



Oklahoma State University/College of Education
School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership
Master of Science in Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
Assessment Report Form 2015-2016

Date of Report: 9/14/2016

Name of Person Submitting Report: Dr. Adrienne Sanogo

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Dr. Adrienne Sanogo

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: Adrienne.redmond@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2015-2016: 283

Number of students graduated in 2015-2016: 108

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

The broad mission of the School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership (STCL) is the study of schooling and the education of professionals for meaningful work with diverse individuals across the life span in schools, industry, higher education, and clinical settings at the state, national and international levels. This mission is focused on the integrated study of curriculum, instructional process, professional development, and educational leadership. Consistent with the goals of OSU's Professional Education Council's Core Concepts and Goals Statement, faculty strives to demonstrate and perpetuate teaching based on theory and research-driven educational practices.

The overarching goals for professional education in the School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership are to educate students in the fields of curriculum and instruction and to prepare students for professional opportunities in education.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

If yes, click here to enter information about how university assessment funds were used.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

D1) Student Learning Outcome #1: : Students will demonstrate an understanding of program content including curriculum, diversity, pedagogy, agency, research, and the area of specialization.

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2015-2016 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Students are expected demonstrate an understanding of: curriculum and its role in educational institutions; pedagogical implications of diversity; the social, psychological, cultural, moral and ethical dimensions of teaching and learning; agency/leadership necessary for transformation in educational settings; how to apply research knowledge to educational questions and problems; and the specialization and its role in educational contexts. Students in the TLL Master's Program have opportunities to learn and practice this Learning Outcome throughout their coursework. For example, the Literacy Master's provides opportunities for students to tutor in the Randal and Carol White Reading and Mathematics Center so that students can apply what they are learning in their coursework to practice with children in a clinical setting.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

107

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Learning outcome #1 is part of the Master's Comprehensive Examination, which is usually taken during students' final semester in the TLL Master's program.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| | | Click here to specify. |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

The assessment method used to measure this Learning Outcome is the TLL master's comprehensive written examination that is prepared and evaluated by each student's advisory committee. Advisory committees consist of 2-3 faculty in the students' area of focus. The comprehensive exam is provided one time each spring, fall, and summer. Students take the exam usually during their final semester in the TLL Master's program. Members of students' advisory committee contribute to the construction of examination questions.

These questions not only address the learning outcome #1 but also are specific to each student's area of focus, thus personalizing each exam to each student. Advisory committee members also evaluate students' written exam responses. Exam questions address: curriculum, diversity, pedagogy, agency, research, and the area of specialization (curriculum leadership studies, elementary/middle/secondary including nontraditional certification/ K-12, occupational educational studies, reading/literacy, or special education). The number of exam questions varies and is determined by each advisory committee. Each option area within the TLL chooses whether the exams will be an on-campus "sit down" exam or a take home exam. At this time, students in the Literacy options complete "sit down" exams. All other option areas administer a two-week take home exam. To maintain consistency, each reviewer evaluates written exam responses using a common scoring rubric to assess responses according to program content areas. Each faculty reviewer submits scores and comments to the student's committee chair. The scoring rubric assesses the quality of written responses to exam questions on a scale of 4 (high) to 1 (low).

Comprehensive Exam Assessment Rubric

Score of 4: Scholarly, well-conceptualized, well organized, addresses major theorists/concepts, & well documented with references to professional literature.

Score of 3: Acceptable, organized, clear conceptualization, adequately addresses question, & includes adequate relevant documentation from professional literature.

Score of 2: Unclear conceptualization of the question, does not fully answer question, & lacks relevant documentation.

Score of 1: Unacceptable response; retake is recommended.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☒ Yes ☐ No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

We would like 90% of our students to receive a 3 on each section of the rubric.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 1.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Master's Comprehensive Exam Mean Results 2015-16

| Program Content | Spring 2015 N=36 2 failed | Summer 2015 N=6 0 failed | Fall 2015 N=9 1 failed | Spring 2016 N=40 3 failed | Summer 2016 N= 16 0 failed | *Mean N=107 |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Agency | 3.33 | 3.67 | 3.00 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.40 |
| Research | 3.08 | 3.67 | 3.22 | 3.30 | 3.13 | 3.28 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Pedagogy | 3.30 | 3.67 | 3.22 | 3.48 | 3.38 | 3.41 |
| Diversity | 3.20 | 3.00 | 3.33 | 3.18 | 3.22 | 3.19 |
| Specialization | 3.36 | 3.50 | 3.33 | 3.48 | 3.40 | 3.41 |
| Overall | 3.31 | 3.67 | 3.22 | 3.45 | 3.31 | 3.39 |

*Comprehensive exam scores were not awarded in all subareas for all students. The mean reflects the actual number of scores reported which may differ from the overall N.

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

The data suggest that students are meeting this learning outcome. We had 6 students fail at least one portion of the exam and had to retake all or a portion the following semester. This equates to a 94% pass rate.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☒ Each Semester

☐ Yearly

☐ Every other year

☐ Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 1 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?

