UNIT REPORT

**Curriculum and Instruction PhD - Institutional Effectiveness Final Annual Report 2019**

**Generated: 9/5/19, 10:49 AM**

# Definition of Unit

## Exceptional Learning Ph.D.

**Reporting Year:** 2018-2019

**Providing Department:** Curriculum and Instruction PhD

**Department/Unit Contact:** Ashley B. Akenson

**Mission/Vision/Goal Statement:**

The central focus of the Exceptional Learning Ph.D. (ELPhD) program is the study of diverse exceptional learner populations. Exceptional learners may be a member of one or more of the following groups: at-risk, vulnerable, underserved, underrepresented, and/or marginalized populations. Exceptional learners include, but are not limited to, those persons for whom social, economic, cultural, and physical characteristics may function as a barrier to learning. These exceptional populations may be neglected, oppressed, or disempowered by society; often excluded from equitable access to governmental, economic, educational, sociocultural, and community resources; and viewed as inherently different from the majority population. The ELPhD program offers an outstanding graduate education that prepares professionals for careers as leaders in their disciplines and to effect positive change in diverse populations through research, leadership, and service.

The ELPhD program has a primary mission of offering rigorous and robust academic preparation of professionals who serve their communities, public school systems, institutions of higher education, and nontraditional educational environments. Core courses prepare students to address issues related to exceptional learners in all disciplines, traditional and nontraditional learning environments, inclusion, equity, and diversity. The research course sequence provides students a thorough grounding in research methods. Core, research, and concentration courses deliver interdisciplinary perspectives, advanced methodological preparation, and fundamental theoretical knowledge—which work together to shape inspired, engaged, and innovative professionals. Specific programs of study are available in four concentrations: Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), Literacy, Program Planning and Evaluation (PPE), and STEM Education. There are two strands within ABA: *Applied Behavior Analysis School Age and Adult Populations* (ABAS) and *Young Children and Families* (YCF). Instruction and research are major components of the academic mission of the program. A committed faculty serves the students through instruction, scholarly activity, and service to provide quality academic experiences.

These goals and outcomes have been identified through faculty collaboration, and they are consistent with a central purpose of any Ph.D. program: to prepare individuals for scholarly and professional success in their chosen field. The objectives are broad enough to allow for the diversity of the concentrations, yet maintain the focus on exceptional learners. Faculty routinely monitor current practices in core, research, and concentration courses—through attending academic and professional conferences, examining theory, and reviewing evidence-based literature—and assess how they align with program goals and outcomes.

# Academic Curriculum Map

## ELPhD Academic Curriculum map

### Curriculum Mapping :

**Core Course Alignment with Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes**

| *Course* | *Title* | *Content Mastery (SLO 1)* | *Scholarly Research Activities (PG 2)* | *Professional Skill Development (PG 3, SLO 2)* | *Evidence-based Practices (PG1)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EDU 7000** | Trans-Concentration Seminar | I | I | I | I |
| **EDU 7010** | Theoretical Foundations of Research | I | I, A | I | R |
| **EDU 7020** | At-Risk Populations: Research, Service, & Delivery | R, A | R | R, A | R, A |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EDU 7040** | Program Planning and Proposal Development | I, R | I, R, A | R, M, A | R |
| **CUED 7430** | Specialized Applications of Technology to Education | I | I | R, A | R |

## Research Course Alignment with Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

| *Course* | *Title* | *Content Mastery (SLO 1)* | *Scholarly Research Activities (PG 2)* | *Professional Skill Development (PG 3, SLO 2)* | *Evidence-based Practices (PG1)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EDU 7010** | Theoretical Foundations of Research | I | I, A | I | R |
| **EDU 7330** | Qualitative Inquiry in Education | R | R | R | R |
| **EDU 7340** | Data Analysis and Representation in Qualitative Inquiry | R, M, A | M, A | M, A | M, A |
| **EDU 7420** | Quantitative Inquiry in Education I | I | I | I | I |
| **EDU 7430** | Quantitative Inquiry in Education II | R, M | R, M | R | R |
| **EDU 7300** | Research Design | M, A | M, A | M, A | M, A |
| **EDU 7320** | Single Subject Design | I, R | R, M, A | R, M, A | R, M |
| **EDU 7350** | Advanced Regression Analysis | R, M | R, M, A | R, M | R, M |
| **EDUL 7700** | Theory, Methodology, & Trends in Literacy Research | R, M | M, A | M, A | M |
| **EDUS 7350** | STEM Education Research | R, M | M, A | M, A | M |
| **ABAP 7920** | Topics, Issues, & Research in Early Childhood Special Education | I, R | R, M | M, A | R |

