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BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:
Data is collected each semester from the Academic Advisor of the Professional Studies Program from the ED580 capstone course for the Student Learning Assessment Report. This data is compiled in the Education Database on the “S” drive of the School of Education and Human Services in the Education folder under Assessment. The database is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education and is password controlled. Only the Chair of the Department, Assessment Coordinator, and Clinical Experiences Coordinator has access.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.
This master's degree program is designed for those students who are not seeking a Virginia teaching license. Students in this program may be practicing teachers, education professionals who are not working in a classroom setting, or students who intend to teach in international or private schools. Along with completing a core of professional courses intended to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions basic to the field of education, students will complete an emphasis area and professional project designed to meet the individual needs, interests, and goals of the student.

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Assessed This Year</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• research and write critically about issues in education;</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• apply specialized knowledge and skills in emphasis area;</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• analyze content, behavior, and data for educational decision making and problem solving; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

Marymount University Mission: Marymount University is an independent Catholic university that emphasizes academic excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Committed to the liberal arts tradition, the university combines a foundation in the arts and sciences with career preparation and opportunities for personal and professional development. Marymount is a student-centered learning community that values diversity and focuses on the education of the whole person, promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth of each individual. Scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics are hallmarks of a Marymount education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Mission Hallmarks</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>research and write critically about issues in education</td>
<td>apply specialized knowledge and skills in emphasis area</td>
<td>analyze content, behavior, and data for educational decision making and problem solving</td>
<td>exhibit high ethical standards, respectful attitudes, and a dedication to education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:
The hallmarks of a Marymount education are scholarship, leadership, service, ethics, and a global perspective. The University’s mission emphasizes academic excellence, a liberal arts foundation, career preparation, and personal and professional development. The Education department directly supports this mission and Marymount’s strategic plan with its own mission and theme: “Preparing Educational Leaders for Diverse Learning Communities.” The three strands comprising our model include critical thinker, effective practitioner, and caring professional that synergistically interact with one another. To develop our conceptual framework and learner outcomes, the Education department uses the guidelines set forth by the nationally recognized organization, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and their model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers.
Knowledge of the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility provide the foundation of our course work and field experiences. Our classes are student-centered, personalized, and offer a variety of engaging and creative activities that help train each student in research-based best practices. Throughout the program, students are trained to personally and professionally develop and deepen the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to become an effective educator. Our department’s commitment to valuing diversity and a global perspective is demonstrated by placing students in a variety of settings both locally and abroad for their field experiences which helps promote a deeper understanding, appreciation, and sensitivity to the diverse needs of their students, parents, and communities.

Our mission and program outcomes also support the SEHS mission to enable students to serve as agents of positive change for individuals and in the global community. Our students are required to participate in service learning opportunities and to engage with the larger community. Our program prepares educators to create learning environments that support individual and collaborative learning, model professional learning and ethical practice, and demonstrate leadership by taking responsibility for student learning. Students who graduate our program become reflective practitioners who assess their professional and ethical responsibilities in bringing about positive change at the individual, school, community, and global level.

We designed our student learning outcomes to measure our students’ abilities to be critical thinkers, effective practitioners, and caring professionals. We assess our students through a variety of critical assignments that span throughout their coursework and into their capstone experience. Our students are assessed by their professors and field placement teachers. This variety of data allows our department to highlight our strengths and identify areas in need of improvement.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

Based upon the assessment data and examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the overall program effectiveness to meet the needs of our students, the Education department has made significant changes for the coming year and will continue to work this year on our planned improvements. The department met several times throughout the 2015-16 academic year to discuss and evaluate possible changes to make to the program. However, the department will continue to meet throughout this year to monitor, discuss, and evaluate these and future changes in our on-going efforts to ensure that the needs of our students are being successfully met.

1. The name of our program will be changing from “Professional Studies” (PRST) to “Professional Masters with Concentration” (PMC) with one of the following non-licensure concentrations: Curriculum and Instruction; ELL and International Studies; Special Education; or STE(A)M/Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Math. Several meetings last year took place to decide which classes would fulfill each concentration and which classes would be the core requirements for all concentrations. The department will work on
seeking approval of these concentration areas being translated into “Certificate” programs recognized by the Virginia Department of Education.

2. Based on these new concentration areas, the Learning Outcomes for this program and the syllabus for the ED580 capstone course will both need to be revisited and reassessed with input from the faculty members who facilitate each of the concentration areas. Our department will then submit any new Learning Outcomes for the 2017-18 catalog printing.

3. Based upon these changes to the Learning Outcomes and syllabus, the evaluation instruments, measurements, rubrics that are used to assess student work will also need to be revised and adjusted to align with the new course requirements and Learning Outcomes.

4. The Portfolios submitted by students in this program will be uploaded in a similar format as to the Portfolios uploaded by our Teacher Education Program. This will enable all full-time faculty to participate in the scoring, rather than just the professor of this capstone course, of the student Portfolios.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no Planned Improvements from last year since this is the first year our department is submitting a Student Learning Assessment Report for this particular program, as requested last year.

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

There are no responses since there were no previous reports.
Outcomes and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will research and write critically about issues in education.

Is this outcome being reexamined?  [ ] Yes  [x] No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Portfolio Standard #2: Professional Research and Writing | DEFINED – Professional Research and Writing: 
a) Translate a research problem into testable hypotheses. 
b) Locate, interpret and analyze research literature on a specific topic. 
c) Design and use an appropriate methodology or theoretical framework. 
d) State clear and thoughtful conclusion that demonstrates a solid understanding of the question. | |
| This is a direct measure. | Collection: The ED580 (capstone course for this program) course professor scored portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester. The capstone course is only offered in the spring semesters. | 1) Analysis Process: included the department examining the data from the student portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester during their assessment meeting. |

**Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #2: Professional Research and Writing**

| n | 3.25 |

**Rubric Scale:**
1 = Ineffective  3 = Acceptable  2 = Developing  4 = Target

2) Findings:
A. The aggregate mean in Standard #2: Professional Research and Writing exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level.
e) Use APA style formatting and write without errors in punctuation, grammar, or word usage.

f) Research and report on an issue through active investigation, practical problem solving, or reflective practice.

g) Demonstrate the ability to integrate technology and use appropriate software applications.

Acceptable Level: A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.

### Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #2: Professional Research and Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubric Scale:**
1 = Ineffective  
2 = Developing  
3 = Acceptable  
4 = Target

B. Individually, three students received ratings below the acceptable (3.0) level. This accounted for approximately 21% of the students.

C. For Portfolio Standard #2: 36% of the students scored at the highest possible level on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).

### Interpretation of Results

**Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**
For Portfolio Standard #2, 79% of the students achieved at or above the acceptable level (3.0). We feel that when we make the planned improvements to the overall program, we will have additional data to analyze, improved rubrics to provide more specific feedback, and a higher percentage of students meeting or exceeding the portfolio standard.

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**
While this is the first time this program is being assessed separately from our other programs, we will look to assess and record data on two pieces of evidence for this standard. The students did submit a second piece of evidence for this standard but it was not entered into a data format to be analyzed for our assessment meeting. This will be an improvement for this coming year.
Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
1. As a department, we will be discussing and planning for a number of changes in the overall program, such as: reassessing the Learning Outcomes, reassessing the syllabus for the capstone ED580 course to ensure that it meets the individual needs of students in all of the concentration areas, and reassessing the alignment of the evidence that students upload for each of the Portfolio standards.
2. The ED580 capstone professor and the professor who teaches ED550 (Research Methods) will work collaboratively to review and assess the rubric for evaluating the students’ research papers that are uploaded as Portfolio evidence for this standard. The research paper is done in ED550 but put into the portfolio in ED580. This will help better align expectations with the assessment of this standard. Also, two students had not yet taken ED550 (Research Methods) so it will be important for the department to problem-solve how to better sequence the order of the courses so that all students have taken this course prior to their capstone course so they have viable and meaningful evidence to upload.
Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will apply specialized knowledge and skills in emphasis area.

Is this outcome being reexamined? ☑ Yes ☒ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfolio Evidence
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge
This is a direct measure.

DEFINEd – Professional Knowledge
a) Teaching and Learning: demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences
b) ESOL: demonstrate an understanding of the social, cultural and linguistic needs of students with limited proficiency in English

Performance Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection: The ED580 (capstone course for this program) course professor scored portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester. The capstone course is only offered in the spring semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Describe the analysis process.  
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |

| Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| n = 14 | 3.36 |

Rubric Scale:
1 = Ineffective  
2 = Developing  
3 = Acceptable  
4 = Target

1) Analysis Process: included the Education department examining the data from the student portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester during their assessment meeting.

2) Findings:
A. The aggregate mean for Standard #1: Professional Knowledge exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level.

B. Individually, four students received ratings below the acceptable (3.0) level. This accounted for approximately 28% of the students.
### c) Special Education:
Demonstrate an understanding of characteristics and needs of exceptional learners and the ability to meet those needs through adaptations and accommodations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubric Scale:**
1 = Ineffective  
3 = Acceptable  
2 = Developing  
4 = Target

### Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. For Portfolio Standard #1: 43% of the students scored at the highest possible level on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).

### Portfolio Standard 4: Application of Knowledge

**DEFINED – Application of Knowledge**

- **a) Teaching and Learning**: Examples of different teaching strategies and instructional planning, delivery, assessment, motivation, and learning achievement.
- **b) ESOL**: Examples of EL student learning, different teaching strategies, instructional planning, delivery, assessment, and differences in TESOL levels.

**Collection**: The ED580 (capstone course for this program) course professor scored portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester. The capstone course is only offered in the spring semesters.

**Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #4: Application of Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>3.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubric Scale:**
1 = Ineffective  
3 = Acceptable  
2 = Developing  
4 = Target

1) **Analysis Process**: Included the Education department examining the data from the student portfolios at the end of the spring 2016 semester during their assessment meeting.

2) **Findings**:

A. The aggregate mean for Standard #4: Application of Knowledge exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level.

B. Individually, three students received ratings below the acceptable (3.0) level. This accounted for approximately 21% of the students.
c) Special Education: Examples of different teaching strategies, identification, assessments, and curriculum modifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Scale:
1 = Ineffective
2 = Developing
3 = Acceptable
4 = Target

C. For Portfolio Standard #4: 50% of the students scored at the highest possible level on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).

**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**
For Portfolio Standard #1, 71% of the students achieved at or above the acceptable level (3.0). For Portfolio Standard #4, 78% of the students achieved at or above the acceptable level (3.0). We feel that when we make the planned improvements to the overall program, we will have additional data to analyze, improved rubrics to provide more specific feedback, and a higher percentage of students meeting or exceeding the portfolio standard.

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**
Again, while this is the first time this program is being assessed separately from our other programs, we will look to assess and record data on two pieces of evidence for this standard. The students did submit a second piece of evidence for this standard but it was not entered into a data format to be analyzed for our assessment meeting. This will be an improvement for this coming year.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:**
As a department, we will be discussing and planning for a number of changes in the overall program, such as: reassessing the Learning Outcomes, reassessing the syllabus for the capstone ED580 course to ensure that it meets the individual needs of students in all of the concentration areas, and reassessing the alignment of the evidence that students upload for each of the Portfolio standards.