The assessment revealed that most TLL students (101/107) are successful in passing all subareas of the TLL Comprehensive Examination. This is slightly down from the previous academic year where 96% of the students passed the TLL Comprehensive Examination. We also looked individually at students' scores to see if the students tended to fail a specific portion of the exam or if there were more overall failures. We determined that only 1 student failed a portion of the exam (research). Most of the students who failed, failed the entire exam and one of those students failed the exam two semesters in a row. That student will have one more opportunity to pass the exam and if they fail, they will be dismissed from the program.

Faculty interpret the results to mean that types of courses on the TLL degree plan and how the courses are taught complement the expectations of the TLL comprehensive examination. The scores fluctuate within each of the subcategories from semester to semester with the overall scores being the lowest in Fall 2015. However, the scores in each subarea were higher than in the previous academic year with the exception of Diversity, which was slightly lower. Previously, we had cautioned that the scores included students who were obtaining initial certification. This will be the last academic year that those students will be included. The students interested in initial certification will now take part in the Master of Arts in teaching degree. The TLL faculty are also concerned with the number of students (6) who failed the comprehensive exam. Our goal would be to have 100% of students, taking the TLL comprehensive examination, receive a passing score. We set that goal last year and did not achieve it.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.

Master students, usually in their final semester of the TLL program, take a comprehensive examination to demonstrate their understanding and knowledge of curriculum, diversity, pedagogy, agency, research, and the area of specialization (curriculum leadership studies, elementary/middle/secondary including nontraditional certification/ K-12, occupational educational studies, reading/literacy, or special education). Individuals responsible for scoring TLL students' understanding and knowledge are members of each student's advisory committee. Using a scoring rubric each advisory committee member independently evaluates written exam responses using a common scoring rubric to score responses according to program content areas. Each faculty reviewer submits scores and comments to the student's committee chair. The scoring rubric assesses the quality of written responses to exam questions on a scale of 4 (high) to 1 (low). The coordinators of the TLL program review overall scores on a yearly basis.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.

After receiving students' scores from all committee members, the chair of the student's advisory committee will notify all committee members of the results. If reviewers are in agreement that the student was successful

in addressing all questions, the student is notified. If there is a discrepancy between reviewers' scores, the committee chair will hold a committee meeting. Based on the committee's recommendation, the committee chair will inform the student of the changes/modifications that need to be addressed. Students usually have two weeks to make the suggested revisions. These revisions are completed in a take-home format. Revised responses are sent to the committee chair who in turn sends the responses to individual committee members for a final review. As a program, program faculty meet once a semester to discuss Comprehensive Exam results and possible program changes that need to be made based on reoccurring themes.

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?

Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

To better meet the needs of our diverse student population in terms of education background and teaching experiences, the School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership proposed a Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree designed specifically for students interested in pursuing initial teacher certification at the elementary and secondary levels. Moving those students to a program that is designed to better meet their unique prior experiences and learning needs will help them to be more successful in masters level course work and on their comprehensive examination. This move took effect in August of 2016. In addition to this change, we would like to determine ways to improve the preparation of our students so that our goal of a 100% pass rate can be met. We are in the process of developing a TLL Handbook that will include some sample Comprehensive Examination questions. We feel that by allowing students to see the types of questions in which they will be assessed will allow them to better prepare for their exams.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?

For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?

The TLL faculty feel that the format of and types of questions in the TLL comprehensive examination reflect what students should know and be able to do upon completing the TLL program. But, because we have only one data point (the overall comprehensive examination score), we are limited as to how we can report student progress. Thus, the TLL program is transitioning to an online Qualtrics survey format for result reporting. This will not only make it easier to gather data and develop reports based upon the data, but the new format will allow us to report scores for the individual components of the comprehensive examination. We implemented this new system during this academic year but had a lot of incomplete data. We have put a reminder system in place so that we can obtain all of the scores on the Comprehensive Exams. We would also like to try to find more than one data point to assess student learning. We will be discussing this matter at the next TLL program meeting.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.

Reminders will be sent out to all option coordinators one week, two weeks, and three weeks after the Comprehensive Exams are due. We will remind them to use the Qualtrics system to score their Comprehensive Exams.

Our faculty will meet in November to discuss possible updates to our assessment plan and discuss any new data we would like to collect.

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) **here.**
COMPREHENSIVE/QUALIFYING EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE RUBRIC 2015

Student's Name _ _ Committee Member Name: _ _ _ _ _ Date _ _ _ _ _

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Agency & Advocacy | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Research | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Pedagogy | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Diversity | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Specialization | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Overall Grade | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

CIRCLE ONE: The student has:

A. passed the exam **B.** needs to retake the entire exam **C.** needs to retake part of the exam (indicate which part/s)_____

Scoring Rubric:

4: Scholarly, well conceptualized, well organized, addresses major people/concepts, & well documented with references to professional literature

3: Acceptable, organized, clear conceptualization, adequately addresses question, & includes some relevant documentation from professional literature

2: Unclear conceptualization of the question, does not fully answer question, and/or lacks relevant documentation

1: Unacceptable response, lacks conceptualization: Exam Retake is recommended.

Comments: