

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Program: Ed Tech M.Ed. (502)

College: GCEHD

Prepared by: Dustin Hebert

Date: 6/7/18

Approved by: Kim McAlister

Date: 6/29/18

Mission Statements (fill in your program mission statement at the end):

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is a committed and diverse community of scholars, educators, students, and future leaders working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. The College produces graduates with the capabilities and confidence to be productive members of society equipped with the skill sets necessary to promote economic and social development thereby improving the overall quality of life in the region. The College offers a wide variety of exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare candidates for career success across the spectrum of professional roles and settings. These programs include teacher education, leadership, and counseling; health and human performance; psychology and addiction studies; social work; and military science. Candidates are taught to become adaptive critical thinkers and problem solvers in diverse scenarios capable of leveraging new technologies to enrich lifelong learning. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive role models in their communities and leaders in the nation's military.

Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling Mission. The Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and professional endeavors.

Program Mission Statement: The M.Ed. ETEC program seeks to enhance professionals' skills in digital tools for personal and professional productivity in education and other professional disciplines.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Methodology: Data are collected from key assessments in courses identified for each SLO. The assessments are administered as capstone assessments in the courses, and all are evaluated with analytic rubrics. Results are reviewed annually using descriptive statistics, comparisons across administration cycles, and, anecdotally, student feedback.

SLO 1

Course Map:

EDUC 5850

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1)	Candidates will demonstrate technology literacy skills, technology advocacy, and leadership in planning and delivering professional development appropriate for unique populations.

Measure 1.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Project Study

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment is aligned to the Graduate School's paper-in-lieu-of-thesis guidelines as well as criteria specific to ISTE standards, data analysis, and project-based learning.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The assessment criteria are aligned to the frameworks used to develop the assessment requirements. Performance indicators are qualitative and progressive across the rating scale.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

85% (n=11) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2016-2017: 76.9% (n=10) candidates met the benchmark.

2017-2018: 85% of candidates met the benchmark.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Analysis: In 2016-2017, 76.9% (n=10) candidates met the benchmark. Writing resources available to candidates were emphasized. In 2017-2018, 85% of candidates met the benchmark. Given the minimal increase, actions were relatively unsuccessful. Ratings on formatting, writing, and grammar in 2017-2018, like in 2016-2017, were routinely below benchmark, which accounts for the below benchmark performance. Since last year, additional APA style, writing tips, and grammar support were provided to candidates; however, patterns of consistent errors in candidate work were identified, which revealed that candidates did not take advantage of the additional resources nor did they, overall, integrate corrections from draft assignments into their final assignments on which these data are based.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Additional assignments will be added to EDUC 5850 that focus on APA style, writing, and grammar, which are the areas where candidates have for two years earned the lowest performance ratings. Since ratings on “content” items are consistently at benchmark, data do not indicate adjustments to those criteria are necessary. For 2018-2019, assignments based on the additional resources will be included into the course so that candidates are held accountable for reviewing those resources and so that performance on these assignments can be compared to final project rubric ratings to determine on which topics candidates struggle the most of APA style, writing, and grammar. Analyses of those data will determine next steps.

SLO 2

Course Map:

ETEC 6010

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #4)	Candidates will design and implement a virtual learning experience and assess participant learning in that experience.

Measure 2.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Virtual Digital Citizenship Seminar

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment was developed to align with ISTE Technology Director Standard 5. Candidates demonstrate content knowledge of digital citizenship and gain practical experience in online course design and delivery by completing the Digital Citizenship Seminar. The seminar is an online course designed by candidates and hosted in Eliademy or another platform of the candidate's choosing. Candidates solicit individuals to serve as “students” in the seminar; these “students” may be P-12 students or adults depending on the seminar's intended audience. Candidates' digital citizenship content

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

knowledge is evaluated based on the content presented in the seminar, and their pedagogical knowledge is evaluated against the Quality Matters criteria for online course design and delivery.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards? Each candidate's seminar follows a standard framework of four units, and each unit must include a presentation of content, at least one interactive activity, and at least one assessment. The seminar content is created by the candidate and is unique to a school or district. While the content is unique to the setting, each unit's broad topic is standard. Those are: 1) overview of digital citizenship (Standard 5: Digital Citizenship); 2) digital equity (Element 5.1: Digital Equity); 3) safe, healthy, legal, and ethical technology use (Element 5.2: Policies for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use; Element 5.3: Programs for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use); and 4) diversity, cultural understanding, and global awareness (Element 5.4: Diversity, Cultural Understanding, and Global Awareness). Specific sub-topics are provided for each (see seminar outline below).

