Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18 *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

Unit/Program Name: ___Social Studies Education__ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** _Daniel A. Clark_____

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the assessment website.

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?
1. Performance on State Licensing Test, to assess how well they grasped the concepts, knowledge and skills of the six content areas (Economics, Geography, Government, History, Psychology and Sociology) within the major.	State licensing exam results. These exams are taken by program completers (graduates) after their graduation, pulled from the state through the help of ISU's office of Education Student Services	The SSE program has no criteria other than passage of the test (scoring 220 points). The program ideally needs to maintain an overall 80% passage rate.	In two content areas, Sociology and Government, ISU SSE program completers achieved a 100% pass rate over the last three years. The passage rate in Psychology was 86 %. In two areas Economics and History, ISU SSE program completers were very close to the 80% threshold but fell just short, at 78% and 79% respectively. The passage rate in Geography is a dismal 33%, even lower than the state average of 41% (it is a ridiculously hard exam and not a good assessment instrument, but…what can you do). Incidentally, a three-year aggregate was used, as that is what the NCSS accrediting body liked to see.	The ISU SSE coordinator is pushing through word-of-mouth and email for students/future graduates to prepare as much as possible for these exams—i.e. to simply take them very seriously. The Coordinator has also begun discussions with the faculty of Earth and Environmental Systems (who deliver the Geography content) to revise the curriculum with an eye to enhancing the rigor of the coursework in order to gradually improve scores.

			It also works better for these Pearson company licensing exams, since so many graduates fail and are forced to take the exams multiple times that it is better to see the results over a multiple year stretch to capture whether a student eventually passes. The state doesn't care how many times a student takes to pass the exam, only whether they ultimately do or not. As a program coordinator, I am concerned about the number of attempts graduates are forced to make.	
2. Ability to plan engaging and informative lesson plans, at appropriate depth within the six content areas (noted above)	Unit report (with lesson plans) prepared for SS 305 and SS 306 methods classes.	For purposes of accreditation through the National Council for Social Studies and CAEP, the program must evaluate the ability of students to effectively plan within 10 thematic standards and 5 disciplinary standards. The ISU SSE program has developed detailed rubrics for each of these standards with anywhere from 4-7 criteria within a thematic standard or disciplinary standard, all focused on proper understanding of content and the usage of appropriate resources. Students are rated as Exceeds, Meets or Does Not Meet on how they meet each criteria within a standard. The program establishes no expectations	Space does not permit a summary of how students performed in all 15 of the different areas evaluated. Suffice to say that all achieved a "meets" or "exceeds."	The rubric is very new and revised to suit new CAEP guidelines. The program will need to gather more data before evaluating if any actions would need to be taken.

		other than that all students will at least "meet" the standards.		
3.	Ability to present evidence of teaching effectiveness	Evidence presented by Student in a Unit Report performed in CIMT 400 after a clinical field experience (prior to student teaching). Students usually are co-enrolled in SS 306.	For purposes of accreditation through the National Council for Social Studies and CAEP, the program must evaluate the ability of students to effectively plan within 10 thematic standards and 5 disciplinary standards. The ISU SSE program has developed detailed rubrics for each of these standards with anywhere from 4-7 criteria within a thematic standard or disciplinary standard, all focused on proper understanding of content and the usage of appropriate resources. Students are rated as Exceeds, Meets or Does Not Meet on how they meet each criteria within a standard. The program establishes no expectations other than that all students will at least "meet" the standards.	Space does not permit a summary of how students performed in all 15 of the different areas evaluated. Suffice to say that all achieved a "meets" or "exceeds."	Students demonstrate, I think, quite solid competency in employing (and then reporting on) targeted assessments to evaluate how well their pupils advanced in their own knowledge/skills as a result of the ISU student-teacher's own teaching. No actions are required.
4.	Performance on internal content area tests to gage their basic competence in all six of the content areas, something that reflects the "core" social studies courses required of all majors and a competent knowledge base required of middle-	These exams are administered in SS 306 taken during the Fall semester of each year.	Each student has multiple attempts to take each exam and is rated based on how many attempts it take for them to pass the exams with a 70% score. The program has established no expectations aside from the expectation that all students pass the exams.	Out of the 11 students in the cohort taking these exams last year, 2 failed to reach the minimum 70% score in all of their exams.	No actions are required.

school social studies teachers.				

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Notes
  a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
  b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
  c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
  d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark").

