

Weber State University
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Education
Academic Year of Report: 2021 and 22 (covering Summer 2020 through Spring 2022)
Date Submitted:
Report author(s): Louise R. Moulding and Dustin Grote

Contact Information:

Phone: 801.626.7665
Email: LMoulding@weber.edu

Table of Contents

- [A: Mission Statement](#)
- [B: Student Learning Outcomes](#)
- [C: Curriculum Grid](#)
- [D: Program Contact Information](#)
- [E: Assessment Plan](#)
- [F: Student Achievement](#)
- [G: Evidence of Learning](#)
- Appendices
 - [A: Recommendations](#)
 - [B: Program Faculty](#)
 - [Questions](#)
- [Glossary](#)

The Institutional Effectiveness website hosts a page for each program that displays assessment reports and information. All available biennial assessment and program review reports are located at the bottom of the program's page on our site. As a part of the biennial report process, we ask that you please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate below the changes that need to be made.

Program page link: https://www.weber.edu/ie/Results/Teacher_EducationM.html

A. Mission Statement

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

The mission of the Master of Education 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 teaching and leadership.

B. Student Learning Outcomes

(Please include certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

C. Curriculum Grid

(Please review your current curriculum grid and verify that at least one course has been identified for each outcome in which you expect your students to demonstrate the desired competency of a graduating student. This could be shown in a variety of ways: classroom work, clinical or internship work, a field test, an ePortfolio, etc. You may request access to the Google Sheet on our site if that is easiest, or we can make the updates. Please reach out to oi@weber.edu if you wish to have access)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current

1= Minor Emphasis; 2 = Moderate Emphasis; 3 = Major Emphasis														
Emphasis	Course	Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, or concepts affecting the education/family system.			Research – Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues.			Writing – Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings.			Evaluation – Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.			Key Assignment
		1.1	1.2	1.3.	2.1.	2.2.	2.3.	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	
Foundation	6000				2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	Literature Synthesis
Foundation	6010	3	3	2	1	1	1		2	1	2	2		Current Issue Analysis
Foundation	6020	3	2	2	1			3	3	2	2	2	2	Equity Lens Analysis & Cultural Lens Field Trip
Foundation	6030	3	2			1	1	1	1	1				Theory Presentation, Personal Learning Contract
Foundation	6040	2	1	2				2	2	2	2	1	1	Policy Issue Paper
Foundation	6082				3	3	2	2	3	2				Research Design Matrix
C&I	6055	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	Theoretical Infographics, Continuity and Change Inquiry Paper, Curriculum Analysis Paper
C&I	6060													None - proposed removal
C&I	6065	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	Assessment Plan
EL, FLE, HEL	6100	2	3	2							1		2	Final Project; Weekly Reading Logs; Personal Leadership Statement
EL, FLE, HEL	6101	2	1	2	2	2		1	1	1				Evaluation Plan
EL, HEL	6102	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	In Class discussion/reflection paper; Final Paper
EL, FLE, HEL	6210													
FLE	6800				3	2	2							Advanced Survey Project
FLE	6801		2	1				2	2	2	2	2	2	Mini Research Papers
FLE	6802	3	2	2				3	2	2				Family Studies Issue Paper
FLE Elec Choose 3	6803	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2				Research Review Fact Sheet
FLE Elec Choose 3	6806		3	3							2	2		Literature Review
FLE Elec Choose 3	6807	2	2	2										Research Presentation

1= Minor Emphasis; 2 = Moderate Emphasis; 3 = Major Emphasis														
Emphasis	Course	Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, or concepts affecting the education/family system.			Research -- Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues.			Writing -- Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings.			Evaluation -- Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.			Key Assignment
		1.1	1.2	1.3.	2.1.	2.2.	2.3.	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	
	FLE Elec Choose 3 6820									2	2	2	2	Interview Paper
	C&I, FLE 6150	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	Project Proposal
	C&I, FLE 6090	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Project Final
	HEL 6102	3	3	3	1	1	1				3	3	3	Budget Analysis
	HEL 6700	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	Final Paper
	HEL 6701	3	3	3				3	3	3	1	1	1	Current Issues Paper 1 and 2
	HEL 6702										2	2	2	Final Project
	HEL 6703													None - proposed removal
	HEL 6704	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Internship