Content for each unit includes at least one candidate-created video lesson/lecture, one Web site, and one additional digital resource that extends that unit's content. Activities must reinforce the content, and assessments must provide meaningful feedback for seminar participants.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director Standard 5 performance expectations.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how? 80% (n=10) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2016-2017: 80% (n=4) of candidates met benchmark.

2017-2018: 80% (n=10) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis: In 2016-2017, 80% (n=4) of candidates met benchmark. Course content changes were made to provide better instruction to help candidates define diversity, digital citizenship, and the integration of the two.

In 2017-2018, 80% (n=10) of candidates met benchmark.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Standard 5 (overall): Digital Citizenship; Element 5.1: Digital Equity; Element 5.2: Policies for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use; and Element 5.3: Programs for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use. Aggregate mean scores of 11.92-14.23 show that candidates demonstrate mastery of content above the expected benchmark on topics related to digital citizenship in general, digital equity, policies related to digital citizenship, and programs related to digital citizenship. This assessment requires candidates to construct not only instructional materials (text, visual, and audio) on digital citizenship topics as presented in Standard 5 but also examples of how these topics are (or could be) present in their schools and districts, thus making the candidates' products unique to their environments.

Element 5.4: Diversity, Cultural Understanding, and Global Awareness. The aggregate mean of 8.85 on the rubric criterion relevant to Element 5.4 reflects that candidates did not demonstrate mastery at the expected performance benchmark overall. A cycle-by-cycle analysis shows that fall 2017 data were below benchmark ($m=7.75$) while spring 2018 data were only .83 above ($m=10.83$); however, the spring 2018 data range shows a greater dispersion of ratings, with some candidates earning the highest rating for the indicator. A case-by-case analysis of submissions showed that two spring 2018 submissions earned maximum ratings of 15 while all others ($n=4$) earned ratings of either 10 or 5. Fall 2017 submissions had no ratings of 15, and greater than 50% ($n=4$) earned ratings of 5. Program faculty acknowledge that while some candidates earned maximum ratings, those represent only roughly 15% ($n=2$) of the total number of candidates ($n=13$).

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Candidate performance relevant to this element was somewhat alarming when considering the above-benchmark performance means on other criteria. The course instructor reviewed candidates' raw scores and selected at random five work samples of candidates who earned a 5 or 0 rating on this criterion. A review of those work samples revealed a consistent lack of "technology-focused and/or technology-mediated collaboration projects with individuals from a range of cultures and backgrounds..." as prescribed on the rubric. Required discussions on benefits and challenges related to diversity, cultural understanding, and global awareness were consistently included, though. Since candidates appear to be satisfying the conceptual element of this criterion, the faculty agree that greater detail and discussion on the application element of the criterion is needed. This detail will be added to the presentation of the assessment during the next administration (2018-2019).

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

SLO 3

Course Map:

ETEC 6010

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics.	Candidates will model skills and characteristics appropriate for individuals in formal or informal leadership roles.

Measure 3.1. (Direct - Skills, Dispositions)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Mentor Evaluation

How was the assessment developed?

The mentor evaluation is aligned to departmental goals, course outcomes, and ISTE and InTASC standards linked to course outcomes. It was developed by faculty using existing tools as models.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The evaluation's alignment to departmental goals, ISTE standards, and InTASC standards provides evidence for meeting the said goals and standards.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?

The evaluation criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to departmental goals, ISTE standards, and InTASC standards.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

100% of candidates will earn minimum ratings of 2 on all items.

Finding:

2016-2017: 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark.

2017-2018: 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis: In 2016-2017, 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark. Faculty reviewed the assessment tool and found items to be unbiased despite potential rating inflation from raters. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark. Trends show that data from this assessment are not actionable, which resulted in a decision to change the assessment tool. The 2016-2017 report noted possible rating inflation, and 2017-2018 yielded the same concern. Thirteen candidates were evaluated on 20 items for a total of 260 evaluated items. Of the 260, only 9 individual ratings were below the maximum score of 3. This emphasized the suspicion of rating inflation expressed in the 2016-2017 report.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Action - Decision or Recommendation: The mentor evaluation will be replaced with a departmental dispositional evaluation for advanced programs. This evaluation was administered in 2017-2018. Individual item means were 2.71 with an overall aggregate mean of 2.71 on a scale of 1-3 with N/A as an option, but no N/A ratings were used. While in its first implementation, no variance exists in data reported for this tool, but means of “less than perfect” scores do provide some dispositional expectations for faculty to explore. This tool will be re-administered in 2018-2019 so that two years’ of comparable data are available for comparison.

