ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This certificate prepares individuals for engagement in program evaluation roles as they earn their doctoral degree in a related area. Students learn to combine research and practical application to understand significant issues in program evaluation. While student are earning degrees in fields such as Educational Psychology, Higher Education, and Kinesiology, this certificate offers them an additional credential as evidence of their ability to play a significant program evaluation role in their discipline. Graduates with this certificate credential are prepared to work for colleges and universities, school systems, state and federal agencies, business and industry, private research and development organizations; as well as other educational and developmental settings

Student Learning Outcomes

1. **Specificity of Outcomes**

Current SLOs

SLO 1: Analyze and evaluate program theories of action, objectives and expected outcomes to generate evaluation questions.
SLO 2: Plan and apply appropriate program evaluation methods to address evaluation questions, issues, and problems, in accordance with professional and ethical standards established by the American Evaluation Association.
SLO 3: Communicate evaluation findings to clients and practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

Revised SLOs

SLO 1: Construct a program logic model that reflects program components such as theories of action, objectives and expected outcomes and discuss the relationship among these components.
SLO 2: Plan and apply appropriate program evaluation and research methods to address evaluation questions, issues, and problems, in accordance with professional and ethical standards established by the American Evaluation Association and describe the approaches taken to communicate results to key stakeholders.
SLO 3: Communicate evaluation findings to clients and practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

2. Comprehensive Outcomes

Faculty reviewed the College and University mission as well as the SLOs for Auburn University's Educational Psychology programs in the country. The initial review took place as a team of faculty in the Educational Psychology program and follow-up discussion took place among the faculty responsible for the core required coursework for the certificate in Program Evaluation. The final SLOs are based largely on those established for the Educational Psychology program, but tailored to the discipline of program evaluation. Critical aspects of this development process included:

a. A review of the initial six SLOs established for Educational Psychology program. This discussion (March 10, 2017) resulted a revised set of four SLOs.
b. Further discussion of the relevance of the Educational Psychology SLOs to the Program Evaluation certificate and coursework required for this certificate (ERMA 7210, ERMA 8100, ERMA 8200) was initiated electronically on April 15, 2017 to solicit core faculty feedback. Subsequent discussion took place on May 4, 2017 to finalize the certificate SLOs.
c. American Evaluation Association (AEA) Mission. Specific aspects of the AEA mission are aimed at the improvement of evaluation practices, increased use of evaluation results, and promotion of evaluation as a profession, - http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=13
d. In addition to the overall AEA Mission, AEA has established "Guiding Principles" - http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51. These principles were created after a systematic review of existing guiding principles , a designated Task force and comprehensive survey of AEA membership. The principles are focused on:

   1. Systematic Inquiry – evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries
   2. Competence – evaluators provide competent performance
   3. Integrity/Honesty – evaluators display honesty and integrity
   4. Respect for People – evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of the people with whom they interact
   5. Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare – evaluators take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may relate to evaluation.

e. Standards for Research Conduct (AEA, 2006) and Code of Ethics (AERA, 2011) proposed by the American Educational Research Association - More specifically, standard 1 (Problem Formation) from the AERA Standards for Research Conduct relates to SLO1; standards 2 (Design and Logic), 3 (Sources of Evidence), 4 (Measurement and Classification), 5 (Analysis and Interpretation) are reflected in SLO2 and 6 (Ethics and Reporting) is reflected in SLO3.
f. College and University Missions - Finally, these SLOs were created to directly reflect the college and university missions. They reflect the college mission as indicators of preparing competent, committed and reflective professionals

(http://www.education.auburn.edu/mission). They also reflect the teaching, research and outreach aspects of the University mission (http://www.auburn.edu/main/welcome/visionandmission.html).

    g. Further discussion of the program evaluation certificate (e.g., SLOs, scoring rubrics) took place among the four faculty members responsible for teaching ERMA8100, Program Evaluation on March 23, 2018.

AEA Guiding Principles (2013) - file:///C:/Users/shanndm/Downloads/Guiding%20Principles%202013%20Report.pdf

    AERA, (2006). Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in AERA Publications. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 33-40 - http://www.aera.net/Publications/StandardsforResearchConduct/tabid/15746/Default.aspx

    AERA (2011). Code of Ethics, American Educational research Association. Approved by the AERA Council. February 2011 - http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/About_AERA/CodeOfEthics(1).pdf

3.   **<u>Communicating Outcomes</u>**

    The communication of the program evaluation certificate SLOs is underway. During the 2015-16 academic year, our team generated these SLOs for the doctoral program in Educational Psychology through faculty team meetings and on subsequent email discussions. We have discussed and communicated this list of Student Learning Outcomes within the program area. More specifically, all program faculty responsible for advising students have been provided with these SLOs and map along with this report. Advising or not, all Educational Psychology faculty are informed on our SLOs, map, and related information via emails from program coordinators and at program meetings. The purpose of informing all faculty is to ensure everyone knows this material since all of them teach one or more of our core courses with SLO's. So, all of our faculty team knowing the SLO's and map is vital in order to properly plan, teach, and assess students in these core courses. The initial discussion among program faculty responsible for teaching any of the three core required courses (ERMA7210, ERMA8100, ERMA8200) was done electronically through an email and draft of SLOs I sent on April 15, 2017. Based on the initial feedback from faculty, the SLOs and curriculum map was drafted and discussed at a meeting on May 4, 2017 and refined through subsequent discussions among the faculty members responsible for teaching the course in Program Evaluation and with an established record of funded program evaluation projects.

