Program Outcomes Assessment

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum

Created on: 08/31/2010 01:54:00 PM CDT
Last Modified: 10/28/2015 01:12:31 PM CDT

Table of Contents

General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)

Standing Requirements

Mission Statement

The Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology directly supports the University's mission at both the graduate and undergraduate program levels through the integration of innovative teaching, research, and creative activity designed to produce competent professionals who desire to teach or assume positions of service and/or leadership in schools or other service organizations.

Outcomes Library

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams
Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Outcome	Mapping
Preliminary Examination Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.	No Mapping

Dissertation Defense
Students' culminating assessment to the program

Outcome	Mapping
Dissertation Defense Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.	No Mapping

Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps

Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (See appendix)
Alignment Set: PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set
Created: 08/31/2010 3:20:17 pm CDT
Last Modified: 08/31/2010 3:22:17 pm CDT

Communication of Outcomes

Outcomes are communicated to students, the department, and unversity through outcome reports of preliminary examinations and dissertation defenses.

Archive (This area is to be used for archiving pre-TaskStream assessment data and for current documents.)

Archive

2009-2010 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

2010-2011 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Data for June 2010:

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Mean Score 2.2 2.4 1.8
Mean Score 2.75 2.25 2.33
Range 2 0.83 1.3
Range 0.5 0.75 0.5

Data for August 2010:

Mean Score 3.125 3.07 3.17
Mean Score 2.95 2.75 3

Range 0.5 0.2 0.5
Range 1.8 2 2

Data for January 2011:

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Mean Score 3.03 3.39 2.58
Mean Score 3 3.47 2.5
Mean of Means 3.015 3.43 2.54

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Range 0.25 0.67 0.25
Range 1.25 0.42 1

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : In terms of raters, issues appeared to abound with inter-rater reliability given the ranges in scores. Although the range in scorer ratings applied to exam reviews has dropped over time, the considered change in prelim format (to portfolio) and the training that will attend such a change seem well-poised to remediate the discrepancies in scoring that have existed heretofore.

Reflections/Notes : Overall, means for each day of the exam have increased over time. Day 1 means per exam period have increased by .32 points, Day 2 has increased by .97 points, and Day 3 had increased by .36 points until falling for the January 2011 period to yield an overall drop of .03 points. In the time period under examination, two students had to retest but all passed oral defenses in the final review. Overall, trends appear to be positive in terms of student learning and scores indicate that, on average, students are scoring on the higher end of the scale between Acceptable and Comprehensive scores.

Substantiating Evidence:

Summary of Data: Report of Preliminary Exams 2008-2011 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Consider substituting dossier for preliminary examination
(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense
Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not

defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Findings for Pass rate for dissertation

No Findings Added

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Action: Prelim exam changes

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: As stated in the findings section, the preliminary examination will be addressed in the 2011-2012 academic year. Moreover, a systematic means of capturing outcomes data for the system outlined above is being considered. Of course, excel spreadsheets are most expeditious at this point, but TK20 may be leveraged as a useable database once "issues" are ironed out from our initial and advanced licensure programs. That "ironing out" is well underway as an outcome of this year's Assessment Day. We look forward to our review of assessment data so that may form the basis of curriculum change.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2011-2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Program director

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating

No actions specified

assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Action: Prelim exam changes

Action Details: As stated in the findings section, the preliminary examination will be addressed in the 2011-2012 academic year. Moreover, a systematic means of capturing outcomes data for the system outlined above is being considered. Of course, excel spreadsheets are most expeditious at this point, but TK20 may be leveraged as a useable database once "issues" are ironed out from our initial and advanced licensure programs. That "ironing out" is well underway as an outcome of this year's Assessment Day. We look forward to our review of assessment data so that may form the basis of curriculum change.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2011-2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Program director

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Status for Prelim exam changes

No Status Added

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

No actions specified

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2011-2012 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year.

Scoring for the preliminary examination is evaluated using the following rubric:

0 points - Fail–typically, either no answer is attempted, or the answer is wrong on a majority of its statements or irrelevant to the question.