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

The SSE program has run the same assessments for several years now. The assessments dealing with lesson planning and teaching effectiveness, along with an assessment covering student teaching (not assessed formally this year), have consistently demonstrated the competency of our students. They are ready to begin as teachers with the skills and knowledge in the subject areas and through their methods/pedagogy to begin their professional life. There are little things that I have noticed through assessments that they could do better on the whole, such as using a larger variety of formal assessments in their clinical experience. This is not something obvious in the assessment data, but something that I noticed in my capacity as coordinator. It does not rise to a level that requires systemic attention and can be handled through SS 306. Of much more obvious concern is less than ideal passage rates on the Pearson content licensing exams. I am not a fan of the Pearson tests. I believe they over-emphasize methods and under-emphasize actual content knowledge. And on the History exam, a subject I am best qualified to critique, they have a section worth, I believe 10 or 15% on Indiana History even though this is not covered in the content of any of the relevant grades in middle or high school, a fact which again to me raises doubts about the competency of those crafting the exams. Nonetheless for now these are the assessment instruments that we must measure the program against. We exceed or just barely miss the 80% passing rate threshold in 5 of the 6 content areas, and exceed the state average in the same 5 of 6, with the obvious trouble spot as Geography. Even though I don't have a great deal of faith in the reliability of these exams as assessment instruments, I am disappointed that the passing rates in Economics, History and especially Geography are not higher, and as noted above will take what steps I can to improve performance by raising the alarm, pushing students to prepare adequately, trying to provide funding for such preparation via an assessment award given to the program last spring, and finally to explore alterations to the course offerings in the three fore-mentioned specializations in order to ensure proper preparation. The testing data allows a program to dial down into the performance of students by topics within the discipline. For example, within History, while I think the test overemphasizes methodology, our students performed relatively well on social studies methodology. They performed worse on World History and historical methods. I have not yet had a chance to "slice and dice" the data on other content areas, but will as I consult with the fore mentioned departments. They are the stakeholders with which I will be sharing this information.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities
Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Improve passage rates on the state licensing exams	Push by word of mouth that the exams were difficult and that students needed to take it seriously and do some preparation. Most students approach it with little prep. Historically the exams were not difficult to pass, but since Pearson Publishing took over some 6 years ago now, with a mandate to be tougher, the exams have become ridiculously difficult. Students have not yet caught up to treating it more like a standard professional licensing exam such as the bar exam.	If one goes only by yearly data, then the ISU SSE program performed dismally in the calendar year 2017-2018. If one looks more long term at the 3-year aggregate passing rates, then the picture is more accurate. This figure is better for the fact that with the Pearson test, students take it multiple times, sometimes spanning 2 or more years, and reporting standards only count if a student passes or fails, regardless of how many times they might have taken the exams. I can tell you anecdotally from viewing the data that the number of times some students have taken exams in order to pass borders on criminal, in my opinion, and bespeaks of the naked profit motive of the private enterprise company in charge of the exam. Overall in only three (Government, Psychology and Sociology) out of the six content areas, our passage rates are over the 80% threshold set by the state. Government and Psych passage rates are 100%. In	I have already noted some obvious challenges. The licensing exams are exceedingly difficult. I continue to build "buzz" about the exams—i.e. the need to take them seriously and prepare for them.	This will continue to remain a major goal for the program. The Coordinator has already reached out to the Earth and Environmental Systems faculty in order to coordinate a revision of the Geography specialization with an eye toward increasing the rigor of the course work required. We will also enter into discussions this year with the Department of History regarding adding one of their new methods courses to the History specialization in SSE.

