**PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS**

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**MASTER DEGREE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

**Goals and Objectives:**

The School of Education serves to prepare confident, caring, and reflective educators within a Christian environment for both pre-service educators as well as advanced preparation for inservice educators.

The specific goals and objectives of the Master of Education programs are to provide students with opportunities to become confident, caring, reflective educators by:

1. earning academic credentials that may allow them to advance in the chosen field of employment;
2. experiencing personal growth and understanding through in-depth study in the area of concentration and certification;
3. expanding the student’s Christian values through course work and campus activities;
4. specializing in a chosen area or discipline;
5. building upon their undergraduate studies and work experience to broaden their knowledge base in the teaching field; and
6. becoming strong professional leaders in their chosen discipline and area of certification.

**M.Ed. Art of Teaching (MAT) Secondary Education**

**Mission: The M.Ed. Secondary Education is designed to provide advanced graduate training in secondary (7th-12th grades) teaching strategies, secondary students’ learning styles, differentiated instruction, meeting needs of exceptional learners, building a safe, successful learning environment, and designing effective units of instruction that add value to the students’ social, intellectual, emotional, and physical skills in the classroom. The program advocates for high-quality content teaching and learning for each and every student. It is based on three frameworks:**

* **Teaching and Learning (supporting the learning of each and every student in equitable environments);**
* **Access, Equity, and Empowerment (advancing a culture of equity where each and every person has access to high-quality teaching empowered by knowledge and skills offered in that content);**
* **Advocacy (training educators to focus, raise awareness, and influence decision makers and the public on issues concerning high-quality secondary teaching and learning) (nctm.org).**
1. **Within the institution’s mission to provide academic programs to promote student learning (WCU 1) and to provide an environment that supports student learning (WCU 2), the M.Ed. Secondary Education has six singular, specific, and measureable SLOs.**
	1. **Graduate School of Education Exit Survey** requires students to demonstrate the ability to analyze the 12 program components with a three or higher on a five point Likert scale:
		1. My advisor provides high quality guidance information for my program;
		2. My instructors are highly qualified in their subject areas. They communicate their knowledge in the university classroom;
		3. The Library (its databases, books, media, periodicals, and online resources) supports a quality learning experience in my program;
		4. The facilities for the School of Education encourage a quality learning experience;
		5. My university classrooms support current technology necessary for my preparation as an educator in the modern classroom;
		6. My instructors practice what they preach by modeling best teaching practices;
		7. I feel well prepared to communicate my ideas in writing addressing current issues in my field;
		8. I am well prepared to critically evaluate the literature in my field and to synthesize the literature from a variety of sources;
		9. The School of Education makes available classes that will allow me to complete my program in a timely manner;
		10. I believe there is a strong commitment on the part of faculty and staff in my program to meet my individual needs;
		11. The School of Education is carrying forth its mission to prepare me as a confident, caring, reflective decision-maker;
		12. I encounter diversity in my course content, my interactions with faculty, and discussions with students.

Table 1. Exit Survey

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Advisor Effectiveness | 3.8 |  5.0 | 4.1 |
| Faculty Expertise | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.1 |
| Library Resources | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 |
| Modern Facilities | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.3 |
| Technology Resources | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.3 |
| Best Practices | 4.4 | 5.0 | 3.9 |
| Scholarly Writing Training | 4.5 | 5.0 | 3.9 |
| Research Skills Training | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.0 |
| Class Availability | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Individual Needs Met | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| School Mission Realized | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Diversity  | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.1 |

* 1. **Comprehensive Examination:** Students (90%) pass the comprehensive examination with a 3 or higher on a five point Likert scale rubric.
		1. Ability to Demonstrate Content Knowledge at a Graduate Level
		2. Ability to Problem Solve Based on a Scenario
		3. Ability to Analyze and Evaluate Information Presented in the Examination

Table 2. Comprehensive Examination Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Percentage Passed | 100 | 100 | 100 |

* 1. **Implementation of an Instructional Unit:** Students design, implement, and analyze the impact of a value-added instructional unit tested in a classroom and earn 85% or higher on the assignment rubric.
		1. Topic and Topical Themes
		2. Unit Overview
		3. Generalizations
		4. Guiding Questions
		5. Teaching Strategies and Procedures
		6. Culminating Tasks

Table 3. Implementation of an Instructional Unit

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Topic and Topical Themes | 97 | 93 | -- |
| Unit Overview  | 97 | 92 | -- |
| Generalizations | 97 | 90 | -- |
| Guiding Questions  | 97 | 92 | -- |
| Strategies and Procedures | 97 | 94 | -- |
| Culminating Tasks | 67 | 93 | -- |
| Overall Design | 97 | 87 | -- |

