Degree/Certificate: MED

Major/Option: Curriculum and Instruction, Literacy, Adult Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Foundations/Interdisciplinary
Submitted by: Marion Moore and Jan-Olov Johansson
Date: December 17, 2014

<div align="center">

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2013-14

</div>

Part I – for the 2013-14 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

    Master of Education (M.Ed.) Students Learning Outcomes:

    *   Students will demonstrate effective practice in the implementation of learning activities which include: knowledge of content area; problem solving; use of technology; opportunity for student choice; motivation; collaboration and respect for diversity in a student centered learning environment; and demonstrate professional leadership in the field.

    *   Students will design and implement curriculum based on standards, knowledge, skills and professional dispositions from the Department of Education, state of Washington Professional Education Standards Board (PESB) standards and certification requirements and other applicable professional standards.

    *   Students will demonstrate excellent communication skills necessary to communicate effectively with all constituencies, including students, colleagues, parents and community.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
    _____*SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing*
    _____*assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;*
    ___**X**__*SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;*
    _____*SLO met without change required*

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

The Masters of Education in Education (M.ED.) program with its options is designed to provide opportunities for graduate candidates who desire advanced training in education.

The common course for all graduate candidates across these options is EDUC 520 Methods of Educational Research. This course provides the background of research methods and techniques necessary for meeting the requirements of EDUC 600 (Thesis) or 601 (Report). The methods, tools and strategies used in educational research, both quantitative and qualitative are explored. EDUC 520 course outcome include:

    i. To locate various educational research sources.
    ii. To explain the nature of research methods and their usage to explain educational phenomena and promote classroom practice.
    iii. To evaluate major differences between types of educational research.
    iv. To identify the basic concepts, procedures and methodologies that distinguishes between methodologically sound and specious research.
    v. To possess skills to utilize and synthesize research findings as a foundation of continued professional development.
    vi. To produce a Literature Review from analyzing and synthesizing valid research studies.

One comprehensive project and assessment within EDUC 520 is the writing of Chapter 1 (initial plan for M.Ed. Final Project) and Chapter 2 (Literature Review). Project expectations and proposed timeline are clearly outlined and include due dates and scoring rubrics for both chapters. We believe this assessment best align with the SLOs listed above as well as course objectives and provides a measure of candidates "proficiency" as an outcome of the course.

EDUC 520 Chapters 1 & 2 evaluation rubrics and scoring criteria included:

- Chapter 1 – Scoring criteria
    - 2 = Proficient (met most expectations)
    - 1 = Mediocre (met some expectations, lack focus and/or organization)
- Chapter 1 – Scoring areas
    - Knowledge of topic
    - Articulation/Flow
    - Convention/Format
    - Depth of analysis
- Chapter 1 – Total points = 8
- Chapter 2 – Scoring criteria

- o 4 = Outstanding (Met or exceeded all expectations)
        - o 3 = Proficient (Met most expectations)
        - o 2 = Mediocre (Met some expectations)
        - o 1 = Novice (Major difficulties with basic expectations)
    - Chapter 2 – Scoring areas
        - o Relevancy/Focused with Chapter 1 research questions
        - o Knowledge of topic
        - o Articulation/Flow
        - o Convention/Format
        - o Citations/References
    - Chapter 2 – Total points = 20
    - Chapter 1 & 2 – Total points = 28

Data from Fall & Spring 2012-2013 & 2013-2014 were used in this evaluation. We decided to use the total score for the purpose of this report and using this data for the first time in evaluating SLOs. To be able to provide feedback related to the rubric scale used for Chapters 1 & 2 we created a total score "proficiency" scale using the total score with the following scoring criteria:

- Outstanding = a total score of 27-28
- Proficient = a total score of 23-26
- Mediocre = a total score of 15-22
- Novice = a total score less than 14

The number of candidates that completed this project and were included in this evaluation were 14 candidates (Fall 2012), 17 candidates (Spring 2013), 15 candidates (Fall 2013) and nine candidates (Spring 2014) completed this project and assessment.