Program and Contact Information

 Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

Contact Information:

Dr. Louise R. Moulding
 1351 Edvalson St., Dept. 1306
 Ogden, UT 84408
 McKay Education Bldg, Rm 224
 (801) 626-7665

Report due 11/15/2022

D. Assessment Plan

We have traditionally asked programs to report on outcome achievement by students at the course level. We are encouraging programs to consider alternative assessment approaches and plans that are outcome-based as opposed to course-based, though course-based assessment can continue to be used. A complete assessment plan will include a timeline (which courses or which outcomes will be assessed each year), an overall assessment strategy (course-based, outcome-based, reviewed juries, ePortfolio, field tests, etc.), information about how you will collect and review data, and information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

___ Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

Assessment of outcomes will rely on the culminating experiences in the MEd program: 1) final project for Curriculum and Instruction and Family Life Education; 2) internship for Higher Education Leadership; and 3) the culminating experience for Educational Leadership is the internship and Praxis score used to report to AAQEP, the national accreditor for licensing programs.

Outcome 1: Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, and/or concepts affecting the education/family system.

- 1.1. Issues, theories, and/or concerns are critically considered, clearly stated, and comprehensively described.
- 1.2. Information is incorporated with interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are thoroughly questioned and/or analyzed.
- 1.3. Complex issues are analyzed in-depth. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or thesis are acknowledged.

Outcome 2: Research -- Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues.

- 2.1. Specific research/evaluation question(s) and/or aims of the study are clearly stated and described in the context of previous studies relevant to education.
- 2.2. Research/evaluation design and methods for data collection and analysis are clearly explained and analyzed for their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the research question.
- 2.3. Results are clearly and accurately discussed in the context of the research/evaluation question, and limits of the study's findings are identified and discussed in relation to the question and methods.

Outcome 3: Writing -- Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings.

- 3.1. The written work includes an introduction and conclusion that clearly state and explain the thesis, position, or purpose of the work.
- 3.2. Information is organized in a logical and easy to understand format that makes effective use of transitional statements between ideas. The writing is mostly free of errors relative to effectively communicating ideas.
- 3.3. The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional/academic and/or non-academic audience.

Outcome 4: Evaluation -- Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.

- 4.1. Evaluation of arguments contains thorough and insightful explanation, reviews logic/reason, examines feasibility of solution(s), and weighs impacts of solution(s).

4.2. Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem/issue. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem/issue.

4.3. Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources.

Rubric used for final project (Curriculum and Instruction, Family Life Education) during the current reporting period

Outcome	Element	Target
Combined score used as evidence for Outcome 3	APA (0–5 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows APA conventions with few errors
	Mechanics (0–10 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing flows smoothly Transitions are effective
	Format (0–5 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate organization Few errors in formatting (incl. title page, table of contents, figures, etc.) Effective headings and subheadings
Used as evidence for Outcome 1	Literature Review (0–10 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive and clearly connected to the nature of the problem Identifies gaps in current knowledge and reflects understanding of the topic Constitutes a clear synthesis of the literature
Used as evidence for Outcome 2	Project Design (0–10 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closely aligned with a clearly stated purpose Supported by sound scholarly arguments
Used as evidence for Outcome 4	Synthesis (0–30 pts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results or conclusions are logically explained relative to the overall purpose Data tables or figures (if used) are clearly labeled and accurately report findings Discussion is thorough and fully contextualized relative to research, issues, and practices within the field of inquiry Limitations and implications/recommendations for future research are identified
Not used for reporting	Independence (0–10 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate worked independently with an appropriate amount of direction from the chair Candidate followed through with directions
Not used for reporting	Oral Defense (0–20 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated depth of knowledge about the candidate’s scholarship Well-prepared and used appropriate visual media Emphasized synthesis (discussion, results, recommendations) sections Revealed ability to interconnect and extend knowledge Candidate communicated clearly and confidently about the topic

