

**Academic Affairs Assessment of Student Learning**

**Report for Academic Year 2019-2020**

**Department/Program: Education/MEIL**

**Assessment Coordinator’s Name: Dr. Emily Waugh**

**Assessment Coordinator’s Email Address: ewaugh@wvstateu.edu**

1. **Which learning outcomes did you measure this past year?** [Please indicate whether any of these measures were conducted as follow-up to a previous year’s issues or in response to Program Review. Be specific.]

Based on the rotation of courses, the MEIL program assesses all learning outcomes over the course of one academic year. The Department of Education is required to participate in the accreditation process provided by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Regular and annual reporting requirements through CAEP necessitate a robust assessment system within the department.

1. **In which course(s) were assessments conducted?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | WVDE Standards | ELCC Standards | NELP Standards | Data Collected for CAEP |
| EDUC 620 | 1-9 | 2 | 1-6 | Professional Development Plan  Project |
| EDUC 630 | 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 | 3 | 6 | Case Study |
| EDUC 640 | 2-9 | 1, 6 | 1-8 | School Improvement Project |

1. **How did you assess the selected program learning outcomes?** (i.e., what did you assess –group project, skills demonstration, presentation, performance, debate, lab experiment, online discussion, etc. *and*- what tool (measure) did you use - rubric, nationally or state-normed exam, item analysis, pre-posttest design, skills inventory, survey, etc.)

Program created assessments provide evidence of meeting program learning outcomes and standards put forth by constituents of education programs (ELCC, NELP, WVDE, and CAEP). These assessments are rubrics aligned with the appropriate standards and they gauge student performance on projects, assignments, and case studies.

1. **How many students were included in the assessment(s) of each PLO in a course?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Assessment | Number of students |
| EDUC 620 – Change, Innovation, and Professional Development in Schools | Working with Faculty: Professional Development Plan Project | 30 |
| EDUC 630 – Financial and Human Resource Management of Schools | Case Study: School Management | 26 |
| EDUC 640 – Data-based Decision Making for School Improvement | School Improvement Project: Supporting Student Learning | 29 |

1. **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of each outcome (**Helpful details might include- whether this assessment represents all students, a sample of students in a class, or a sample of students across sections)?

All students enrolled in the course participate in the assessment.

1. **In general, describe how each assessment tool (measure) was constructed** (i.e. in-house, national, adapted).

The assessments were created in-house and are aligned with standards.

1. **Who analyzed results and how were they analyzed?**

Assessment results are entered into LiveText and the MEIL Assessment Coordinator generated reports for these assessments. Results include median score on each indicator of the rubric and the number of students who have scored at each level on the assessment rubric. Results are discussed regularly in the MEIL Assessment Committee Meetings.

1. **Provide a summary of the results/conclusions from the assessment of each measured Program Learning Outcome.** *Report scores for this assessment, as well as students’ strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.*

Please see end of report for assessment data pulled from LiveText and represented in a table format. LiveText reports available upon request. They were not included here due to formatting issues that did not allow the entire report to be visible in a Word document.

During the 2019-2020 academic year, no students scored at the “Basic”, “Beginning”, or “Unsatisfactory” level on the programmatic assessments. “Basic”, “Beginning”, and “Unsatisfactory” are the lowest performance level on the three assessments in the respective courses of EDUC 620, EDUC 630, and EDUC 640. On each of these programmatic assessments, there are four levels of performance. Overall performance on the assessment indicators range from 3.36-4.0 for all students across all assessments. The individual class assessment scores range as follows:

EDUC 620 – 3.36-3.58

EDUC 630 – 3.48-3.68

EDUC 640 – 3.56-4.0

Overall student performance is above mastery level for all indicators of the rubrics on all assessments. Course instructors track student performance and make adjustments as needed based on the data. If performance falls below mastery level, the MEIL Committee will work with the course instructor to make adjustments as needed to support student success.

1. **What are next steps?** (e.g., will you measure this same learning outcome again? Will you change some feature of the classroom experience and measure its impact? Will you try a new tool? Are you satisfied?)

These three assessments are in the process of being revised to align with the new specialty organization standards for this program. ELCC is no longer the standard bearing group for the MEIL program with NELP taking over this responsibility. Dr. Paige Carney revised the EDUC 620 assessment to align with the NELP standards. Dr. Mickey Blackwell is working on revising the assessment for EDUC 630 to align with the NELP standards. The instructor of record for the Summer implementation of EDUC 640 will revise that assessment to align with the NELP standards. This move is in keeping with the requirements of the accrediting body, CAEP.