4. **Observations gathered from data**: Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

    a. Findings: First, we looked at average scores. Results showed average scores ranging from 22.67 in Spring 2014 to 25.06 in Fall 2013. See Table 1 below.

Table 1: Average Scale Scores

Row Labels	Count	Average of Score
Fall 2012	14	23.50
Fall 2013	15	24.67
Spring 2013	17	25.06
Spring 2014	9	22.67
Grand Total	**55**	**24.16**

Email report to Helen Bergland (hbergland@ewu.edu) by November 1, 2013 | Questions? 509-359-4305

The range of candidates total scores were between 14 and 28. The median and mode scores were both 26. There were 13/55 (24 percent) candidates with perfect scores while 16/55 (29 percent) candidates scored 22 or lower (mediocre or novice).

Second, we looked at "proficiency" scale scores, numbers and percentages. Results are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Average scale scores across "proficiency" categories

Row Labels	Column Labels Novice	Mediocre	Proficient	Outstanding	Grand Total
Fall 2012					
Count	1	4	4	5	14
Average of Score	14.00	19.25	25.00	27.60	23.50
Fall 2013					
Count	1	3	6	5	15
Average of Score	14.00	20.67	25.67	28.00	24.67
Spring 2013					
Count		2	11	4	17
Average of Score		21.00	25.00	27.25	25.06
Spring 2014					
Count		5	1	3	9
Average of Score		19.20	24.00	28.00	22.67
Total Count	**2**	**14**	**22**	**17**	**55**
Total Average of Score	**14.00**	**19.79**	**25.14**	**27.71**	**24.16**

Average results suggest a large difference between candidates' scores who are categorized as "proficient" or higher and candidates' scores that are categorized as "mediocre" or less. In Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 two candidates scores very low, at a "novice" level, in Spring 2014 11/17 scored at a "proficient" level and in Spring 2014 only nine candidates were enrolled in EDUC 520 and completed the project.

Third, we are very interested in the difference in scores between candidates that successfully completed the project with a score of "proficient" or higher compared to candidates who struggle with the project and whose scores are lower. We grouped data into "proficient" and "non-proficient" candidates' average scores and these are presented in Table 3 below.

Results showed us that with an exception for Spring 2013 the difference was almost eight average points between candidates with "proficient" scores compared to candidates with "non-proficient" scores. This suggested that candidates with "non-proficient" scores were low across multiple scoring areas i.e. they mostly met some expectations related to knowledge, articulation, and conventions, but lacked focus and/or organization in their project.

Email report to Helen Bergland (hbergland@ewu.edu) by November 1, 2013 | Questions? 509-359-4305

**Table 3: Average scale scores by "proficient"
and "non-proficient" categories**

Row Labels	No	Yes	Grand Total
Fall 2012			
Count	5	9	14
Average of Score	18.20	26.44	23.50
Fall 2013			
Count	4	11	15
Average of Score	19.00	26.73	24.67
Spring 2013			
Count	2	15	17
Average of Score	21.00	25.60	25.06
Spring 2014			
Count	4	5	9
Average of Score	18.50	26.00	22.67
Total Count	**15**	**40**	**55**
Total Average of Score	**18.87**	**26.15**	**24.16**

Fourth, we looked at numbers and percentages across our "proficiency" scale. Results are presented in Table 4 below. We wanted to create a baseline for future analysis and evaluation related the number and percentage of candidates that successfully complete the project with a score of "proficient" or higher compared to candidates who struggle with the project and whose scores are lower.

Table 4: Numbers and percentages across "proficiency" categories

Row Labels	Novice	Mediocre	Proficient	Outstanding	Grand Total
Fall 2012					
Count	1	4	4	5	14
%	7%	29%	29%	36%	100%
Fall 2013					
Count	1	3	6	5	15
%	7%	20%	40%	33%	100%
Spring 2013					
Count		2	11	4	17
%	0%	12%	65%	24%	100%
Spring 2014					
Count		5	1	3	9
%	0%	56%	11%	33%	100%
Total Count	**2**	**14**	**22**	**17**	**55**
Total %	**4%**	**25%**	**40%**	**31%**	**100%**

Results suggested that about 70 percent of our candidates had "proficient" scores and 30 percent had "non-proficient" scores.

b. Analysis of findings:

Our analysis was organized according to the four areas discussed in our result section of this report.