    Communication of the program evaluation SLOs takes place in a variety of ways. First, they will be posted on the program webpage and on the Educational Psychology Information Board in the hallway on 4th floor of Haley Center. All incoming students will be advised of the program evaluation certificate and requirements upon admission. Additionally, when students meet with advisors, the advisor is encouraged to discuss the SLO's, the map, and related requirements. As a form of triangulation, the SLOs, the map, and related requirements, have been distributed and discussed in the program evaluation required courses (ERMA7210, ERMA8100, ERMA8200). Feedback from students enrolled in ERMA8100 was used to make things clearer to students. Finally, we are in progress in developing an electronic student handbook that details all graduate school and program requirements which would include the SLOs, the map, and process in which the SLOs will be measured and reported.

4. Curriculum Map

Our curriculum map can be found below; it visually represents the alignment between student learning outcomes and required courses/experiences.   1=introduced, 2=reinforced, 3=emphasized

Revised SLOs

SLO 1: Construct a program logic model that reflects program components such as theories of action, objectives and expected outcomes and discuss the relationship among these components.
SLO 2: Plan and apply appropriate program evaluation and research methods to address evaluation questions, issues, and problems, in accordance with professional and ethical standards established by the American Evaluation Association and describe the approaches taken to communicate results to key stakeholders.
SLO 3: Communicate evaluation findings to clients and practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

CORE COURSES REQUIRED FOR ALL STUDENTS	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3
ERMA 7210/7216: Theory and Methodology of Qualitative Research	1	1	1
ERMA 8100/8106: Program Evaluation	3	3	2
ERMA 8200/8206: Survey Research Methods	1	1	1
Perhaps include other aspects of the program (although not formally required for all)			
Conference Proposals, Presentations, Manuscripts for Publication	3	3	3
Program Evaluation Experience	3	3	3
1. 1=introduced, 2=reinforced, 3=emphasized			

Measurement

5. **Outcome-Measure Alignment**

[Please provide a description of the assessment measures, noting how they were chosen/developed to align with the student learning outcomes.]

For alignment with our student learning outcomes (SLOs), we have developed a portfolio-based measurement. Portfolios offer an authentic assessment opportunity, engaging students in the process of self-assessment and reflection in relation to valuable student learning outcomes. Supportive evidence will be included based on students' efforts in core coursework and professional experiences. For example, students are required to analyze program missions and theory of action and construct a set of meaning evaluation questions in ERMA 8100. This aligns directly with SLO1. In all three core courses (ERMA7210, ERMA8100, and ERMA8200), students are required to plan appropriate research (and evaluation) methods to address the purpose and specific research/evaluation questions. These artifacts align directly with SLO2. The third SLO is more challenging and may not be directly observed in existing coursework. In these courses, the end product is typically a plan or proposal. Many students, however, do implement such plans and are required to communicate research and evaluation findings to clients and practitioners. Determining which student have implemented their plans and getting artifacts has been challenging. Therefore, a practicum (ERMA7910/7916) in which student would enroll while carrying out their research or evaluation projects is being proposed.

6. **Direct Measures**

[Please consider indicating which assessments are direct measures of student learning (e.g., exams, rubric scores).]

Specific scoring rubrics were developed in relation to each SLO for the program evaluation certificate. We piloted theses rubrics this year and are in the process of refining these rubrics and tailoring them to the program evaluation certificate requirements and SLOs. A four-point scoring rubric is used in scoring student performance on each SLO. The emphasis is on the *evidence* provided by the student for each SLO and that component has its own rubric to score student work. The current scoring rubrics can be found in APPENDIX A.

7. **Data Collection**

[Please provide a description of the assessment data collection process (i.e., information on how data were collected, who provided data, and the pertinent methodological details such as rating/scoring design).]

Students are eligible for portfolio assessment review after they complete all required courses (ERMA7210, ERMA8100, ERMA8200) and approved elective courses and submit their request to obtain the certificate. Each student provides their evidence/artifacts electronically along with their record of completion of the requirements for the certificate. As students will be completing these core courses on varying timelines, it will be difficult to establish an annual deadline. Therefore, students will be requested to submit their portfolio upon completion of the three core required courses. Portfolio artifacts are reviewed by the certificate coordinator as well other faculty associated with the three core required courses. Reviewers will focus on areas in which they have expertise.

Results

8. **Reporting Results**

[Please provide assessment results aligned with the student learning outcomes. If historical assessment data is available, consider providing this data to reveal any student learning trends.]