SLO 4

Course Map:
ETEC 5760

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3)	Candidates will design virtual learning experiences that yield multimedia content presentations and interactive learning activities.

Measure 4.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Interactive Multimedia Website

How was the assessment developed?

The Instructional Multimedia Website is the capstone assessment of ETEC 5760. In the Website, candidates demonstrate their mastery of digital tools/resources, digital-age learning strategies, educational technology/technology integration knowledge, and reflection on practice.

The Website serves as technology-mediated instructional tool where a target audience and instructional problem or opportunity are identified. The candidate, considering the unique needs of the target audience, then creates and organizes content and learning activities using the Web platform he/she has selected. Students then use/work through the Website and provide feedback via survey on the Website once they complete the tasks embedded within it. Candidates then review that feedback and student performance on activities within the Website and prepare an analysis report of the Website’s implementation and student feedback. Within the analysis, candidates identify what decisions they made on revising the Website content or activities based on student feedback and performance.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

Candidates use their knowledge of research-based pedagogy, digital tools, students, and the learning environment to select appropriate Web platforms for the Websites they

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

create. They further demonstrate their mastery of instructional design principles for digital-age learning by designing the content and activities of the Website in alignment with those principles and reasonable expectations of students (Element 2.1: Digital Tools and Resources; Element 2.2: Research-Based Learning Strategies).

Through the selection/creation of digital content and tools, candidates provide evidence of their knowledge of technology content and best practices in pedagogy for technology-mediated learning. The learning experiences they create through the Websites show their capacities for fostering innovation and creativity in digital-age learners (Element 6.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge)

Promoting self-reflection and use of data are emphasized in this assessment. Candidates are required to create mechanisms to collect student performance data on Website activities and feedback on the learning experience via the Website. Candidates then analyze the performance data and student feedback and report a synopsis of that analysis with plans for revising the Website content and/or activities aligned to student performance and feedback (Element 6.4: Continuous Learning; Element 6.5: Reflection).

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?
The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director standards as noted in the analysis.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?
80% (n=13) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 3 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2016-2017: 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark.

2017-2018: 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis: In 2016-2017, 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark. Given that this was the first implementation of this assessment, no changes will be made until at least two cycles of data are available to investigate whether trends exist. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark. The 2016-2017 action plan was to collect at least two cycles of data before decisions were made. An additional cycle was collected and is reported herein.

Element 2.1: Digital Tools and Resources and Element 2.2: Research-Based Learning Strategies. Aggregate mean scores of 3.22-3.67 for the criteria related to

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Standard 2 demonstrate that candidates not only are knowledgeable of digital tools and resources to support learning but also use and support the use of research-based learning strategies with those tools.

Element 6.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Element 6.4: Continuous Learning, and Element 6.5: Reflection. Mean scores of 3.44-4.11 for the criteria related to Standard 6 support the conclusion that candidates possess strong skill sets in pedagogy for digital-age learning and reflecting on then acting upon data based on student performance.

Decision: Elements 2.1 and 2.2. Even though candidate means exceeded the expected benchmark rating of 3, program faculty acknowledge that the lowest candidate means were for two criteria related to Standard 2 related to digital tool knowledge and research-based practice. However, program faculty also acknowledge that this assessment was revised substantially for the 2016-2017 administration and that major decisions about the assessment should not be based on only two administrations. Before revisions are considered, a third administration will occur 2018-2019 with an anticipated doubling of the n value. Data for all three administrations will be reviewed, and assessment revisions based on item analyses will be considered at that time.

Decision: Elements 6.1, 6.4, and 6.5. Equal mean scores of 4.11 related to content and pedagogy and data analysis indicate that candidates are well-versed in implementing technology integration techniques in different learning environments and reflecting on performance data to make instructional improvements.

SLO 5

Course Map:

ETEC 5780

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3)	Candidates will conduct investigations relevant to technology needs and uses in particular professional settings then present findings and recommendations for advancing technology in those settings.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Measure 5.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Technology Plan

How was the assessment developed?

