

**TWU Academic Institutional Improvement 2013-14 Report - AIIR: Findings and Use of Results**Deadline: November 4, 2014**Component Name:** Family Sciences/Early Child Development & Educ**Degree/Academic Program:** M.S. in Child Development**Component Director/Chair:** Dr. K. Rose & Dr. E. McCarroll/ Dr. Karen Petty**Dean:** Dr. Whitworth/COPE**Date Submitted:** Aug. 28, 2014**Degree Program Campus(es):** Denton Dallas Houston**If online degree, indicate type:** Fully Hybrid Completion (Fully) Completion (Hybrid)**Table 1 – SLOs, Assessment Measures, 2012-13 Summary Data, and Target Indicators Table**

List the academic degree program student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and target indicators (criterion for success, *realistic* program goal, and *stretch* program goal – refer to current AIAP). List all SLOs even though you may not have assessed each SLO during 2012-13. Report the summary (aggregate) results/findings for each SLO assessed during 2013-14 (the percentage of students assessed that achieved the set criterion for success), and indicate total number of students assessed per measure ( $N = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$ ). [Disaggregated category/sub-category data for assessments, if applicable, can be reported in Table 2.]

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Measures (2 per SLO)	2013-14 Summary Data	Target Indicators		
			Criterion for Success	Realistic Program Goal	Stretch Program Goal
<b>SLO 1:</b> Clearly apply child development/early childhood education theories with an emphasis on child development.	1. Observation Papers from FS 5003* As described in our assessment materials from 2012-2013, we analyzed the scores on observation reports from FS 5003 (see our analysis and interpretation below for explanation).	( $N = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$ ) 83%	An individual score of 80% on this assignment	80% of students will score an 80% or better on this assignment	90% of students will score an 80% or better on this assignment
	2. Oral defense at final examination	( $N = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$ ) 100%	An individual score of 80% on this assignment	80% of students will score an 80% or better on this assignment	90% of students will score an 80% or better on this assignment
<b>SLO 2:</b>	1.	( $N = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$ )			
	2.	( $N = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$ )			

<b>SLO 3:</b>	1.	(N = )			
	2.	(N = )			

**Table 2 – Disaggregated Assessment Category/Sub-Category Data Table**

Use this table, **when appropriate**, to report **additional category/sub-category data** (disaggregated data) for **applicable assessments** reported in Table 1. **Table 2 only applies to program assessments for which category/sub-category data are available to report.**

SLO/Assessment	Assessment Categories/Sub-Categories	2013-2014 Categorical Data	Realistic Program Goal/Target [if applicable]
1.1	<b>Outcome 1/Assessment 1 – [Insert name of assessment here]</b>		
	A. [List category here]		
	B.		
	C.		
	D.		
	E.		
1.2	<b>Outcome 1/Assessment 2 – Oral Defense at Final Examination</b>		
	A. Professional Standards Competencies (established by NAEYC)	9.0 (out of 10)	80% of students will score 80%
	B. Selection of Samples	9.0	80% of students will score 80%
	C. Organization of Materials	9.3	80% of students will score 80%
	D. Mastery of Program Content	9.3	80% of students will score 80%
	E. Scholarly Writing	8.6	80% of students will score 80%
	F. Oral Defense	9.6	80% of students will score 80%

SLO/Assessment	Assessment Categories/Sub-Categories	2013-2014 Categorical Data	Realistic Program Goal/Target [if applicable]
2.1	<b>Outcome 2/Assessment 1 – [Insert name of assessment here]</b>		
	A. [List category here]		
	B.		
	C.		
	D.		
	E.		
2.2	<b>Outcome 2/Assessment 2 – [Insert name of assessment here]</b>		
	A. [List category here]		
	B.		
	C.		
	D.		
	E.		
3.1	<b>Outcome 3/Assessment 1 – [Insert name of assessment here]</b>		
	A. [List category here]		
	B.		
	C.		
	D.		
	E.		
3.2	<b>Outcome 3/Assessment 2 – [Insert name of assessment here]</b>		
	A. [List category here]		
	B.		
	C.		
	D.		
	E.		
	F.		

**Table 3 – Analysis & Interpretation of Results**

Provide a detailed analysis and interpretation of student performance data for each student learning outcome assessed during the 2013-14 reporting period using Tables 1 and 2 results/findings. Also, use the TWU Summary Analyses & Actions for Improvement – Trend Analysis of AlIRs table (separate document) to reflect trend analysis (where appropriate).