1 point - Inadequate–typically, the answer is too skimpy in its treatment of the concepts and/or fails to include concepts that should have been included. Also, an answer may be well developed but is clearly oblique to the question.

2 points - Acceptable–typically, the answer does not commit the errors specified in the "fail" and "inadequate" categories, and it treats satisfactorily the concepts essential to the question.

3 points - Comprehensive–typically, the answer commits no errors in choosing and treating concepts essential to the question and shows a sound grasp of the relation of concepts to each other.

4 points - Scholarly–typically, an extraordinarily well-presented answer–one clearly superb among doctoral candidates.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data collected in January and August each year

Responsible Individual(s): Department chair

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year.

Scoring for the preliminary examination is evaluated using the following rubric:

0 points - Fail–typically, either no answer is attempted, or the answer is wrong on a majority of its statements or irrelevant to the question.

1 point - Inadequate–typically, the answer is too skimpy in its treatment of the concepts and/or fails to include concepts that should have been included. Also, an answer may be well developed but is clearly oblique to the question.

2 points - Acceptable–typically, the answer does not commit the errors specified in the "fail" and "inadequate" categories, and it treats satisfactorily the concepts essential to the question.

3 points - Comprehensive–typically, the answer commits no errors in choosing and treating concepts essential to the question and shows a sound grasp of the relation of concepts to each other.

4 points - Scholarly–typically, an extraordinarily well-presented answer–one clearly superb among doctoral candidates.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data collected in January and August each year

Responsible Individual(s): Department chair

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Examination of the means over the period of review (2010-2012) reveals Day 1 means ranging between 2.73 and 3.02, Day 2 means ranging between 2.83 and 3.43, and Day 3 means ranging between 2.54 and 2.93. These means indicate our students are performing at a high-acceptable to comprehensive level.

The range of ranges of scores is more concerning. Day 1 scores ranged between 1 and 1.75 points for the review period; Day 2 scores ranged between 0.25 and 1.5 points; Day 3 scores ranged between 0.75 and 1.5 points. Issues appear to abound with inter-rater reliability.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : These data have given us sufficient indication of a need to address the issue of inter-rater reliability for preliminary examinations and the actual form of the examination.

The CIMT Graduate Committee has undertaken review of the preliminary examination and the issue of inter-rater reliability. Current thinking is that we should move to a dossier that more closely reflects students' achievement in various professional domains as achieved throughout the program. Development of a more detailed rubric is being considered as this is believed to be a reasonable "first step" at addressing the issue of inter-rater reliability.

Reflections/Notes :

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Findings for Pass rate for dissertation

Summary of Findings: Pass rate for the dissertation is 100%.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue to monitor

Reflections/Notes : We have not had any candidate fail to pass the dissertation as committees are vigilant in preparing candidates effectively for such. Committees review drafts prior to assenting to the setting of the final defense. On occasion a student may be required to complete certain revisions but that is generally an outcome of new insights raised at the defense. As long as committee members are vigilant about reviewing dissertations diligently before assenting to a defense, this trend will continue.

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Action: Consider substituting dossier for preliminary examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2010-2011 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Data for June 2010:

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Mean Score 2.2 2.4 1.8
Mean Score 2.75 2.25 2.33
Range 2 0.83 1.3
Range 0.5 0.75 0.5

Data for August 2010:

Mean Score 3.125 3.07 3.17
Mean Score 2.95 2.75 3

Range 0.5 0.2 0.5
Range 1.8 2 2

Data for January 2011:

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Mean Score 3.03 3.39 2.58
Mean Score 3 3.47 2.5
Mean of Means 3.015 3.43 2.54

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3
Range 0.25 0.67 0.25
Range 1.25 0.42 1

Action Details: The CIMT Graduate Committee has undertaken review of the preliminary examination and the issue of inter-rater reliability. Current thinking is that we should move to a dossier that more closely reflects students' achievement in various professional domains as achieved throughout the program. Development of a more detailed rubric is being considered as this is believed to be a reasonable "first step" at addressing the issue of inter-rater reliability.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Discussions started in April 2012 and continued throughout 2012-13, including arriving at a consensus that a dossier would be constructed for testing.