		two areas (Economics and History) they fall below but with very close averages for all ISU test-takers.		
2. Increase 4 year completion rates to 62%	Continue 90+ credit hour review of majors (by Coordinator—Dan Clark), performed in November and April of each year. This was implemented only a couple of years ago on the suggestion of the VP of Student Success, and has proven helpful for the coordinator to learn about one or two students per year who might run into some difficulty, usually related to a class or (more frequently) to a life situation.	Looking at the Blue Reports Data, the target of 62% seems now to be far too ambitious. The 4yr graduation rate by original department trend for those entering in stated year is: 2011 25%, 2012-32%, 2013-54%, and 2014-31%. The 6yr by original is better: 2007-35%, 2008-55%, 2009-57%, 2010-52%, 2011-50%, and 2012-47%. When looking under the category in Blue Reports on Cohort Retention and Graduation for SSE majors the trend is better, for example in 2009 the cohort retained graduated only 8.7% for 4 years and 30% in five years, but in 2014 the 4 year graduation rate for those retained within the cohort had jumped to 31% and the 2013 5yr rate stood at 53%, with the trend lines for each on the rise.	I am not an expert on plumbing Blue Reports, but the trend noted at the bottom of the previous column might point to the fact that more intensive advising and checking of records (the greater attention pushed on programs for graduation rates) might have yielded some success in the SSE program, though the other graduation rates do not evidence this.	The Coordinator plans on continuing the 90+ credit hour review of majors.
3. Get more students clearing mid-academic career hurdles—mostly passing the CASA test and being otherwise ready for the sequence of education courses in the Becoming a Complete	Continue midpoint survey of SSE majors (by Coordinator—Dan Clark), performed in November of each year. This survey is mainly intended to ascertain problems for sophomores and juniors as they prepare for the main hurdle in the SSE program (and any education program), a set of qualifications to	Looking at Blue Reports data on Cohort retention for SSE in the 3rd and 4th years, the trend has been a decline from 74% in 2009 to 50% for the 2014 and 2015 freshmen cohorts by the time they reached the third year. I believe this downward trend reflects both the difficulty in passing the CASA exam	See previous box for reference to the challenges that are causing mid-point issues within the major.	The Coordinator will continue to examine "readiness" for the methods/entrance to the Becoming a Complete Professional Program in the BCOE. The coordinator will continue to push students to BCOE tutorial services for the CASA exam.

Professional Program (BCP Program).	continue in the program such as a 2.5 gpa, passage of the CASA exam, etc.	(which when administered by Pearson has become far more difficult to pass and thus gain admission to the Becoming a Complete Professional Program in the BCOE) and the anecdotal evidence noticed by the coordinator (and mentioned elsewhere in this report) that the overall gpa of SSE majors has declined—i.e. the major has failed to attract the best students, likely scared off due to declining teacher pay and mandated oversight that limits creativity in the classroom.		

Notes
  a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
  c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See Blue Reports database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the Office of Institutional Research for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Within the last two years, the quality of the SSE upper-level cohorts (those clearing the hurdle of BCP admittance) has markedly improved. Previously I had grown worried in that I saw quite a few weak gpa's among lower-level students, and even some post-BCP admittance students. In other words, during the down-turn in enrollments following the recession and the continuing "teacher wars" in Indiana, those sticking with SSE tended on average to be more marginal students. Happily that has begun to change. I believe some of the problems in passing rates for our graduates stems from this receding long-term trend. The sub-par passage rates have been an issue for a few years and has motivated the Coordinator to become more pro-active in reaching out to affiliated departments and in revising the curriculum. One problem moving forward is the lack of faculty support for the SSE program by way of serving as advisors. The SSE program benefitted from a long run where the two advisors outside of the coordinator had advised for the program for some time. There was great stability. Both those advisors have chosen to move on to other duties and the Coordinator has had little luck in arousing interest. Advising is a chore, but learning curve in picking up the intricacies of the SSE advising task also render it less attractive. This could have an impact on movement through the program, if the coordinator becomes overwhelmed handling likely around 60 advisees or more.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Dan,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Social Studies Education
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.69/3.00)
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.00/3.00)

Strengths	Recommendations
- Learning outcomes are clear and measureable, for the most part (see recommendations). - Clear information is shared about courses and assignments that will be used to measure student learning. - Expectations for student performance are aligned with NCSS and CAEP standards. - Clear information about expected and actual student performance relative to the learning outcomes. - Descriptions of rubrics used to evaluate student learning are included for outcomes 2 & 3. - Excellent strategy for pairing with EES faculty to target geography coursework. - Great incorporation of faculty in reviewing and using assessment findings. **Relevant goals for student success are shared, along with rationale for their importance (CASA pass rates, progress to graduation).** **Some actions steps are provided, including strategies to address low performance in geography and ongoing advising.**	- Outcomes 1 and 4 aren't really learning outcomes. Performance on the licensure exam and content area tests are measures – the learning outcome should state what these measures are indicating. - For the content exams, providing additional information about how these are evaluated will be helpful in understanding the student performance data. **Consider working with related programs to understand how they're addressing challenges to student performance on Pearson exams.**

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included on the last page for reference only.

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals. Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with little description of analysis.	No data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.	Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.	No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)**Unit/Program:**
Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/ challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	□ **Undeveloped**	□ **Developing**	□ **Mature**	□ **Exemplary**