Revised rubric for use beginning Fall 2023

Master of Education Project Rubric	3	2	1
Literature Review			
Issues, theories, and/or concerns are critically considered, clearly stated, and comprehensively described. (Outcome 1.1)			
Information is incorporated with interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are thoroughly questioned and/or analyzed. (Outcome 1.2)			
Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources. (Outcome 4.3)			
Design			
Specific research/evaluation question(s) and/or aims of the study are clearly stated and described in the context of previous studies relevant to education. (Outcome 2.1)			
Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem/issue. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem/issue. (Outcome 4.2)			
Research/evaluation design and methods for data collection and analysis are clearly explained and analyzed for their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the research question. (Outcome 2.2)			
Outcomes/Discussion			
Results/outcomes/products are clearly and accurately discussed in the context of the research/evaluation question, and limits of the study's findings are identified and discussed in relation to the question and methods. (Outcome 2.3)			
Evaluation of arguments contains thorough and insightful explanation, reviews logic/reason, examines feasibility of solution(s), and weighs impacts of solution(s). (Outcome 4.1)			
Complex issues are analyzed in-depth. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or thesis are acknowledged. (Outcome 1.3)			
Writing			
The written work includes an introduction and conclusion that clearly state and explain the thesis, position, or purpose of the work. (Outcome 3.1)			
Information is organized in a logical and easy to understand format that makes effective use of transitional statements between ideas. The writing is mostly free of errors relative to effectively communicating ideas. (Outcome 3.2)			

The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional or academic. (Outcome 3.3)			
---	--	--	--

Rubric used for ePortfolio (Higher Education Leadership) beginning Fall 2022

Master of Education - Higher Education Leadership ePortfolio Rubric	3	2	1
Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, and/or concepts affecting the education system			
Issues, theories, and/or concerns are critically considered, clearly stated, and comprehensively described. (Outcome 1.1)			
Information is incorporated with interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are thoroughly questioned and/or analyzed. (Outcome 1.2)			
Complex issues are analyzed in-depth. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or thesis are acknowledged. (Outcome 1.3)			
Research -- Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues			
Specific research/evaluation question(s) and/or aims of the study are clearly stated and described in the context of previous studies relevant to education. (Outcome 2.1)			
Research/evaluation design and methods for data collection and analysis are clearly explained and analyzed for their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the research question. (Outcome 2.2)			
Results are clearly and accurately discussed in the context of the research/evaluation question, and limits of the study's findings are identified and discussed in relation to the question and methods. (Outcome 2.3)			
Writing -- Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings			
The written work includes an introduction and conclusion that clearly state and explain the thesis, position, or purpose of the work. (Outcome 3.1)			
Information is organized in a logical and easy to understand format that makes effective use of transitional statements between ideas. The writing is mostly free of errors relative to effectively communicating ideas. (Outcome 3.2)			
The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional/academic and/or non-academic audience. (Outcome 3.3)			
Evaluation -- Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.			
Evaluation of arguments contains thorough and insightful explanation, reviews logic/reason, examines feasibility of solution(s), and weighs impacts of solution(s). (Outcome 4.1)			
Proposes one or more solutions or hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem/issue. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem/issue. (Outcome 4.2)			

Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources. (Outcome 4.3)			
--	--	--	--

E. Student Achievement

There are three types of students in the MEd program: those completing the degree after earning a Graduate Certificate in Teaching, students earning a Graduate Certificate in Educational Leadership, and those completing the full degree. The student types have different requirements to graduate with the credential/degree. For those completing the (a) degree after the GC Teaching, there are 8-10 courses (18 to 22 credits); (b) GC in Educational Leadership there are 10 courses (17 credits); and (c) master’s degree with no prior credits, there are 16 to 18 courses (36 credits). Using data obtained through Argos: Academic Advisor Dashboard, students who have graduated during the report period (N=73) ranged in time to graduation from 3 semesters (international and GC Teaching students) to 9 semesters. The average time to graduation was 5.2 semesters.