During 2013-14, examples will shared and decision-making will commence on form, process and rubrics for dossier.

Fall 2014 targeted for piloting dossier.

See attached document for detailed implementation plan.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Department chair

Measures: Dossier piloted

Resource Allocations: None requested

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report - April 2013.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.	*No actions specified*

Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Action: Consider substituting dossier for preliminary examination

Action Details: The CIMT Graduate Committee has undertaken review of the preliminary examination and the issue of inter-rater reliability. Current thinking is that we should move to a dossier that more closely reflects students' achievement in various professional domains as achieved throughout the program. Development of a more detailed rubric is being considered as this is believed to be a reasonable "first step" at addressing the issue of inter-rater reliability.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Discussions started in April 2012 and continued throughout 2012-13, including arriving at a consensus that a dossier would be constructed for testing.

During 2013-14, examples will shared and decision-making will commence on form, process and rubrics for dossier.

Fall 2014 targeted for piloting dossier.

See attached document for detailed implementation plan.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Department chair

Measures: Dossier piloted

Resource Allocations: None requested

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report - April 2013.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Status for Consider substituting dossier for preliminary examination

No Status Added

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

No actions specified

Status Summary

Prelim Reform Discussion
April 11, 2013

Suggestion: Students produce a dossier recording their accumulative progress on the doctoral program as a replacement of the three-day prelim exams. The materials in the dossier can/will be coursework, presentations, and publications. The dossier will be composed of three levels. Students complete certain required courses and some elective courses at each level. The performance at each level has to meet the required criteria.

Tasks: Before next Graduate Committee meeting, each committee member will do the following homework so at the meeting, we will be able to have a more efficient discussion on the doctoral dossier.

- Definition of each of the three levels
- What should and what should not be included in the dossier

• Course requirement for each level including required courses plus elective courses. For example, for Level 1, students have to complete six courses of which three will be the required courses of CIMT 610, CIMT 620, and CIMT 660. The elective courses can be any three of the following: …
• Criteria for each level
• Evaluation measurement at the checkpoint of each level
• Create a form for sign-up at each checkpoint
• Create a form for the oral defense

See the document attached above for details concerning the actions completed by April 2013 concerning making a determination for substituting a dossier for the preliminary examination and details concerning the next steps in the process.

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2012-2013 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Examination of the mean scores given on preliminary examinations a lower range in means on the first day of questions (these are always the same standard questions) than on the 2nd and 3rd day. For the August exams the Day 1 range in means was 1, day 2 =.75 and day 3=.55. During the January exams the day 1 range of means was 1.08, day 2=.25, and day 3=.31. During the June exams the day 1 range was 1.45, day 2=1.24 and day 3=1.01. the June exams had twice as many test takers as the January exams which might explain the rise in variance.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : In order to adequately evaluate inter-rater reliability, we should begin to evaluate the variance between raters of a single candidate and not continue to evaluate mean scores from all raters.

Reflections/Notes :

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense
Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Findings for Pass rate for dissertation

Summary of Findings: Pass rate is 100%

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Actions

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan

Action: Action Plan 2012-13

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: In the 14-15 cycle replace the measurements of mean preliminary examination scores with an examination of discrete scores between raters to establish a true inter-rater reliability assessment. Retain pass rate measure.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status Report

Action Statuses

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan

Action: Action Plan 2012-13

Action Details: In the 14-15 cycle replace the measurements of mean preliminary examination scores with an examination of discrete scores between raters to establish a true inter-rater reliability assessment. Retain pass rate measure.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status for Action Plan 2012-13

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Examination dates for 13-14 assessment cycle have been set and data will be collected during these exams to both indicate pass rate and range of mean scoring.

