1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year and why?**

Our department assessed three programmatic outcomes this year. They included:

(Note: The data for the M.Ed. – Master Teacher Program in compiled on the web-based software called LiveText. LiveText does not disaggregate data by the year. It accumulates the data. Therefore, our report on Student Learning is aggregated from Spring 2007 to the present.)

1. **Students will demonstrate competence in content knowledge.** This objective is related to CWU Objective 1.1.1: Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes. The objective is also related to CEPS Goal 1: Provide for an outstanding academic and professional growth experience for students at all CWU locations. This goal was selected because we wanted to ensure that the teachers in the Master Teacher Program were better prepared to enhance student achievement in their K-12 classrooms.

2. **Students will demonstrate competence in pedagogical content knowledge and skills.** This objective is related to CWU Objective 1.1.1: Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes. The objective is also related to CEPS Goal 1: Provide for an outstanding academic and professional growth experience for students at all CWU locations. This goal was selected because we wanted to ensure that K-12 classroom teachers added to their repertoire of instructional methods and skills to enhance K-12 student learning.

3. **Students will demonstrate competence in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.** This objective is related to CWU Objective 1.1.1: Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes. The objective is also related to CEPS Goal 1: Provide for an outstanding academic and professional growth experience for students at all CWU locations. This goal was selected because we wanted to enhance the professionalism of all teachers in the Master Teacher Program.
2. How were they assessed?

1. The program goal, students will demonstrate competence in content knowledge, was assessed by a scholarly paper that was evaluated using four criteria: exposition; literature support; significance; and purpose of the study.

2. The program goal, students will demonstrate competence in pedagogical content knowledge and skills was assessed in three courses. EDF 505 was assessed primarily using written language. 507 was assessed using an analysis of the student’s own school. The assignment included students’ assessing their own school according to the principles of Diversity Within Unity as part of the course. The assignment was evaluated using a rubric. EDF 508 was assessed by the students evaluating the educational system of a country other than the United States. A rubric was used to evaluate the assignment.

3. The program goal, students will demonstrate competence in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills was assessed in two courses. EDF 501 was assessed using the following assignment: a written paper dealing with an issue or issues in the historical, philosophical, and/or sociological foundations of American education. The paper was evaluated using a rubric. EDF 503 was assessed using the following on a rubric: written communication; citation of outside resources; and the content of the paper.

3. What was learned?

Note: The specifics of what was learned in the Master Teacher Program are reflected in the LiveText data, which is presented below:

1. Content knowledge for advanced preparation of teachers.
From the chart, it is clear that the majority of the students were at target or proficient in the EDF 510 assignment. Faculty who teach the course the course will continue to work with students who scored at the unacceptable level.

2. Pedagogical Content knowledge and skills for Advanced Preparation of Teachers.

The EDF 505 assessment scores mean the following: (a) 4 is proficient; (b) 3 is target; (c) 2 is acceptable; 1 is unacceptable, and (e) 0 indicates that an assignment was not turned in. The chart shows that all students were at the proficient level on the assessment.

EDF 507: Studies and Problems in Intercultural Education
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Review/Summary

The chart shows that most students were at the proficient or competent level of the assessment.
EDF 508: Comparative Education

The chart shows that all students were at the proficient or target level of the assessment.

3. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Advanced Preparation of Teachers.

EDF 501: Educational Foundations

The chart shows that most of the students were at the exceptional or proficient level of the assessment.

EDF 503: Philosophy of Education

The chart shows that most of the students were at the exceptional or proficient level of the assessment.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

1. Our department will improve the professional writing of our students. A number of students are electing to take the Written Comprehensive
Master’s Examination rather than write a thesis or do a written project. Program student committees will work with the students on the improvement of writing skills. Our department will collaborate with the students and use the Writing Center personnel. In addition, the department will increase awareness among the Graduate Faculty of the need to monitor student writing quality more closely.

2. Our department will work with the students to improve the academic progress of students in their K-12 classrooms. The EFC Graduate Committee will examine ways to enhance our students’ content and pedagogical skills with the end result of increased K-12 student academic performance. Each student’s Graduate Committee will conduct an “end-of-the-program” survey to determine if the student’s K-12 students have increased their academic progress. In addition, our department will conduct an alumni survey to determine if the graduate’s K-12 students are performing at a high level. Our new data management system may allow us to more accurately examine the progress of our graduate students’ K-12 students.

3. Our department will talk as the Graduate Committee reviews the data. We will address: (a) Does the program needs to be modified? (b) Do the courses need to be modified and (c) How might online or hybrid courses support or goals of a quality graduate program?

5. What did the department of program do in response to the feedback from last year’s assessment report?

1. The Graduate Committee adapted the new program goals into a new promotional brochure, to explicitly promote our programmatic expectations and “sell” our program as one of quality and value to teaching professionals.

2. The Graduate Committee began discussions concerning moving toward online or hybrid courses to expand the program, while maintaining quality.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University.

We have no questions. Our comments are positive in that the assessment provides a way to examine the Master Teacher Program in depth.