1. **Please attach an example of the assessment tool used to measure your PLO(s).** These can be added as an appendix, a link to the assessment, or sent separately in email with your report.

These assessment tools will be submitted under separate cover.

EDUC 620 Spring 2020 data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mastery (4 pts) | Mastery (4 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Developing (2 pts) | Developing (2 pts) | Beginning (1 pts) | Beginning (1 pts) | n | Mean | Mode | Stdev |
| 2.3.1 Link PD plans to deficiencies | 24 | 80.00% | 6 | 20.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.8 | 4 | 0.4 |
| 2.3.2 Identify specific instructional improvements | 19 | 63.33% | 11 | 36.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.633 | 4 | 0.482 |
| 2.3.3 Theory based improvements | 11 | 36.67% | 19 | 63.33% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.367 | 3 | 0.482 |
| 2.4.1 Use of technologies for instruction | 15 | 50.00% | 15 | 50.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.5 | 3 | 0.5 |
| 2.4.2 Use of technologies for management | 14 | 46.67% | 16 | 53.33% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.467 | 3 | 0.499 |

EDUC 630 Spring 2020 data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Distinguished (4 pts) | Distinguished (4 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Emerging (2 pts) | Emerging (2 pts) | Basic (1 pts) | Basic (1 pts) | n | Mean | Mode | Stdev |
| Analyzes a management system | 19 | 76.00% | 4 | 16.00% | 2 | 8.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.68 | 4 | 0.614 |
| Identifies a management policy | 17 | 68.00% | 5 | 20.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.56 | 4 | 0.697 |
| Develop fiscal plans and annual budgets | 15 | 60.00% | 7 | 28.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.48 | 4 | 0.7 |
| Use of technology school management | 17 | 68.00% | 5 | 20.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.56 | 4 | 0.697 |
| Identify and Model distributed leadership | 16 | 64.00% | 6 | 24.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.52 | 4 | 0.7 |
| Plan for decision making processes | 15 | 60.00% | 7 | 28.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.48 | 4 | 0.7 |
| Develop school policies | 17 | 68.00% | 5 | 20.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.56 | 4 | 0.697 |
| Develop master schedule | 16 | 64.00% | 6 | 24.00% | 3 | 12.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 3.52 | 4 | 0.7 |

EDUC 640 Summer 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Distinguished (4 pts) | Distinguished (4 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Accomplished (3 pts) | Emerging (2 pts) | Emerging (2 pts) | Unsatisfactory (1 pts) | Unsatisfactory (1 pts) | n | Mean | Mode | Stdev |
| Culture of School Part 1a | 23 | 76.67% | 7 | 23.33% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.767 | 4 | 0.423 |
| Explains Culture of School Part 1b | 19 | 63.33% | 11 | 36.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.633 | 4 | 0.482 |
| School Improvement Plan Part 2 | 29 | 96.67% | 1 | 3.33% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.967 | 4 | 0.18 |
| Facilitating Contributions Part 3 | 19 | 63.33% | 9 | 30.00% | 2 | 6.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.567 | 4 | 0.616 |
| School Capacity Part 4 | 28 | 93.33% | 2 | 6.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.933 | 4 | 0.249 |
| Student Achievement Data Part 5 | 27 | 90.00% | 3 | 10.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.9 | 4 | 0.3 |
| School Outcomes Part 6 | 28 | 93.33% | 2 | 6.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.933 | 4 | 0.249 |
| Synthesizing PoV Part 7 | 19 | 63.33% | 9 | 30.00% | 2 | 6.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.567 | 4 | 0.616 |
| School Improvement Goals/Objectives Part 8 | 29 | 96.67% | 1 | 3.33% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.967 | 4 | 0.18 |
| Trend Data Part 9 | 28 | 93.33% | 2 | 6.67% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.933 | 4 | 0.249 |
| Improvement Plan Timelines Part 10 | 27 | 90.00% | 3 | 10.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 3.9 | 4 | 0.3 |
| Addressing Difficulties Part 11 | 30 | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Climate and Achievement Part 12 | 30 | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Strategies for School Improvement Part 13 | 30 | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Respectfully submitted on 12/1/2020 by Dr. Emily Waugh, MEIL Assessment Coordinator