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Note: Findings are reported here retroactively for the 2012 and 2013 calendar years as well as for the 2014 calendar year.
Examination of the means over the period of review (2012-2014) reveals Day 1 means ranging between 2.73 and 3.15, Day 2 means ranging between 2.83 and 3.34, and Day 3 means ranging between 2.72 and 2.92. These means indicate our students are performing at a high-acceptable to comprehensive level. The range of ranges of scores is more concerning. Day 1 evaluation scores ranged between 1.3 and 2.5 points for the review period (a 1.2 point variance); Day 2 evaluation scores ranged between 1.5 and 1.8 points (a .3 point variance); Day 3 evaluation scores ranged between 1.03 and 1.5 points (a 0.47 point variance).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes : Issues may be associated with inter-rater reliability although having raters in and outside the field for Day's 1 and 2 may contribute to the range variances. As we do have data associated with each student and rater across all days of the preliminary examination, we are able to use this data to evaluate the implications of the variances.

Substantiating Evidence:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation

Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Findings for Pass rate for dissertation

Summary of Findings: Pass rate is 100%.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes : We have not had any candidate fail to pass the dissertation as committees are vigilant in preparing candidates effectively for such. Committees review drafts prior to assenting to the setting of the final defense. On occasion a student may be required to complete certain revisions but that is generally an outcome of new insights raised at the defense. As long as committee members are vigilant about reviewing dissertations diligently before assenting to a defense, this trend will continue.

Substantiating Evidence:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

These data have given us sufficient indication of a need to address the issue of inter-rater reliability for preliminary examinations and the actual form of the examination. The current assessment model does not provide for timely assessment of achievement at given points in the program. Because the graduate committee is considering a dossier to replace the preliminary examination, the opportunity is presented to identify strategic courses and learning opportunities within the curriculum from which work samples for the dossier can be developed. These will be considered "key assessments" within the curriculum articulation and will demonstrate not only content knowledge but will also present other professional competencies such as ethical and competent inquiry practices to contribute to the knowledgebase, and ethical and competent communication to enhance promulgation of the knowledgebase within the local, regional, national or global learning community.

No recent revisions of the Ph.D. core curriculum have been indicated or undertaken. At the conclusion of the 2012-2013 academic year, the CIMT Graduate Committee had determined it would review the preliminary examination and the issue of inter-rater reliability. Development of a more detailed rubric was being considered as this was believed to be a reasonable "first step" at addressing the issue of inter-rater reliability. It should be noted, however, that the committee's direction was influenced by the interim department chairperson for the 2013-2014 academic year; as such, the focus on development of the rubric was stalled. A move to create a dossier to replace the preliminary examination was also considered during 2012-2013 but stalled with the change in departmental leadership. Current thinking remains that we should move to a dossier that more closely reflects students' achievement in various professional domains as achieved throughout the program. Efforts to develop the dossier will be refreshed. As such, the issue of inter-rater reliability is tempered by the speed with which the department can institute a dossier.

Action Plan

Actions

Action Plan 2013-14

Outcome

New preliminary examination form and rubric

The CIMT Graduate Committee is currently returning to consideration of the construct of a new form of preliminary examination and rubric. A timeline follows to demonstrate accomplishments to date and for projected development for this assessment measure. Sections shaded in grey are completed.

Action: 1. Consider dossier as substitute

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: determination made to consider dossier as a substitute for preliminary examination

Implementation Plan (timeline): Apr. 2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Action: 2. Deliberate pros and cons

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: committee deliberates pros and cons of dossier in the two November meetings

Implementation Plan (timeline): Nov. 2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 3. Dossier form and process considered

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Discussion of dossier continues with form and process considered

Implementation Plan (timeline): Jan. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 4. Consult with IUB professors

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Doctoral Dossier HANDBOOK from IUB's Inst. Systems Tech program shared. Document outlines form and process. A rubric of sorts is also included. The rubric identifies areas of competency required (research, teaching, and service) and baseline and target indicators. A website with an example was also shared following the meeting. Drs. Lai and Ziaeehezarjeribi traveled to Bloomington to consult with professors regarding the dossier.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Mar. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 5. Committee works on form and construct modifications