Candidates analyze the technology utilization and needs in an approved school setting. Using the material presented throughout the course, including the readings and class discussions, they orchestrate and lead a planning process with the school's Technology Committee. They format the plan per a template provided with some elements likely being proposed or conceptual. For example, elements related to budget or survey data may not be available within the timeframe of this activity. For those elements, they are addressed broadly with as much detail as possible or a proposed timeframe in which they will be addressed with notations that details are limited and with a proposed timeline for gathering all pertinent details.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The technology plan assessment requires candidates to investigate a school within the P-12 setting. The investigation includes an audit of current technologies and their uses. With that knowledge, the candidate then works with the school leadership to organize a Technology Committee (or convene an existing committee) and lead an effort to draft a technology plan specific to the school in question (Element 1.2: Strategic Planning).

In general, this substantive activity aligns with the three elements of Standard 1: Visionary Leadership in that the candidate is assuming a leadership role in drafting a technology plan to expand and enhance school operations (Element 1.1: Shared Vision; Element 1.2: Strategic Planning).

With support of the school's Technology Committee, the candidate coordinates the effort to draft the school's vision and goals for school-wide technology integration. In some instances, this involves creating a vision and goals; in other instances, the activity serves to refresh an existing vision and related goals (Element 1.1: Shared Vision; Element 4.4: Partnerships).

Once the vision has been identified, the candidate and the Technology Committee work to draft goals for the three planning focus areas of 1) technology integration, 2) professional development, and 3) community engagement. The focus area goals lead to process to identifying key individuals, both internal to the school and external stakeholders, who will be key personnel in supporting the goals and what each individual's or group's role will be. Specific needs—hardware, software, networking, support, etc.—are then identified based on goals and data sources. Finally, candidates draft a budget for accomplishing the goals and seek out funding sources available (Element 4.5: Technology Infrastructure; Element 6.2: Technical Knowledge).

Examples of how advocacy networks and resources influenced the work are integrated throughout all sections (Element 1.3: Advocacy).

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?

The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director standards as noted in the analysis.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

80% (n=15) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2016-2017: 100% (n=7) of candidates met benchmark.

2017-2018: 100% (n=15) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis: In 2016-2017, 100% (n=7) of candidates met benchmark. Faculty elected to collect an additional cycle of data and await SPA response to conditions feedback before acting on this assessment. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=15) of candidates met benchmark. The 2016-2017 action plan was to collect at least two cycles of data and receive ISTE SPA feedback before decisions were made. Feedback was received, and an additional cycle was collected and is reported herein.

Element 1.1: Shared Vision, Element 1.2: Strategic Planning, and Element 1.3: Advocacy. Aggregate mean scores of 11.11-12.08 for the grading criteria relevant to Standard 1 demonstrate that candidates not only understand but also can lead the development of mission statements, related goals, and support systems aligned with ISTE Standards.

Element 4.3: Human Resource Management. Forty-one percent of candidates scored below benchmark on this element based on the new/revised evaluation criteria in response to reviewer feedback.

Element 4.4: Partnerships and Element 4.5: Technology Infrastructure. Aggregate mean scores of 10.14-12.50 reflect the greatest dispersion of means in the distribution for this assessment. The lower boundary, 10.14, represents the mean rating for the five-year action plan criterion. While the aggregate (m=10.14) and cycle (m=10.26, m=10.00) meet or exceed the benchmark expectation of 10, program faculty elected to review a random selection of work samples to determine any trends in the quality of candidate work related to this criterion. That review showed that the level of detail candidates provided for the five-year action plans was mostly superficial and lacked well-developed strategies with milestones of what would be accomplished when. Instead, 8 of the 10 samples reviewed included brief paragraphs where candidates

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

discussed the five-year action plan in general terms without identifying a timeline of expected accomplishments or how those accomplishments might be measured.

Element 6.2: Technical Knowledge. The mean score of 12.50 indicates that candidates possess the technical knowledge to plan for and make recommendations about the infrastructure (hardware, software, human capital) necessary for implementing a technology plan.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Recommendation - Elements 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. Candidates are expected to both describe the process by which the vision and goals were drafted but also include the ISTE Standards alignment through references in the plan narrative. Furthermore, candidates must show that the vision and goals are appropriate for the school environment relevant to the plan and were developed through a collaboration with stakeholders that engaged those individuals in supporting the school. They are required to include technology-mediated or technology-enhanced tasks or initiatives that will assist school personnel in improving and streamlining the goals within each focus area. Expectations of these elements were met given that all candidates met benchmark scores.

