

## Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2007-08

Department/Program: **Educational Leadership and Organizational Learning**

Degree program(s) **MA Organizational Learning and Instructional Technology**

Person(s) preparing report: Mark Salisbury

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.

*We plan to use the assessments indicated in the assessment grid to collect data in Spring 2009.*

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.

*N/A – Have not collected data yet*

**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. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning (see link in #2 above)).**

*Plans in progress*

**NCA Assessment Grid – MA in OLIT**

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/**PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare graduates to design and develop learning solutions for the individual, team, and organizational levels.	Facilitate Organizational Learning	*U,P, I K, S, R	PIP 2 -- Course Project – OLIT 514 or OLIT 540	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade– OLIT 514 or OLIT 540	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Apply Adult Learning Principles	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project -- OLIT 561	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade-- OLIT 561	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Apply Instructional Design Principles	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project -- OLIT 501	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade -- OLIT 501	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Conduct Evaluations	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project -- OLIT 508	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade -- OLIT 508	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Address Socio-cultural Context	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project – OLIT 546 or OLIT 537	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade – OLIT 546 or OLIT 537	I	0-4.4	3.0
Prepare graduates to utilize instructional technology to facilitate learning.	Apply Instructional Technology	*U,P, I K, S, R	PIP 2 -- Course Project – OLIT 505 or OLIT 525	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade– OLIT 505 or OLIT 525	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Put Theory into Practice for Distance Learning	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project -- OLIT 535	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade -- OLIT 535	I	0-4.4	3.0
	Design Knowledge Management Solutions	*U,P K, S	PIP 2 -- Course Project -- OLIT 507	D	0-100	80
			PIP 2 -- Course Grade -- OLIT 507	I	0-4.4	3.0

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning  
MA Organizational Learning and Instructional Technology**

<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.	1
<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.	2
<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>	1