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: consensus that the dossier will be constructed for testing. Timeline to be determined. Committee members asked to complete homework on form and construct modifications for CIMT Department. Dr. Boileau shared the International Journal of ePortfolio http://www.theijep.com/topten.cfm to provide research support for theoretical underpinnings. Final meeting of the semester cancelled due to Provost and Deans Department Structures Meeting. Concern is that a possible merger will require wider input for the finalizing of a new preliminary process.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Apr. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 6. Decicion-making on form, process, and rubrics for dossier

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: "Homework" will be shared and decision-making will commence on form, process, and rubrics for dossier. Timeline for piloting the process and a plan for data collection will be determined. Should departmental merger conversations prove time-consuming (and they likely will), this may be postponed until Spring 2015.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 7. Curriculum alignment

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Committee begins process of curriculum alignment and identification of strategic assessments to permit monitoring of "in-program" development of learners and to permit development of dossier for preliminary examination.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: Medium

Action: 8. Pilot dossier

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Action: 9. Dossier form and process rubrics

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: The goal is to have the dossier form, process, and rubrics under development int he fall of 2015. Data points of assessment of the process should be finalized

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee Chairperson

Measures: meeting minutes

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Action: 9-10. Pilot Dossier

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Fall 2016- pilot dossier

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Fall 2016

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee Chairperson

Measures: meeting minutes

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Action: 9-11. Refine product/process

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Spring 2017- consider findings from pilot and refine product/ process

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Spring 2017

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Status Report

Action Statuses

Action Plan 2013-14

Outcome

New preliminary examination form and rubric

The CIMT Graduate Committee is currently returning to consideration of the construct of a new form of preliminary examination and rubric. A timeline follows to demonstrate accomplishments to date and for projected development for this assessment measure. Sections shaded in grey are completed.

Action: 1. Consider dossier as substitute

Action Details: determination made to consider dossier as a substitute for preliminary examination

Implementation Plan (timeline): Apr. 2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for 1. Consider dossier as substitute

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 2. Deliberate pros and cons

Action Details: committee deliberates pros and cons of dossier in the two November meetings

Implementation Plan (timeline): Nov. 2012

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 2. Deliberate pros and cons

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 3. Dossier form and process considered

Action Details: Discussion of dossier continues with form and process considered

Implementation Plan (timeline): Jan. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 3. Dossier form and process considered

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 4. Consult with IUB professors

Action Details: Doctoral Dossier HANDBOOK from IUB's Inst. Systems Tech program shared. Document outlines form and process. A rubric of sorts is also included. The rubric identifies areas of competency required (research, teaching, and service) and baseline and target indicators. A website with an example was also shared following the meeting. Drs. Lai and Ziaeehezarjeribi traveled to Bloomington to consult with professors regarding the dossier.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Mar. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 4. Consult with IUB professors

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 5. Committee works on form and construct modifications

Action Details: consensus that the dossier will be constructed for testing. Timeline to be determined. Committee members asked to complete homework on form and construct modifications for CIMT Department. Dr. Boileau shared the International Journal of ePortfolio http://www.theijep.com/topten.cfm to provide research support for theoretical underpinnings. Final meeting of the semester cancelled due to Provost and Deans Department Structures Meeting. Concern is that a possible merger will require wider input for the finalizing of a new preliminary process.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Apr. 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 5. Committee works on form and construct modifications

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 6. Decicion-making on form, process, and rubrics for dossier

Action Details: "Homework" will be shared and decision-making will commence on form, process, and rubrics for dossier. Timeline for piloting the process and a plan for data collection will be determined. Should departmental merger conversations prove time-consuming (and they likely will), this may be postponed until Spring 2015.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 6. Decicion-making on form, process, and rubrics for dossier

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 7. Curriculum alignment

Action Details: Committee begins process of curriculum alignment and identification of strategic assessments to permit monitoring of "in-program" development of learners and to permit development of dossier for preliminary examination.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: Medium

Status for 7. Curriculum alignment

Current Status: Not started

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 8. Pilot dossier

Action Details:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee chairperson