Time to Graduation (semesters)	n	%
3	11	4.8
4	17	27.4
5	7	11.3
6	28	40.3
7	7	11.3
8	2	3.2
9	1	1.6

Examining data for declared and enrolled students during the same time period revealed that 22 students who had completed the GC Teaching requested a change of program to begin the MEd, but did not begin the program or took one semester of courses and stopped out. An additional 21 students were identified as those who were admitted to the program and have not taken a course in two years. These students are considered stopped out. Some were admitted and never took any courses (n=8), some completed a single semester (n=6), others last attended in Spring 2020 when the university stopped holding in person instruction (n=7) and one student notified us that he was dropping due to a change of jobs that no longer required the degree. There were 7 students in the data pull who were in a different graduate program on campus.

These results suggest that (a) program of study should not be changed prematurely for those finishing the GC Teaching; (b) students need support in the first semester; (c) there was an impact from COVID-19.

Commented [1]: ?? This does not seem to fit well with the description that follows it...

Commented [2R1]: Should this be 2020?

Commented [3R1]: Good catch!!

G: Evidence of Learning

Curriculum and Instruction, Family Life Education

Evidence of learning is determined by the final project for the Curriculum & Instruction and Family Life Education. The rubric, shown above in section D, has been used during the semesters including in this report. When we implemented the new outcomes, we felt that the rubric was aligned enough. However, as we move forward, we are using the outcomes explicitly in the rubric. As can be seen with the existing rubric, the point value used for the grade does not comply with the value of 0-3 for each outcome; to adjust the score was converted to a 3-point scale for the purpose of reporting. We expect that 80% of students score in the 3-point range (95% or more of rubric points) for each of the program outcomes.

Outcome	Curriculum & Instruction (n=18)	Family Life Education (n=6)	All projects (N=24)	Number Scoring 3	Percent Scoring 3
1: Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, and/or concepts affecting the education/family system.	2.7	2.8	2.8	19	79.2
2: Research -- Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues.	2.8	2.9	2.9	22	91.7
3: Writing -- Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings.	2.5	2.5	2.5	20	83.3
4: Evaluation -- Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.	3.0	2.6	2.6	22	91.7

Higher Education Leadership

Evidence of learning is determined by the e-portfolio for Higher Education Leadership. The rubric, shown above in section D, has been used during the semesters in 2021-22 school year. The ratings for the outcomes are based on a review of artifacts (course assignments) and written reflections. Prior to this year the data were collected by an adjunct who is no longer employed by the program and the data were not available for this report. With the transitions of faculty in this program, which is now led by a tenure-track faculty member, this was the first time e-portfolios were used to assess program learning outcomes. The plan moving forward is to refine the e-portfolio assignment to calibrate the artifacts collected with the program learning outcomes while also reviewing and aligning the current program learning outcomes with national standards for higher education and student affairs professionals established by the Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (SAAHE) (formerly National Association for Student Personnel Administrators--NASPA), and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA).

Outcome	Higher Education Leadership (n=15)	Number Scoring 3	Percent Scoring 3
1: Critical Analysis -- Critically analyze key theories, issues, trends, and/or concepts affecting the education/family system.	2.5	11	73.0
2: Research -- Design and/or implement research or evaluation related to current issues.	2.0	5	33.3
3: Writing -- Model professional-level writing skills in academic and non-academic settings.	2.6	11	73.0
4: Evaluation -- Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding effective models within education contexts.	2.3	9	60.0

Educational Leadership

The program outcomes for the MEd Educational Leadership emphasis and graduate certificate are different outcomes from the other emphases because it results in a license issued by the Utah State Board of Education. The outcomes are defined in the [Utah Effective Leadership Standards](#). This program is accredited through external accreditation. Evidence of learning is determined by internship ratings using score 0-5, with 4=strong competency being the criteria for determining if the student has met the outcome. These ratings are completed by mentor administrators with whom the candidates were assigned. Candidates' internship experiences occur at both the elementary and secondary levels. Although they were rated in both settings, they are not expected to meet each standard in both settings, but rather meet all standards across settings. The data shown below represents 11 graduates. The percent is included for those scoring 4 out of 5 for each standard in either setting.

