

## Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2007-08

Department/Program: **Teacher education**

Degree program(s): **MA/MA plus Licensure, Elementary Education**

Person(s) preparing report: Tom Keyes

Date submitted: Nov. 17, 2008

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.

*At this time, the chief weakness of both the MA and MA plus Licensure programs centers on faculty differences concerning the most appropriate focus for, and possible integration of, the required research, the "capstone" course (EDUC 590) and the MA Examination. "Research" papers, begun in the research class and completed in the capstone class, have been submitted as the product constituting the candidate's final exam. (In the CDP, the paper is supplemented with a presentation of the paper's chief findings). Faculty are divided on several questions: 1) Should the research course and the capstone course be "integrated?" 2) If so, how? 3) Should a particular research course -- namely, "Reflective Inquiry," a course designed around the study of one's own classroom practice and its results (evidence of student learning) -- be required? 4) If not, how is the original core course -- EDUC 500/Research Applied to Education -- to be used in relation to the capstone paper and final exam, since this course is more a "survey" course of research methods? At the heart of these debates are questions raised directly by the final papers themselves. Faculty are asking: Do these papers demonstrate evidence that our MA students have learned what we hoped they would learn? Our first SLO states that the MA candidate will be "able to analyze, assess, and revise practice in light of student learning, research and theory, and collegial feedback." One group of faculty, holding strongly to this SLO, argues that the heart of the final paper must be the evidence that the MA candidate can describe, interpret and evaluate his/her own practice, based on the evidence of student thinking and understanding as revealed by student work samples and performances. The other group of faculty continue to insist that it is the quality of the "literature review," the evidence of scholarly reading and interpretation, that ought to serve as the central standard of a student's work. This is a very important disagreement. It is easy to claim that an excellent final paper ought to include both an excellent literature review AND an excellent classroom-based inquiry, but, in practice, we see an array*

*of final papers which include some which have next to nothing to say about the candidate's actual teaching and others that have very little to say about relevant research.*

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.

*This is a volatile issue. The relationship between the research class, the capstone class and the final exam, for a given group of MA candidates, is determined by the student's program, the particular faculty assigned to teach the research and capstone classes, and the students Committee of Studies. Students in the CDP, for example, have had more consistency in how this is handled because the program approach has evolved over time and has been overseen by a small group of faculty. Students in the MA plus Licensure program, because of frequent changes in faculty teaching the courses in question, may get very different direction and expectations, from semester to semester. Students seeking the MA without licensure are also likely to get contradictory messages, from semester to semester. Our action plan is to confront our differences directly and establish policies about the relationship between the two courses and the MA Exam. Our Elementary Education Graduate Committee is charged with creating a proposal. It could be that we decide on a single model, or perhaps two, distinct models may emerge, one emphasizing familiarity with extant research, the other highlighting practitioner research.*

- 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.**

*The resolution of this issue is critical to the future of our Elem. Ed. graduate programs. Without an agreement -- most likely a compromise -- we will continue to suffer from a lack of "coherence," the preeminent quality in an excellent teacher education program. Our capstone instructors will continue to be in doubt as to the purpose of the final course; those who teach the research class will continue to debate whether this course ought to emphasize a survey of multiple research approaches or the application of a single research approach in one's own classroom, and the Final Exam Committees will continue to argue as to whether a final paper is "scholarly" enough, or "authentic" enough to be passed. This is a worthwhile debate. Ultimately, and potentially productively, our differences should lead us directly back to an examination of our students' work. What does that work show us about what our students know, can do and value? Are these results commensurate with our intentions?*

## NCA Assessment Grid: MA / MA plus Licensure Elementary Education

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/**PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare teachers to be reflective practitioners	Able to analyze, assess, and revise practice in light of student learning, research and theory and collegial feedback.	*U, P, I K,S,R	MA Exam CMTE 590	D	1-4*	2
	Understands that sharing their work with others is necessary for their continued professional growth as a teacher.	*U, P, I K,S,R	GPA in MA	I	0-4	Overall GPA $\geq$ 3.0
					*MA Scores: 4 = Pass w/ Distinction 3 = Pass 2 = Conditionally Pass 1 = Fail	

\* 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  
MA / MA plus Licensure Elementary Education**

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score for each Element</b>
<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