

CNM ANNUAL STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

Due to the Student Academic Assessment Committee by October 15



PART 1: REPORT INFORMATION

Report Year and Contact Information			
<u>2017-2018</u> Academic Year	<u>Catron Allred</u> Contact Person	<u>Callred2@cnm.edu</u> CNM Email	<u>50606</u> CNM Office Extension

Subject of this Report
CHSS--TE_AA--Teacher Education Degree

PART 2: CONTEXT IN WHICH THE ASSESSMENT TOOK PLACE

Program/Area Highlights and Successes (Wherever applicable, include course completion rates, job placement outcomes, and licensing examination pass rates. See the program information dashboard at https://livecnm.sharepoint.com/sites/Dashboards/SitePages/Program%20Information%20Dashboard.aspx (access restricted to CNM employees) and other reports at https://www.cnm.edu/depts/opie .)
Due to changes at the state for teacher education general education requirements, CNM restructured the Teacher Education associate degree program in 2017-2018. The degree changed from 5 different concentrations to 2 concentrations: Secondary and Elementary/Special Education. We were able to add two additional teacher education courses to the Elementary/Special Education degree and set up transfer agreements with NMHU and WNMU to accept our courses. There were 528 declared majors in Fall 2017 and 66 graduates from the Teacher Education program in 2017-2018. Course completion rates in both programs are above 80%.

Changes Implemented During the Past Year in Support of Student Learning
In the past year, faculty have worked to revise curriculum to ensure that the course learning objectives are well aligned to the summative tasks for each class. Online consensus shells have been created to ensure consistency in these learning objectives and related summative assignments for online courses offered and this work will continue for the face to face classes as well. Common course numbering (Trifecta) has provided additional opportunity to revisit learning objectives to ensure statewide alignment first, and thereafter to revise and align summative assignments, as needed.

PART 3: REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Assessment Method	Type of Assessment Tool	Population or Course(s) Assessed	Graduate Learning Outcome(s) Assessed	Mastery Level (E.g., "Minimum score of 3 on a rubric scaled 0-4" or "Minimum score of 75%")	Targeted % Achieving Mastery	Outcome
Student Survey	Direct & Internal	Teacher Education Courses	Alignment between course learning objectives and how well summative assessments prepared students to meet course learning objectives.	3.5 out of 5 point scale	100%	Target met
Instructor Survey	Direct & Internal	Teacher Education Faculty	Alignment between summative assessments and course learning objectives	3.5 out of 5 point scale	50%	Target partially met

Summary of Assessment Findings

A student survey was administered in the Fall of 2017 and Spring of 2018 that asked students to rate their level of agreement with the extent to which the course content prepared them to meet course learning objectives. Students were then asked what assignment demonstrated their learning of course objectives and this data was collected as qualitative responses to be used for course improvement. In the Fall, 129 survey responses were collected with an average rating of 4.72. In the Spring of 2018, 126 surveys were collected with an average rating of 4.8.

A faculty survey was administered in the Fall of 2017 and Spring of 2018 to ask instructors if they believed that course content was aligned to course learning objectives and what assessments aligned to those same course objectives. In the Fall, 6 responses were collected with an average rating of 3.9. In the Spring, 5 responses were collected with an average rating of 3.4.

Interpretation of Assessment Findings

Student responses indicate that they perceive a high degree of alignment between course assessments and course learning objectives. In other words, they feel that the course prepared them to meet learning objectives and had qualitative responses about which assignments they felt were best aligned with course learning objectives.

Faculty perceptions of alignment between course assessments and course learning objectives are much lower than the student perceptions. This might be the result of the syllabus revision work being completed over the past year. Because one semester’s results were below our target of 3.5 on the 5 point scale, we will be taking an in depth look at the qualitative responses and talking with individual faculty to gain insight into what needs to be revised to ensure that the assessments are designed and implemented in a way that instructors feel are aligned with the outcomes stated for each course.

Action Plan in Support of Student Learning (Describe changes to be made that are based at least in part on the assessment interpretation. If the assessment did not yield useful information, describe changes to be made in the assessment methodology and/or criteria.)

The Teacher Education faculty will take a closer look at the student's and faculty's qualitative responses to ascertain where the breakdown in alignment between course learning objectives and course assessments is occurring. Interviews with faculty will provide additional context to allow the team to revise any course assessments necessary to maintain strong alignment with the stated course objectives.

Please select all of the following that characterize the types of changes described in the above action plan:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment criteria revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methodology revision | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assignment revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Budgetary reallocation | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in teaching approach | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course content revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Curricular Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty training/development | <input type="checkbox"/> Process revision |

Recommendations, Proposals, and/or Funding Requests	Budget Needed
<p>In order to more efficiently collect, analyze, and act upon programmatic data, the Education Program would benefit tremendously from data software. This program assessment provides a glimpse into the alignment and effectiveness of our program, but with more sophisticated data software (e.g., Tk20, LiveText), we could collect more robust data that would allow us to draw better conclusions about what is working well in our program and what improvements should be made on a formative and summative basis.</p>	

PART 4: REMAINING YEARS IN CURRENT ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLAN (including any revisions) – **OR -- UPCOMING ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLAN** (if this was the final year)

Years of Full Cycle	Next Year's Assessment Focus (Describe how the next planned assessment is expected to provide information that can be used toward improving student learning.)
2017-2022	Student and faculty surveys will address the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in each Teacher Education course, as was implemented in Fall 2017.

Graduate Learning Outcomes to Be Assessed	Years in which Assessment Is Planned	Population/Courses to Be Assessed	Planned Assessment Approach
Alignment between course learning objectives and course summative assessments	2017-2020	All EDUC AA Courses	Student and Faculty Surveys