No historical assessment is available since we just introduced the SLOs and the measurement processes. However, results from the examination of five students' artifacts are summarized below. Overall, student performance on each SLO averaged close to 3 (compentent). Further examination reveals that students 4 and 5 received the highest ratings from each reviewer while students 2 and 3 received the lowest ratings. Overall, rating were internally consistent among raters, resulting in an intraclass correlation (ICC) coefficient of .858.

Portfolio Results	R1	R2	R3	R4	Average
SLO1 Evidence- Logic Model					
Student Artifact 1	2	2	2	2	2.00
Student Artifact 2	2	3	3	3	2.75
Student Artifact 3	2	2	2	4	2.50
Student Artifact 4	3	4	4	4	3.75
Student Artifact 5	4	4	4	3	3.75
SLO 1 - OVERALL	**2.6**	**3.0**	**3.0**	**3.2**	**2.95**
SLO2 Evidence – Evaluation Plan					
Student Artifact 1	3	3	3	4	3.25
Student Artifact 2	1	3	2	2	2.00
Student Artifact 3	2	2	3	3	2.50
Student Artifact 4	3	4	4	4	3.75
Student Artifact 5	4	4	4	3	3.75
SLO 2 - OVERALL	**2.6**	**3.2**	**3.2**	**3.2**	3.05
Scale: 1=Inadequate /Insufficient 2=Developing 3=Competent 4=Accomplished/Exceeds Expectations					

9. **Interpreting Results**

[Please provide an interpretation of the results aligned with the student learning outcomes. The interpretation should reflect consideration of factors (e.g., capabilities of a particular cohort, innovative curricular change) that may have affected the results.]

The findings from the pilot data show the average score was close to 3, indicating overall competence of students on these two SLOs. Also, there was general agreement among the 4 raters, but this can be improved. When examining these scores more closely, there were several student artifacts rated 1 (insufficient) or 2 (developing) and this should serve as a sign that improvement needs to occur. To help future students improve, the core courses need to be examined to be sure that the key concepts are being addressed sufficiently to help students achieve competence on these SLOs. This initial data suggests that there were more lower ratings associated with SLO1 so additional attention to helping student analyze theories of action and constructing logic models to reflect the connections among program resources, activities, outputs and expected outcomes is needed. The four faculty who scored these initial set of artifacts will also have a meeting to reflect on and discuss potential revisions.

10. **Communicating Results**

[Please provide a very brief narrative describing with whom the results are shared (e.g., all program faculty).]

The results will be initially be shared within the Educational Psychology program team faculty, between the raters and the students who submitted these initial artifacts, as well as to the EFLT Department Head, and the Assessment Directors for Auburn University and the College of Education. This communication of results will be done through email with the students as well as, for faculty and admin, on the EFLT G-Drive. In addition, we will communicate results at face to face faculty and program meetings. Finally, these results will be shared in ERMA 8100 – Program Evaluation, this fall to provide students with an opportunity to not just learn more about the certificate program but the types of artifacts examined.

Use of Results

11. <u>Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan</u>

[Please provide a narrative describing the process in which faculty engage to discuss assessment results and create actionable plans in an effort to improve student learning.]

The key program evaluation faculty will have dialogue about these assessment results and examine the curriculum to determine where attentional attention is required. Faculty will also further examine the scoring rubrics and revise so that they are clear to all raters and accurately reflect the SLOs. The faculty will also be meeting to discuss the guidelines provided for students for critical assignments and projects in required courses, especially ERMA 8100-Program Evaluation. More specifically, guidelines for developing logic models and evaluation plans will be reviewed this summer, prior to the fall offering of ERMA 8100. Finally, a proposal for a practicum course (ERMA 7910/7916) in which students can implement the plans they developed in required coursework has been drafted and will be submitted for curriculum review by fall semester.

	Inadequate or Insufficient	Developing	Competent	Accomplished/Exceeds Expectations
SLO 1: Construct a program logic model that reflects program components such as theories of action, objectives and expected outcomes and discuss the relationship among these components.				
Evidence	No evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Perfunctory-not a synthesis, not comprehensive	Comprehensive and synthesizing	Adequate AND makes a novel contribution to the field

SLO 2: Plan and apply appropriate program evaluation and research methods to address evaluation questions, issues, and problems, in accordance with professional and ethical standards established by the American Evaluation Association and describe the approaches taken to communicate results to key stakeholders.				
Evidence	No evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Mismatch between problem/question and the design OR fundamental flaw in the application of methods	Appropriate and well conducted	Novel or substantial contribution

SLO 3: Communicate evaluation findings to clients and practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.				
Evidence	No evidence is provided or communication of findings was limited to a class presentation and did not describe how findings would be communicated to others.	Evidence of communication is evident but limited to a few or select number of stakeholders or violates professional or ethical standards.	Communication is made through informal reports (e.g. brief summaries, emails) and discussions with client and/or stakeholders and is aligned with professional and ethical standards	Communication is made through formal report (e.g. annual report) and presentation to client and/or stakeholders and is aligned with professional and ethical standards