Decision - Element 4.3. Faculty have reviewed data and believe that stronger language in the requirements related to human resource management are in order. Those adjustments will be made to the assessment, and at least one more cycle of data on this element will be reviewed before further adjustments are made to the evaluation criteria.

Decision - Elements 4.4 and 4.5. Data led the lead faculty member to adjust the instructions provided to candidates, and those revised instructions will be provided when this assessment is administered again in 2018-2019. The mean rating of 12.50, the upper boundary of the complete range of means, shows that candidates are skilled in determining the infrastructure needed to sustain a quality technology plan that meets the needs of the school environment.

Recommendation - Element 6.2. All candidates met the benchmark expectation, but faculty agreed that no revisions should be made to this recently revised assessment based on one cycle of data. At least one additional cycle will be collected in 2018-2019, and comparisons then decisions will be made.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results:

SLO 1. In 2016-2017, 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark. Given that this was the first implementation of this assessment, no changes will be made until at least two cycles of data are available to investigate whether trends exist. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark. The 2016-2017 action plan was to collect at least

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

two cycles of data before decisions were made. An additional cycle was collected and is reported herein.

SLO 2. In 2016-2017, 80% (n=4) of candidates met benchmark. Course content changes were made to provide better instruction to help candidates define diversity, digital citizenship, and the integration of the two. In 2017-2018, 80% (n=10) of candidates met benchmark.

SLO 3. In 2016-2017, 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark. Faculty reviewed the assessment tool and found items to be unbiased despite potential rating inflation from raters. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark. Trends show that data from this assessment are not actionable, which resulted in a decision to change the assessment tool. The 2016-2017 report noted possible rating inflation, and 2017-2018 yielded the same concern.

Thirteen candidates were evaluated on 20 items for a total of 260 evaluated items. Of the 260, only 9 individual ratings were below the maximum score of 3. This emphasized the suspicion of rating inflation expressed in the 2016-2017 report.

SLO 4. In 2016-2017, 100% (n=20) of candidates met benchmark. Given that this was the first implementation of this assessment, no changes will be made until at least two cycles of data are available to investigate whether trends exist. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=13) of candidates met benchmark. The 2016-2017 action plan was to collect at least two cycles of data before decisions were made. An additional cycle was collected and is reported herein.

SLO 5. In 2016-2017, 100% (n=7) of candidates met benchmark. Faculty elected to collect an additional cycle of data and await SPA response to conditions feedback before acting on this assessment. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=15) of candidates met benchmark. The 2016-2017 action plan was to collect at least two cycles of data and receive ISTE SPA feedback before decisions were made. Feedback was received, and an additional cycle was collected and is reported herein.

Overall:

- Candidates are exhibiting sufficient knowledge and application of the breadth of each ISTE standard/element.
- Program faculty acknowledge that some areas of candidate knowledge and performance warrant improvement when data are reviewed element-by-element.
- Data show that candidates struggle with 1) scholarly writing, 2) digital tools, 3) human resource management, and 4) strategic planning.
- 2017-2018 findings were consistent with 2017 national program review feedback.

AY 2017-2018 Assessment

- New assessment requirements and experiences were integrated into the curriculum, which is the primary reason for only one cycle of data reported for some assessments.
- Faculty agree that at least an additional cycle is appropriate before revisiting the revised evaluation criteria so that methodical adjustments may be made based on trends across cycles rather than nuances of a single cycle of data.

Plan of Action Moving Forward: In 2018-2019, based on the analysis of results as noted elsewhere in this report, the program will focus on establishing evidence quality for all assessments as part of program improvement for accreditation expectations, administer revised assessments to collect at least one additional cycle of data for comparison, and retool elements of some courses to improve student performance.

The primary adjustments are slated for EDUC 5850 given that candidates have routinely earned low ratings on APA style and scholarly writing criteria. In 2017-2018, additional resources were added to the course to address these topics; however, student performance has not improved.

Other ratings of note related to candidates' knowledge of digital tools, human resource management, and strategic planning. Curricular and assessment adjustments made for 2018-2019 implementation base on ISTE SPA reviews have been noted in this report, and results and comparisons will be reported once those revised assessments are implemented.