of the research question(s) (Purpose). The method and data analysis were supportive of the Purpose of the study. Sound scholarly arguments presented the writer's logic. <p align="center">18 19 20</p>
Results/ Findings (20 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study's results were explained. The results were related to the research question(s) and reported in a logical order. Data tables or figures (if used) were labeled and reported findings. The results/data were reported without inferences. <p align="center">15 16 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study's results were thoroughly and logically explained. The results were related to the research question(s) and reported in a logical order. Data tables or figures (if used) were clearly labeled and accurately reported findings. The results/data were reported without inferences. <p align="center">18 19 20</p>

Discussion* (20 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion is supported by related literature and results/findings are reported. Results/findings are interpreted. Limitations and implications/recommendations for future research are identified. <p style="text-align: center;">15 16 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion is supported by related literature and results/findings are compared/contrasted to other studies. Results/findings are interpreted. Limitations and implications/recommendations for future research are identified. <p style="text-align: center;">18 19 20</p>
Independence of Candidate's work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate required a lot of direction and support from the chair or committee members. Candidate did not follow through with directions. If yes, subtract up to 10 points from the rubric grade. <p>Number of subtracted points: _____</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate worked independently with little direction from the chair. Candidate followed through with directions the first time. If yes, no points are subtracted.

*In some projects, the Findings/Discussion are within the same section. If that is the case, the total points that can be awarded is 40.

Oral Defense – 20 points possible

Acceptable	Target
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion demonstrated knowledge about the candidate's research. Presentation was prepared and used appropriate visual media. (Past tense verbs are used where needed.) Too much emphasis was placed on literature review and purpose. Speaking quality was clear and candidate used correct vocabulary. <p style="text-align: center;">15 16 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion demonstrated depth of knowledge about the candidate's research. Presentation was well-prepared and used appropriate visual media. (Past tense verbs are used where needed.) Emphasis was placed on the results and discussion sections. Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge. Speaking quality was clear and candidate used correct vocabulary. Spoke with enthusiasm and confidence. <p style="text-align: center;">18 19 20</p>

Total points for written project and oral defense (100 pts. possible) _____

Circle Grade: 95-100 = A 90 -94 = A- 87-89 = B+ 84-86 = B 80-83 = B-

***Portfolio Rubric

Criteria	Ratings			Pts.
Writing - Student demonstrates with artifacts and discusses evidence of growth/change in writing.	7	5	0	
Research - Student demonstrates with artifacts and discusses evidence of growth/change in research abilities during his/her program.	7	5	0	
Organization - Student demonstrates and discusses reasons for the organization of the portfolio.	7	5	0	
Table of Contents - Student demonstrates and discusses the reasons for the choice of the table of content for the portfolio.	7	5	0	
Evaluation and Findings - Student demonstrates and discusses the types and findings of the evaluation component within the portfolio.	7	5	0	
Core Classes - All core classes have at least one artifact and evaluation/reflection, including 6090 and 6091.	5	X	0	
Overall Look - No errors in grammar or writing. 10 pts. Few errors in grammar or writing. 5 pts. Many errors in grammar or writing. 0 pts.	10	5	0	
	50 total			

G. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifact	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
Final Project/ Thesis and Rubric	Upon defending their projects, the students do the final edits and receive the sign-off from their committee chair. They bring the copies to be bound into the master's administrative assistant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two hard-bound books are submitted to the Stewart Library; a third copy is placed in the Master's Library (rm. 238) in the McKay Education Building. • Some copies are stored at the Stewart Library electronically. • The rubric for the project is placed in the student's file. These data are saved in a secure location in the Education Building and shredded at the end of 5 years.
Final Portfolio Rubric	The portfolio is assessed in MED 6091 – Graduate Synthesis Seminar. The professor who teaches the course does the final grading of the portfolio in a one-on-one meeting with the student who explains the nuances of his/her portfolio with the instructor.	The rubric is saved on the Canvas course website under each student's name. If the student chose to do an electronic portfolio (about ½ choose this option), it is sometimes available through the Canvas site or a link to Box or Google docs. We do not archive all of the portfolios especially those that are hard copies.

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is acting upon.

Date of Program Review: April, 2014	Progress Description
<p>Program Concern 1: Program outcomes are appropriate and stated for a graduate M.Ed. program. However, there is not enough distinction between outcomes for the post-bacc licensure track when compared to the M.Ed. program mission. Learning outcomes should be defined for each measure/standard which has created some confusion with the dual track program.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate Certificates in Teaching (GCT) were created by the department and approved as new programs by the Utah Board of Regents. 2. The GCT programs include licensing for elementary, secondary, and special education. 3. Data collected for the GCT are reported with the undergraduate teacher licensing programs because of the similarity of the artifacts and assessments collected.
<p>Program Concern 2: With a dual track, students need a clear process for advising. A single office advisor may not be sufficient for this need.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The administrative assistant does much of the initial advising of students considering the GCT. 2. A new director of the GCT programs was appointed in August, 2016. She will also do advising of students. 3. The MED director will focus her efforts on the students who are in the master's program only or those who after completing the GCT, have moved into the master's program.

Appendix B: Faculty Headcount

The MED program is part of the Teacher Education Department. The faculty headcounts are reported with the department not the program.

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

Revisit the program outcomes as a department to assure that these outcomes are still the focus of those instructors who are currently teaching the courses.

- 2) We are interested in better understanding how departments/programs assess their graduating seniors. Please provide a short narrative describing the practices/curriculum in place for your department/program. Please include both direct and indirect measures employed.

In the MED program, our master's candidates are summatively assessed two ways: (a) the final project/thesis and (b) the portfolio which summarizes each individual's journey through the program. These two items are deemed our summative assessments. All other assessments are formative for the entire program.