Student Learning Outcome	Analysis & Interpretation
<b>SLO 1 Clearly apply</b> child development/early childhood education theories with an emphasis on child development.	<p>Instructors in FS 5003 did not require a theory paper during the 2013-2014 semesters, but FS 5003 does require observations of individuals during different life stages, requiring students to apply child development theories to assessing those observed behaviors based on developmental progressions/levels. We proposed last year that this SLO's assessment be modified to utilize observations of infants, toddlers, early childhood, and school-aged children to be used instead of a theory paper in FS 5003. Toward that end, we analyzed the scores on the first three observation assignments in FS 5003 (infants, toddlers, early childhood—the last two cover early adulthood and aging) and found that on average across the three observations, 83% of ECDE students enrolled in all sections of FS 5003 scored an 80% or higher on these observations. Interestingly, this 83% also met the 90% threshold set as our stretch goal, so a majority of our students in this class did very well on these assignments. The one student who did not meet the 80% criteria had an average over the first three observations of 79.3%, so we were not far from meeting our realistic goal at 100%. When looking at students' outcomes across all five observation assignments, 100% earned an 80% or higher (and 83% earned a 90% or higher) indicating that their scores may improve with continual feedback on the structure and format of the assignment. While this provides a positive assessment of our program outcomes, these data should be interpreted with caution, as there were only 6 students represented in the sample. The ECDE program should continue to monitor and assess this SLO to see if this finding is consistent across time and with a larger sample. While these are encouraging findings, the fact that FS 5003 is typically taken earlier in the program than later, we feel that a more accurate assessment may come from the oral presentation of their final examination (portfolio or thesis).</p> <p>One hundred (100%) of students scored 80% or higher on their oral defense at final examination. In fact, 100% of students scored higher than 90% on their oral defense at final examination, indicating that they are able to clearly apply child development theories. While this provides a positive assessment of our program outcomes, these data should also be interpreted with caution, as there were only 2 students represented in the sample. The ECDE program should continue to monitor and assess this SLO to see if this finding is consistent across time and with a larger sample.</p>

SLO 2	
SLO 3	

**Table 4 - Next Steps – Actions for Improvement**

Using the data analysis and interpretation provided in Table 3, describe in detail one targeted action that will be implemented to improve student learning for each SLO assessed during the 2012-13 reporting period. Use the Improvement Code Table below to “code” the type of action that will be taken.

Student Learning Outcomes (List each SLO statement)	Actions for Improvement	Improvement Codes
<b>Outcome 1</b> <b>Clearly apply child development/early childhood education theories with an emphasis on child development.</b>	<p>The following are the proposed plans to increase the validity of our reporting process for future years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revise assessment plan to incorporate data from the oral presentation of the portfolio/thesis as the other direct measure for this SLO.</li> <li>2. Revise portfolio evaluation rubric to gather more specific and meaningful data on several aspects of students' knowledge of child development/early childhood education theories.</li> <li>3. Gather data each semester as they grades are awarded and house these data in a common Blackboard space, accessible by all members of the component.</li> </ol>	RA, OTH
<b>Outcome 2</b>		
<b>Outcome 3</b>		

\*Recommend no more than 1 action for improvement per SLO so that changes in performance data may be more likely attributed to the action taken.

<b>Code</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>
Curr-C	<b>Curricular Change</b>	Curricular change to degree program (adding a course or other requirement, changed course sequence, etc.)
Ped-C	<b>Pedagogical Change</b>	Revised instructional methodology of delivering course material (less lecture, more student engagement; integrated technology; more formative assessment & feedback, etc.)
CR	<b>Course Revision</b>	Revised existing course(s), added or modified assignments or projects, modified content of course, changed textbooks; etc.)
C-Pre	<b>Change in Course Prerequisite(s)</b>	Adding or deleting course prerequisites; enforcing prerequisites
SS	<b>Student Support</b>	Improving tutoring services, self-study materials, developing specialized support by library or writing center staff, improved advising to ensure students follow established course sequencing, faculty mentoring, etc.
RP	<b>Revised Process</b>	Changed entrance/admission requirements, hired new faculty, changed environment, other process revisions, etc.
RA	<b>Revised Assessment</b>	Modified assessment tools, changed data analyses strategy, etc.
D/T	<b>Development/Training</b>	Providing faculty or TA development or further training workshops
ESS	<b>Equipment, Supplies, Space</b>	Change in instructional equipment, supplies, and/or space (new/updated computers or software, improvements or expansions of labs or studios, expanded space or equipment for student projects)
Crit-C	<b>Criteria Change</b>	Increased or modified set criteria for success or standards change/implementation
Fac-C	<b>Faculty Change</b>	Additional or change in roles or responsibilities of faculty
SLO-C	<b>SLO Change</b>	Revisions or changes to SLOs
Accr-C	<b>Accreditation Change</b>	Revisions due to disciplinary accreditation standards, etc.
OTH	<b>Other Change</b>	Changes made that are not reflected in any of the above categories

[