Measures: Meeting minutes

Resource Allocations: Committee

Priority: High

Status for 8. Pilot dossier

Current Status: Not started

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information:

Action: 9. Dossier form and process rubrics

Action Details: The goal is to have the dossier form, process, and rubrics under development int he fall of 2015. Data points of assessment of the process should be finalized

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee Chairperson

Measures: meeting minutes

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Status for 9. Dossier form and process rubrics

No Status Added

Action: 9-10. Pilot Dossier

Action Details: Fall 2016- pilot dossier

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Fall 2016

Key/Responsible Personnel: Committee Chairperson

Measures: meeting minutes

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Status for 9-10. Pilot Dossier

No Status Added

Action: 9-11. Refine product/process

Action Details: Spring 2017- consider findings from pilot and refine product/ process

Implementation Plan (timeline): Targeted next steps: Spring 2017

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Status for 9-11. Refine product/process

No Status Added

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Ph.D-Curriculum&Instruction Outcome Set

Preliminary Exams

Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the coursework portion of the program.

Preliminary Examination

Culminating assessment for the coursework portion of the program.

Measure: Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Three-day exam given in January and and August each year

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings:
Examination of the means over the period of review (2012-2015) reveals Day 1 means ranging between 2.73 and 3.15 with a drop in the current reporting period to 2.78, Day 2 means ranging between 2.83 and 3.34 with a drop in the current reporting period to 3.19, and Day 3 means ranging between 2.72 and 3.17 with the current reporting period marking the highest mean for the period under review. These means indicate our students are performing at a high-acceptable to comprehensive level. The range of ranges of scores is more concerning. Day 1 evaluation scores ranged between 1.3 and 2.5 points for the review period (a 1.2 point variance); Day 2 evaluation scores ranged between 1.0 and 1.8 points (a .8 point variance); Day 3 evaluation scores ranged between 1.0 and 2.0 points (a 1.0 point variance). Issues may be associated with inter-rater reliability although having raters in and outside the field for Day's 1 through 3 may contribute to the range variances. As we do have data associated with each student and rater across all days of the preliminary examination, we are able to use this data to evaluate the implications of the variances.

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report 2014-2015.docx (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Dissertation Defense

Students' culminating assessment to the program

Dissertation Defense
Students' culminating assessment at the conclusion of the doctoral the program.

Measure: Pass rate for dissertation

Direct - Other

Details/Description: Dissertation committees, and more so committee chairs expend significant time in overseeing and supporting successful dissertation research. In general, students do not defend until the dissertation is sufficiently ready for defense. Having a 100% pass rate is expected.

Target: 100%

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s): Program Director

Findings for Pass rate for dissertation

Summary of Findings: Data Set: Pass rate is 100%.

We have not had any candidate fail to pass the dissertation as committees are vigilant in preparing candidates effectively for such. Committees review drafts prior to assenting to the setting of the final defense. On occasion a student may be required to complete certain revisions but that is generally an outcome of new insights raised at the defense. As long as committee members are vigilant about reviewing dissertations diligently before assenting to a defense, this trend will continue.

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:

PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report 2014-2015.docx (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Status Report

2015-2016 Assessment Cycle

- **Assessment Plan**
- **Assessment Findings**
- **Action Plan**
- **Status Report**

2016-2017 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Assessment Findings

2017-2018 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Assessment Findings

2018-2019 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Assessment Findings

2019-2020 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Assessment Findings

Appendix

A. **Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction** (Curriculum Map)
B. **Summary of Data: Report of Preliminary Exams 2008-2011** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
C. **Summary of Data: Report of Preliminary Exams 2008-2011** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
D. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report - April 2013.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
E. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan** (Word Document (Open XML))
F. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan** (Word Document (Open XML))
G. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction 2013-14 Findings and Action Plan** (Word Document (Open XML))
H. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report 2014-2015.docx** (Word Document (Open XML))
I. **PhD in Curriculum and Instruction Action Plan and Status Report 2014-2015.docx** (Word Document (Open XML))