

Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction

Academic Year of Report: 2016/17

Date Submitted:

Report author: Louise R. Moulding, M.Ed. Program Director

Contact Information:

Phone: (801) 626- 7665

Email: lmoulding@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.

Update:

Contact Information

[Dr. Louise R. Moulding](#)

1351 Edvalson St., Dept. 1306

Ogden, UT 84408

McKay Education Bldg, Rm 224

(801) 626-7673

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.

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 ability to

1. use writing to meet scholarly and professional goals.
2. use highly developed verbal communication in presentations, questioning, and discussions.
3. analyze, critique, and summarize educational research.
4. find and report on a significant educational question that has usefulness and applicability in educational settings.
5. 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
Core Courses in Master of Education Program					
6000 – Fundamentals of Graduate Study	F	F	F	F	F
6010 – Advanced Historical Foundations	F		F		F
6020 – Diversity in Education	F	F			F
6030 – Advanced Educational Psychology	F	F	F		F
6050 – Curriculum Design, Evaluation, & Assessment	F		F	F	
6060 – Instructional Strategies	F	F		F	
6080 – Conducting Educational Research	F	F	F	F	
6085 – Developing the Project Proposal	F		F	F	F
6090 – Master’s Project	S	S	S	S	S
6091 – Graduate Synthesis Seminar	S	S	S	S	S

Note: F=Formative and S = Summative

E. Assessment Plan –

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:

WSU M.Ed. Outcomes	1. Use writing to meet scholarly and professional goals	2. Use highly developed verbal communication	3. analyze, critique, and summarize educational research	4. Find and report on a significant educational question	5. Critically and reflectively synthesize personal and professional experiences
Summative Evidence	Project rubric score for writing quality	Project rubric score for oral defense	Project rubric score for literature review quality	Project rubric score for results and discussion	Portfolio rubric score

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					
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
Outcome 1	Project Rubric Writing Quality	90% of students will score 13 or above out of the possible 15 points	Mean: 14.0 % above threshold: 90	The writing quality is good, but there are basic skills in mechanics and APA formatting that need additional emphasis.	Rubric will be modified after measurable and conceptually connected outcomes are identified. While this skill is valuable, it will likely be modified to focus on conceptual quality of writing rather than on mechanics.
Outcome 2	Project Rubric Oral Defense	90% of students will score 18 or above out of the possible 20 points	Mean: 18.0 % above threshold: 100	Students effectively present and defend their project.	This outcome is likely to remain and no additional action is needed as students are successful.
Outcome 3	Project Rubric Alignment of Sections	90% of students will score at 18 or above out of the possible 20 points	Mean: 19.7 % above threshold: 92	Students generally can identify relevant issues in the literature and align them throughout the project.	This outcome will be modified to better reflect the goal of having students make conceptual sense of a body of research and act upon it for the final project. Currently students are doing well, but more work is needed to help students make connections between existing literature and their own practice.
Outcome 4	Project Rubric Results & Discussion	90% of students will score at 36 or above out of the possible 40 points	Mean: 38.7 % above threshold: 100	Students are doing well in interpreting research, their own findings, and connecting these.	No action needs to be taken but this outcome is likely to change as we revisit our program.
Outcome 5:	Portfolio Rubric	90% of students will score at 22 or above out of the possible 25 points	Mean: 24.5 % above threshold: 94	Students complete the portfolio with good reflection on their learning.	This outcome may remain as we work on identifying measurable outcomes, however the measure is likely to change.

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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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 style="text-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-

MED Portfolio Rubric

5.0 pts The portfolio has a table of contents with all core courses listed (though they do not need to be in order). If you are a SPED licensing student, please use the alternative courses. The courses that should have representation are MED 6000, 6010, 6020, 6030, 6050, 6060, 6080, 6085, and any electives that were of particular importance to you.	3.0 pts The portfolio is missing one or two core courses.	0.0 pts The portfolio is missing more than two core courses or the table of contents
4.0 pts A one to two-page educational philosophy statement should be included after the table of contents. It can be a straight statement or you can explain how you have changed as an educator through this degree process.	2.0 pts Although a statement has been included, it contained many spelling, syntactical, or other errors in it.	0.0 pts A philosophy statement was omitted from the portfolio.
8.0 pts Each course has a well-written reflection/self-evaluation on what was learned in the course and how that learning affected you as an educator.	4.0 pts The reflections/self-evaluations lack depth of understanding of the information/objectives covered in the three or more of the courses.	0.0 pts The reflections/self-evaluations are missing or show evidence of a complete lack of understanding of the information/objectives in the program.

4.0 pts Throughout the reflections or in discussions during the final check out, you can articulate the growth and changes in your ability to assess, analyze, and critique educational research including your own.	2.0 pts Evidence of growth in research is articulated in a cursory manner.	0.0 pts No evidence of growth in research capabilities is presented.
4.0 pts Throughout the reflections or in discussions during the final check out of the portfolio, you articulate the growth and changes in your writing abilities to meet professional and scholarly goals from the beginning of the program to now.	2.0 pts Evidence of growth in writing ability is articulated in a cursory manner.	0.0 pts No evidence for growth in writing abilities is presented.

G. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifact	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
Final Project Rubric	During the defense meeting, the committee completes the rubric and evaluates the student on each criterion. The results of the rubric are shared with the student in that meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Two hard-bound books of the project 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.
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 measurable, conceptually connected throughout the program so that formative data can inform the program and be linked to summative outcomes.

- 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.