



Submission Guidelines for **Interim** Assessment Reports (assessment results from AY 2013-14)

Guidelines:

- 1) *Submission deadline: **September 26, 2014**, early submissions are encouraged*
- 2) *Submit electronically to Yvonne Kirby (Director of OIRA) as an email attachment (ykirby@ccsu.edu)*
- 3) *Provide a SEPARATE REPORT for each academic program, **all certificate and degree programs are required to be assessed per NEASC***
- 4) *An Interim report consists of the Completed Overview report for the academic program and General Education Overview, if appropriate.*

Reminder: Assessment reporting is on a 5 year cycle, consisting of a full report in year one followed with interim reports for years 2, 3, 4, and 5. The assessment cycle is aligned with the Program Review Cycle such that the full assessment report is due the year prior to the year that the department will submit their program review report. Departments are not required to submit an assessment report for that program in the year that they prepare a program review report (see [Program Review Policy](#) and [Assessment Calendar](#)). For example, if your program is scheduled for program review in Spring 2017 or Fall 2017 then only a Summary assessment report will be due for that program in Fall 2017 (report covering AY 2016-17 activities); this is necessary to comply with BOR requirements. Departments that are accredited by an outside agency, and thus exempt from the Program Review Policy, should follow the same guidelines as outlined for departments preparing for their Program Review—in the year the self-study is written, they complete the Summary report. Please remember that an annual update to an accrediting agency is not analogous to a self-study.

Interim reports: complete ONLY the Overview for the program, complete with contribution to general education, using the table format below. URL to Assessment website resources: <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=3454>

Overview: The following questions are required by the Connecticut State Colleges and University Board of Regents, NEASC and the CCSU Academic Assessment Committee. These questions must be completed annually for all academic programs (all degree and certificate programs) as well as all departments offering courses in general education. Submit a separate table for each program and for each general education learning outcome the department teaches.

- You may use a bulleted list for each of the questions—full details should be included within the text of the full report when it is due, not in the Overview.
- **Interim reports:** the Overview should append clearly labeled data tables as appropriate - for both the academic program as well as general education.

Overview

Department: Educational Leadership and Instructional Technology

Report Preparer: Anthony Rigazio-DiGilio

Program Name and Level: _____

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/eduLeadership/msEdLeadership/default.asp
2) LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	<u>None</u>
3) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	<u>We are collecting data about the overall performance/learning of our students as based on a one-time assessment (comprehensive examination). This provides a global understanding of our students' knowledge about our learning outcomes.</u>
4) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	<u>We are shifting away from the comprehensive examination to a course embedded capstone. This new assessment is an extended assessment covering two semesters. It is an action research project and we need to align the program LO's with the rubrics for this capstone.</u>
For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs):	
LO #1) Design, implement, and evaluate instructional programs to promote student learning	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.)	<u>Performance on one question of the comprehensive examination</u>
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	<u>faculty</u>
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting	<u>Conclusion: The focus on student learning remains a strong focus of our program. Students continue to demonstrate they possess skills in designing, implementing, and evaluating curricular, instructional, and assessment programs that promote student learning.</u>

<p>data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): <u>Of the students taking the comprehensive examination, 75% earned a pass or high pass and 25% of the students scored at the acceptable level. No students scored in the unacceptable range for this LO.</u></p> <p>Changes: <u>We have expanded our course offerings to emphasize the Common Core Standards.</u></p>
<p>LO #2) <u>Develop learning programs that are responsive to cultural and learning differences</u></p>	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p><u>Performance on one question of the comprehensive examination</u></p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p><u>faculty</u></p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: <u>Students continue to show evidence of the need to design learning opportunities that are responsive to cultural and learning differences.</u></p> <p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): <u>Of the students taking the comprehensive examination, 66% earned a pass or higher and 33% of the students scored in the acceptable range for this LO.</u></p> <p>Changes: <u>An online course focusing on programming for ELL students and diverse learners has been identified as a core requirement in the program.</u></p>
<p>LO #3) <u>Conduct fair, equitable, and effective classroom supervision</u></p>	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p><u>Performance on one question of the comprehensive examination</u></p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO,</p>	<p><u>faculty</u></p>

provide information by LO.	
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: <u>Based on the written responses, our students show they value the importance of conducting supervision that promotes teacher learning and is connected to student learning.</u></p> <p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): <u>Of the students taking the comprehensive examination 83% earned a high pass or pass and 17% of the students scored in the acceptable range for this LO.</u></p> <p>Changes: <u>While a written examination captures what students think they would do to promote teacher learning, it may not accurately reflect what they would do when working in real-world situations. We will consider ways to utilize video-taping real supervisory conferences to assess our students' proficiency In this area.</u></p>

LO #4) <u>Design, implement, and evaluate professional development activities that promote teacher learning</u>	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	<u>Performance on the comprehensive examination</u>
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	<u>faculty</u>
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: <u>Results for this LO indicates that our students have a very strong understanding of how to create effective professional development activities.</u>
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): <u>Of the students taking the comprehensive examination, 83% earned a high pass or pass and 17% of the students scored in the acceptable range for this LO.</u>
	Changes: <u>No changes are anticipated in this LO</u>
LO #5) <u>Use standardized and classroom-based student performance data to improve student learning;</u>	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	<u>Performance on the comprehensive examination</u>
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	<u>faculty</u>
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: <u>Interpreting classroom assessment data is the area our students need the most growth.</u>
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): <u>Of the students taking the comprehensive examination, only 58% earned a high pass or pass and 25% of the students scored in the acceptable range for this LO. One student (17%) scored in the unacceptable range.</u>

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Changes: The new course embedded capstone immerses students in classroom data. We will continue to shift to this type of assessment for our department.

LO #6) Understand, interpret, and critique educational research

5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)

Performance on one question of the comprehensive examination

6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.

faculty

7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).

Conclusion: Our students continue to show strong ability to understand and critique published research articles.

Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): Of the students taking the comprehensive examination, 83% earned a high pass or pass and 17% of the students scored in the acceptable range for this LO.

Changes: The new course embedded capstone requires students to apply research to their classroom-based action research. This move away from a comprehensive examination to an applied situation will only strengthen our students' understanding of educational research.

Interim reports: append clearly labeled supporting data tables, organized by LO

2013-2014 MS Assessment Data

N=12

<u>Learning Outcome</u>	<u>High Pass</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

General Education: Here is the URL for the list of approved general education courses and LO/objectives: <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=14893>

NOTE: If department contributes to more than one LO, complete one summary for each LO

Department: _____

General Education LO Assessed: _____

Report Preparer: _____

General Education Question	Response
1) Courses: General Education course(s) taught	
2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	
3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course.	
4) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion:
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:
5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	
6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	

Interim reports: append clearly labeled supporting data tables, organized by LO