The data show that, on average, those who completed the Educational Leadership degree or graduate certificate met the criteria of a rating of 4 or higher on all standards. Looking at individual students, only one student had a rating of 3 at one level (elementary) but was missing a score for that standard at the secondary level. This may have been an oversight because all other ratings at the secondary level for that student were 5s.

Utah Effective Leadership Standards	Ratings (out of possible 22)	Mean Rating (SD)	Met Standard n (%)
1. Effective educational leaders facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared vision that promotes each student's academic success and well-being.	20	4.7 (0.5)	20 (100)
2. Effective educational leaders support teaching and learning by facilitating coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.	18	4.7 (0.7)	17 (94)
3. Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote the success and well-being of faculty, staff, and students.	20	4.7 (0.5)	20 (100)
4. Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in order to create an inclusive, caring, safe, and supportive school environment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.	19	4.8 (0.4)	19 (100)
5. Effective educational leaders act ethically and professionally to promote each student's academic success and well-being.	15	4.6 (0.8)	12 (80)
6. Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement and foster a professional community of teachers and staff to promote each student's academic success and well-being.	21	4.6 (0.6)	20 (95)
7. Effective educational leaders honor the heritage and background of each student, use culturally responsive practices, and strive for cultural competency and equity of educational opportunity to promote each student's academic success and well-being.	20	4.8 (0.5)	19 (95)

Appendix A

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

Date of Program Review: Fall 2018	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1	Revisit the mission and vision statements in light of the revisions.	<u>Accomplished</u>
Recommendation 2	Revise and maintain program website	<u>Ongoing</u> The website is being updated on a regular basis.
Recommendation 3	Distribute aggregate program assessment data and engage more faculty in strategic planning based on those results	<u>Ongoing</u> This is still a work in progress. The data have not been shared on a regular basis, but areas of concern have been shared. The formation of the Graduate Studies in Education program will have advisory committees that will inform assessment and receive reports of student performance.
Recommendation 4	Consider career advising strategies	<u>Accomplished</u> Advisement for the Higher Education Leadership and Family Life Education emphases has been accomplished by faculty in those programs.
Recommendation 5	Write a guidance plan for addressing long-term diversity of faculty	<u>Ongoing</u> Faculty hiring is done by the departments that have emphases in the MEd. The departments have been working to diversify faculty; however, the efforts have not yet yielded significant shifts in diversity.
Recommendation 6	Investigate methods for evenly distributing project committee workload	<u>Ongoing</u> Effort is made to distribute project committee workload. We have implemented a payment system to compensate chairs. This has incentivized faculty who in the past have declined to serve.
Recommendation 7	Bring in more staff to support the duties of that position, possibly in the form of a work study student.	<u>Accomplished</u> The issues of workload for the administrative assistant have largely been resolved with a new hire and implementation of new SOP.

Additional narrative:

Report due 11/15/2022

Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time *and adjunct faculty* contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five-Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

Faculty Headcount	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)				
Full-time Tenured			16	12
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)			8	9
Part-time and adjunct			7	3
With Master's Degrees				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-Tenured				1
Part-time and adjunct			1	3
With Bachelor's Degrees				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time and adjunct				
Other				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time				
Total Headcount Faculty				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time				

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Looking back at your previous biennial report where you identified strategies for improvement, what progress has been made in implementing improvements?
- 2) Please take a few minutes to review the new DFWI dashboard in the Report Gallery. This dashboard allows you to see the percentage of students in each course who earn a D+, D, D-, E, W, UW, or NC grade. The data can be filtered by several parameters. Reflect on the DFWI rates overall and of your underserved minority students versus your Caucasian students:
 - a. What are you seeing? What concerns you?