First, an analysis of candidates' total scores revealed that candidates' average score of 24.2 was lower than both the median 26 and mode 26. Five outlier scores between 14-16 points were found to support and contribute to this finding.

Second, an analysis of "proficiency" scale scores revealed a large difference in average scores between candidates whose scores were "proficient" or higher versus "non-proficient." Our analysis found that candidates with "non-proficient" scores were low across multiple scoring areas i.e. they mostly met some expectations related to knowledge, articulation, and conventions, but lacked focus and/or organization in their project.

Third, we found that candidates who scored low had most of their points deducted from the second part of the project, Chapter 2 compared to Chapter 1. This result is important because Chapter 2 accounts for 71 percent of the total score of 28 points and candidates would not be able to complete Chapter 2 without first completing Chapter 1 at a "proficient" level.

In addition, our analysis suggested a slight revision to the "proficiency" scale. Specifically, the "novice" category scores should include all scores less than 18 instead of 14 and the "mediocre" category should include scores between 19 and 22. Revised results suggested that:

- Ten candidates' scores were considered as "mediocre" with scores ranging from 19-22 out of 28 possible points. These candidates struggled with lack of focus and organization in their work meeting some expectations of the project.

- Five candidates' scores were considered as outliers with scores ranging from 14-16 out of 28 possible points. These candidates demonstrated difficulties in meeting basic expectations and their project didn't reflect graduate-quality work.

Future analysis of "proficient" versus "non-proficient" candidates' scores will reveal what areas of Chapter 2 candidates struggle with and to what degree such challenges impact their total score as well as the quality of the overall project.

Fourth, we established a baseline by looking at numbers and percentages of candidates across our "proficiency" scale. This baseline will be used for future analysis of candidates work, but also to set goals for program improvement. Current results revealed that 70 percent of candidates completing the project in 2012-2014 had "proficient" scores. We

would like to see that percentage to go up over 80 percent as well as decrease or eliminate low outlier scores. Finally, our analysis identified the need to add a breakdown of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 scores, to identify candidates' areas of strength and weakness in completing Chapters 1 & 2 of the project and identify areas in which the rubrics can be improved. One such suggestion is to establish a clear alignment of components of the project, expectations and rubrics to program standards.

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

   a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

   No changes to content, curriculum or sequence at this time, but with an added collection of and a breakdown of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 scores we will through 2014-2015 conduct an analysis that will help us to identify candidates' areas of strength and weakness in completing Chapters 1 & 2 of the project and identify areas in which the rubrics can be improved.

   Use our analysis of "proficiency" scale scores as examples within EDUC 520. Focus, improve clarity of expectations, and support for candidates to improve their drafts and self-evaluation. Provide examples of "proficient" work related to knowledge, articulation, and conventions, and focus and/or organization.

   b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

   Our timeline for data collection and analysis will be Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 with a more in-depth evaluation during Summer 2015. This will follow revisions made to our program assessment plan.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

   First, a slight revision to the "proficiency" scale will be completed. Specifically, the "novice" category scores should include all scores less than 18 instead of 14 and the "mediocre" category should include scores between 19 and 22.

   Second, add a collection of and a breakdown of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 scores. Establish an analysis that help us to identify candidates' areas of strength and weakness in completing Chapters 1 & 2 of the project and identify areas in which the rubrics can be improved.

Third, use our established baseline to set goals for program improvement. For example, current results revealed that 70 percent of candidates completing the project in 2012-2014 had "proficient" scores. We would like to see that percentage to go up over 80 percent as well as decrease or eliminate low outlier scores.

Fifth, incorporate and align these changes with our current assessment plan.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome**: The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.

4. **Observations gathered from data**: This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.

5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.

6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.