* 1. **Choice Board-An Integrated Lesson Plan**: Students design an integrated lesson plan using a Choice Board Planning format in order to process information utilizing multiple intelligences. The total group mean and indicator means will be 3 or higher on a five point Likert scale.
		1. Familiarity with Frameworks
		2. Activities Aligned with Learning Styles
		3. Differentiation through Learning Activities
		4. Measurable and Appropriate Assessment

Table 4. Choice Board

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Familiarity with Frameworks | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Aligned with Learning Styles  | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.6 |
| Differentiation – Learning Activity | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 |
| Measurable Assessment  | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 |

* 1. **Instructional Unit with Technology:** Students demonstrate technology competencies in the design of an instructional unit earning 85% or higher on each indicator.
		1. Synthesis of Knowledge with the Content of the Unit
		2. Organization of the Content and Instructional Components
		3. Demonstrating the Skill to Teach Across the Curriculum
		4. Aligning all Instructional Strategies and Activities to Standards
		5. Demonstrating the Ability to Design Language Arts Strategies
		6. Aligning all Instructional Strategies to Multiple Intelligences
		7. Demonstrating the Ability to Design Depth in the Procedures
		8. Demonstrating the Ability to Integrate Technology.

Table 5. Instructional Unit with Technology

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Synthesis of Knowledge | 92 | 94 | 66 |
| Organization | 89 | 94 | 93 |
| Across the Curriculum | 86 | 94 | 93 |
| Aligning Standards | 86 | 100 | 66 |
| Language Arts Skills | 89 | 88 | 86 |
| Multiple Intelligences | 92 | 100 | 100 |
| Design Depth in Procedures | 86 | 82 | 73 |
| Integrate Technology | 89 | 100 | 100 |

* 1. **Assessing Student Learning:** Students will assess their students’ learning through analysis of informal and formal performance indicators, feedback, monitoring and guiding students. The students will have a group mean of 3.0 or higher on a four point Likert scale. Key assessment started in 2016-2017.
		1. Analyzing Student Work ACEI 4.0
		2. Using Assessment to Inform Instruction ACEI 3.1
		3. Using Feedback to Guide Further Learning ACEI 4.0
		4. Monitoring Student Progress and Adjusting Instruction ACEI 4.0
		5. Understanding Language Demands and Resources

Table 6. Assessing Student Learning

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Analysis | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Informing Instruction | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Feedback | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Monitoring | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Understanding Language | 4.0 | 4.0 |

1. **What students learned as documented by learning measurements.**

The M.Ed. Secondary Education degree is designed to meet the instructional needs of new and seasoned secondary educators in 7th through 12th grades. Heavy emphasis is placed on multiple intelligences and learning styles to build the foundation of learning theory and support innovative learning strategies and best practices based on the most current research. Educators become skilled in their abilities to follow current research trends and make applications to their classroom environment. The program trains educators to see all students as individuals and design learning experiences that encompass all needs, interests, gifts, and skills.

1. **Documented evidence of what students learned and did not learn based on SLOs.**

**What students learned?**

M.Ed. Secondary Education students demonstrated strengths in unit designs, lesson planning, and aligning curriculum frameworks. All students demonstrated strong content knowledge and application in the comprehensive examinations.

**What students did not learn based on SLOs?**

M.Ed. Secondary Education students reported a decrease depth of design procedures in the Choice Board Project. Differentiated instruction results indicate a pattern of lower performance scores due to the fact that secondary educators tend to focus on course content rather than individual students’ needs, expectations, and interests. They showed a significant decrease in the implementation of an instructional unit over two years. Differentiated instruction continues to be an average area of performance when compared to other instructional components.

1. **Evidence of continuing appropriate programmatic SLOs.**

Four of the five SLOs are being continued without revision because they offer a strong diagnostic analysis of student growth in instructional practices and design. The SLO (Comprehensive Examination) will be replaced this academic year with Teacher Performance Assessment developed through Pearson EdTPA.

1. **Evidence of programmatic revision or improvement for weak results on SLOs.**

The Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) is designed to analyze educators’ professional growth throughout the M.Ed. program. The analysis includes the teaching abilities to differentiate instruction, integration of content, demonstrating the educator’s impact on students’ learning in their classrooms. This will replace the rubric for the Implementation of the Instructional Unit. The first implementation of the TPA was 2016-2017. The full implementation will include Assessing Student Learning, Context for Learning, Engaging Students, Grading Rubrics, and Lesson Plans. This TPA (five key assessments) will substitute for the Instructional Unit and the Comprehensive Examination.