Given that the MEd is a graduate program, most students earn grades that are above a B-, the threshold for “passing” the class. However, there are three courses that have a higher rate of Incompletes than others. These are the capstone courses (Project Proposal, Project, and Educational Leadership Internship) that students can not finish in a single semester. To address this we have proposed a new course sequence for the project proposal and project courses. The internships may continue to require longer than a single semester, however new processes are being put into place including hiring an adjunct that will visit students in their internship sites to provide added support.
 - b. What additional data could be beneficial?

It would be helpful to know how to use Tableau or other systems to track time to completion. Although I found data, I’m unsure if it is accurate.
- 3) We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?

Our plan is to identify signature assignments for the non-project emphases (Educational Leadership and Higher Education Leadership) to better assess program outcomes. Although the Educational Leadership emphasis will have outside accreditation, the assessment data will be crucial for that process. Following the model of Nursing, we will have students add signature assignments to Folio but will rely on evaluation by faculty. This will also require rubrics for the signature assignments. Faculty have had access to the outcome rubric, but have not always used it as intended. The Higher Education Leadership faculty will review the current program learning outcomes and ensure alignment with SAAHE and ACPA standards for higher education and student affairs professionals.

It would be helpful to have help in establishing the process of data management, whether that is training on how to effectively use existing reports or strategies for maintaining data in a more automated way.

Glossary

Student Learning Outcomes/Measurable Learning Outcomes

The terms ‘learning outcome’, ‘learning objective’, ‘learning competency’, and ‘learning goal’ are often used interchangeably. Broadly, these terms reference what we want students to be able to do AFTER they pass a course or graduate from a program. For this document, we will use the word ‘outcomes’. Good learning outcomes are specific (but not too specific), are observable, and are clear. Good learning outcomes focus on skills: knowledge and understanding; transferrable skills; habits of mind; career skills; attitudes and values.

- Should be developed using action words (if you can see it, you can assess it).
- Use compound statements judiciously.
- Use complex statements judiciously.

Curriculum Grid

A chart identifying the key learning outcomes addressed in each of the curriculum’s key elements or learning experiences (Suskie, 2019). A good curriculum:

- Gives students ample, diverse opportunities to achieve core learning outcomes.
- Has appropriate, progressive rigor.
- Concludes with an integrative, synthesizing capstone experience.
- Is focused and simple.
- Uses research-informed strategies to help students learn and succeed.
- Is consistent across venues and modalities.
- Is greater than the sum of its parts.

Target Performance (previously referred to as ‘Threshold’)

The level of performance at which students are doing well enough to succeed in later studies (e.g., next course in sequence or next level of course) or career.

Actual Performance

How students performed on the specific assessment. An average score is less meaningful than a distribution of scores (for example, 72% of students met or exceeded the target performance, 5% of students failed the assessment).

Closing the Loop

The process of following up on changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, materials, etc., to determine if the changes had the desired impact.

Continuous Improvement

An idea with roots in manufacturing, that promotes the ongoing effort to improve. Continuous improvement uses data and evidence to improve student learning and drive student success.

Direct evidence

Evidence based upon actual student work; performance on a test, a presentation, or a research paper, for example. Direct evidence is tangible, visible, and measurable.

Indirect evidence

Evidence that serves as a proxy for student learning. May include student opinion/perception of learning, course grades, measures of satisfaction, participation. Works well as a complement to direct evidence.

HIEE – High Impact Educational Experiences

Promote student learning through curricular and co-curricular activities that are intentionally designed to foster active and integrative student engagement by utilizing multiple impact strategies. Please see <https://weber.edu/weberthrives/HIEE.html>