

Assessment Report Evaluation Cover Sheet

Program: PhD Educational Psychology

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: 11/12/08

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Report Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2008-09

Department/Program: **IFCE**

Degree program(s): **PhD Educational Psychology**

Person(s) preparing report: Jan Armstrong

Date submitted: 11/03/08

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

See attached assessment grid.

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

See attached assessment grid.

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

The Annual Review process takes place each spring semester. The advisor and a second faculty reader review each student's dossier materials. Progress toward degree is assessed, including methodology course completion and research-related experiences.

Committee member ratings on the RGSP form were tabulated and analyzed for 8 students. Students' methodology dimension scores for this sample were somewhat lower than scores on the other 5 RGSP dimensions. Doctoral students average scores were higher than those for masters degree students. Program faculty agreed that there is a need to examine how we foster and assess doctoral students' research and methodology skills.

4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

The CARC develops systems to document assessment to ensure consistency in reporting across the COE. Assessment data are entered into the COEAS by program coordinators. This system generates reports by semester and type of assessment. Program coordinators share these data with their program faculty. Program faculty then discuss the results of the assessments and how they inform faculty about their students' learning. Faculty also examine what the results indicate about the effectiveness of the program overall. Finally

the faculty consider whether the assessment method does accurately and effectively evaluate SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. Programs report and discuss results of their assessments at Department Meetings. Department Chairs then share the results of assessment at the College level. The CARC meets regularly to examine college-wide assessment procedures. The chair of CARC and the Associate Dean in charge of assessment meet with Departments and programs to help evaluate and develop ongoing assessment systems that are manageable, effective, and meaningful.

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.

1) Annual review: Faculty met with advisees to provide individualized feedback and guidance, Spring 2008. Faculty discussed and implemented strategies for assisting students who had encountered barriers to degree completion, as indicated by the review process.

2) We identified a need to revise the RGSP form. Revisions are underway.

3) Program faculty plan to re-examine how we assess student competencies in the area of research and methodology. This may include the development of a methods/research skills rating rubric.

4) We plan to focus on how we foster and evaluate doctoral students' research and assessment skills. The program will discuss revamping the doctoral internship requirement as one way to help students "learn how to evaluate and conduct evaluate research in a variety of contexts." It is likely that this change in the curriculum would help the program ensure that all students have acquired requisite research and assessment skills.

6. Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year (2008-09). If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe.

See last paragraph of #5 above.

NCA Assessment Grid: PhD Educational Psychology

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/UNIV Goal	Assessments	**PIP	Coursework	Direct/ Indirect	Possible Score Range	Pass Score
			<i>App. Screen.</i>	Admission P1		I		
Core disciplinary knowledge	Graduates demonstrate broad and critical perspectives, integrated understanding	*U,P,I K,S	<i>AGS Review</i> <i>RGSP-comps</i> <i>RGSP-defense</i>	Annually—P2 Coursework P2 <i>RGSP—P2</i> <i>RGSP—P4</i>	503,510,610,613 Comp. Exam Dissertation	D/I I D D	Pass/NP 0-4.4 6-36 6-36	Pass 3.0 12 12
Research & assessment skills	Graduates can evaluate and conduct educational research in a variety of contexts.	*U,P K,S,R	<i>AGS Review</i> <i>RGSP-comps</i> <i>RGSP-defense</i>	Annually—P2 Coursework P2 <i>RGSP—P2</i> <i>RGSP—P4</i>	505,511, 574,603,604/606 Comp. Exam Dissertation	D/I I D D	P/NP 0-4.4 6-36 6-36	P 3.0 12 12
Applied contextual expertise	Graduates understand and can develop effective learning environments.	*U,P,I K,S,R	<i>AGS Review</i> <i>Int. Rate Fm.</i> <i>RGSP-comps</i> <i>RGSP-defense</i>	Annually—P2 Fieldwork— P3 <i>RGSP—P2</i> <i>RGSP—P4</i>	574, electives Internship 696 Comp. Exam Dissertation	D/I I D D D	P/NP 0-4.4 2-12 6-36 6-36	P 3.0 4 12 12
Professional dispositions and skills	Graduates are prepared for employment in the field of Educational Psychology.	*P,I K,S	<i>AGS Review</i> <i>Int. Rate Fm.</i> <i>RGSP-comps</i> <i>RGSP-defense</i>	Annually—P2 <i>Fieldwork—</i> <i>P3</i> <i>RGSP—P2</i> <i>RGSP—P4</i>	Internship 696 Comp. Exam Dissertation	D/I D D D	P/NP 2-12 6-36 6-36	P 4 12 12

* COE Conceptual Framework for Student Learning Outcomes: U – Understandings, P – Practices, I – Identities

* University of New Mexico Student Learning Goals: K – Knowledge, S – Skills, R – Responsibilities

Each element within the COE conceptual framework (U, P, I) aligns with the corresponding UNM student learning goal (K,S,R)

Three-year Plan – Program will continue to add (or select) a minimum of one *priority* learning goal and two associated student learning objectives each Fall semester that will be assessed in the corresponding academic year. The SLO’s will be assessed for ALL students in the program and data from the assessments entered into the electronic COE Assessment System for both Fall and Spring semesters. Program coordinators will share these data with their program faculty and faculty will discuss the results of the assessments. Finally, the faculty will consider whether the assessment methods have accurately and effectively evaluated the priority SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. An “Annual Program Report” on the findings and discussions of faculty will be submitted by the program to the Department Chair each year.

****PIP (Points in Program)**, – The College of Education, as part of the NCATE accreditation process, developed a “Points in Program - PIP” gateway assessment procedure for tracking students progress through the program. This tracking system has been adopted by all programs across the COE. In this system, student learning objectives are assessed at PIPS 2,3, & 4. The PIP system is described below.

PIP 1 – Admission requirements

PIP 2 – Assessments that occur during program coursework

PIP 3 – Assessments directly related to Field Experiences (student teaching, internships, etc)

PIP 4 – Program Exit assessments (licensure exams, final projects, comprehensive exams, theses/dissertation defenses, etc)

Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning PhD Educational Psychology

Report Elements	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Unacceptable 1	Score for each Element
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	3
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	3
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	3
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2008-09), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	3