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Goals of the Academic Year 2017-18 action plan:

- Expand the program curriculum map to include outcomes and assessments for each emphasis
- Propose revisions to the MSE-PD Student Learning Outcomes
  - Align outcomes with Master’s Learning Outcomes (MELOs)
- Schedule regular discussion of assessment data by MSE-PD Council
- Hold at least one meeting of an external advisory board that will discuss assessment of SLOs, among other topics
- Propose revisions to the array of emphasis areas consistent with the revised SLOs and assessment procedures

Actions completed during academic year:

- Drafted alignment of outcomes with MELOs
- Reviewed bylaws and position description for advisory board members in MSE Council
- Met with external advisors
  - In consultation with dean, development director, and MSE-PS Council, nominated advisory board members
  - In fall, set agenda for meeting of external “task force” to discuss advisory role
  - Met with external advisors in May:
    - Reviewed program mission and vision for graduate study
    - Discussed role and format of permanent advisory board
    - Discussed kinds of data to be reviewed by advisory board
- Gathered additional data on performance of students in Capstone seminar

Brief statement of main results:

We identified ways in which current program SLOs are aligned with recently revised university outcomes for graduate study (see attachment). We obtained recommendations from external advisors for the frequency and agenda of advisory board meetings, as well as kinds of data to be reviewed at each meeting. We learned the importance to our external advisors of the current emphasis on research and writing in the program, which distinguishes this program from other kinds of professional development they know. Prompted by this project, we also involved the MSE-PS Council more directly in the self-study process, for example by sharing parts of the document electronically for revision.

We obtained additional information about the students’ performance in their capstone experience. Though we cannot draw clear conclusions from the data so far regarding the initial suggestion that students’ communication skill might be an area for improvement, the rubric has provided some basis for discussion.
Table 1. Capstone Rubric (Revised), Spring/Summer 2017 and Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean (Spr/Sum2017)</th>
<th>Mean (Spring 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice Communication</td>
<td>Demonstrates evidence that students can communicate effectively to achieve desired outcomes in a professional setting</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Identifies a problem that needs to be addressed; approaches research critically</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Approaches practice from an informed scholar-practitioner approach</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How you have/will/can make use of the results:

- Decided to continue using the revised rubrics for assessment
- Decide how to revise the capstone sequence (Currently six units, EDUINDP 724, 726, 727, 789)
  - Proposals to replace courses are still in development
- Make further refinements to the assessment instruments

Issues/problems you encountered in implementing your plan and how you dealt with them:

- Need for better communication with instructors about assessment instruments
  - Instructors needed to be supplied with instruments upon starting a course or before
  - Instructors chose to implement the rubric in different ways. For example, it was possible to embed a rubric in the grading system of a course to yield scores incompatible with the program assessment system
- Emphasis areas with low enrollment or subject to change or suspension
  - Decided to wait for program revision (e.g., consolidation and revision of programs in health, human performance, recreation, coaching, and physical education) or revival (Art Education, Challenging Advanced Learners) before developing assessment matrix
- Instructor survey results leave little room to show improvement over time
  - Continue to gather data and see if this persists. If the instrument is reliable, it may need revision