I = introduced R = reinforced M = mastery A = assessment

# Goal/Objective/Outcome

## Program Goal 1 Course Instruction

**Define Goal:**

**Program Goal 1:** Provide course instruction that models evidence-based practices in the respective program areas.

**Strategic Plan Connections**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence*, *Meaningful Innovation*, *Student Success*, *Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: SG1–PA A, B, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B

**Intended Outcomes / Objectives:**

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 1: Content Mastery & Course Competency
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate successful attainment of course competencies within the required program of study that results in the learner's mastery of program content.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 2: Professional Skills
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate the development of professional skills in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

## Program Goal 2 Scholarly Research

**Define Goal:**

**Program Goal 2:** Initiate and maintain scholarly research activities that enhance program development and contribute to the design and delivery of services and supports to exceptional populations through research dissemination in the field.

**Strategic Plan Connections**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence*, *Community Engagement*, *Meaningful Innovation*, *Student Success*, *Supportive Environment*, *Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: SG1–PA A, B, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B

**Intended Outcomes / Objectives:**

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 1: Content Mastery & Course Competency
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate successful attainment of course competencies within the required program of study that results in the learner's mastery of program content.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 2: Professional Skills
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate the development of professional skills in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

## Program Goal 3 Leadership Personnel

**Define Goal:**

**Program Goal 3:** Develop leadership personnel in the areas of teaching and research for service in the fields of public education and social services, such as public schools, state agencies, and higher education.

**Strategic Plan Connections**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence*, *Community Engagement*, *Meaningful Innovation*, *Student Success*, *Supportive Environment*, *Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: SG1–PA D; SG4–PA A, B, C, D

**Intended Outcomes / Objectives:**

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 1: Content Mastery & Course Competency
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate successful attainment of course competencies within the required program of study that results in the learner's mastery of program content.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Goal 2: Professional Skills
Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate the development of professional skills in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

## SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency

**Define Goal:**

**Student Learning Outcome 1 (SLO1):** Upon successful completion of the Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate successful attainment of course competencies within the required Program of Study that results in the learner's mastery of program content.

**Strategic Plan connections**

Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Community Engagement, Meaningful Innovation, Student Success, Supportive Environment, Value Creation

Strategic Goals: SG1–PA A, B, C, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA B & C

**Intended Outcomes / Objectives:**

## SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Define Goal:**

**Student Learning Outcome 2 (SLO2)**: Upon successful completion of Exceptional Learning Ph.D. program, the graduate will demonstrate the development of professional skills in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

**Strategic Plan Connections**

Core Principles: *Academic Excellence*, *Community Engagement*, *Meaningful Innovation*, *Student Success*, *Supportive Environment*, *Value Creation*

Strategic Goals: SG1–PA A, B, C, D, E; SG2–PA B & C; SG4–PA A, B, C, D

**Intended Outcomes / Objectives:**

# Assessment Tools

## Assessment PGs 2 & 3 ELPhD Facuty & Student Scholarly Activity Report

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** PG 2 - Scholarly Research & PG 3 - Leadership Personnel

**Type of Tool:** Other

**Frequency of Assessment:** Annually

**Rationale:**

**ELPhD Faculty Scholarly Activity Report** (conducted annually in Spring semester; Program Goals 2 & 3): Each faculty member submits a Faculty Activity report to Director of Graduate Programs addressing her or his efforts for the previous academic year. The report will address the following indicators: grant proposals, publications, presentations, other research endeavors, external consultants to public schools and agencies (including in-service and professional development). An overall summary of the program's progress will be included in this IE report as the format of the annual report no longer captures a complete picture of faculty activity. Student involvement is captured in the **ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity Report**.

**ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity Report** ELPhD students are asked annually to provide a current record of their scholarly activity (e.g., publication and presentations of original research or theoretical work, grant proposals, professional development activities). These represent peer-to-peer and faculty-student collaborations.

These assessment tools are used to monitor faculty and student attainment of program goals & SLOs. Informal check-ins occur throughout the year as well. Opportunities for collaboration, support, and skill development (e.g., calls for proposals for articles/chapters/conferences, workshops, seminars) in these areas are disseminated to all ELPhD students and faculty. Results are disseminated through faculty meetings, the twice-yearly Data and Assessment Forum, and institutional reports.

An overall summary of the program's progress will be included in this IE report as the format of the annual report no longer captures a complete picture of faculty activity.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Student Scholarly Activity**

Acceptability: actively working on a presentation or publication manuscript; submitted at least one presentation proposal &/or publication; collaboration with ELPhD students and faculty.

Expectation: submitted two or more presentation proposals &/or publication manuscripts; acceptance continued work on conference proposals and manuscripts for submission; collaboration with ELPhD students, faculty, and staff.

Exceptionality: submitted multiple presentation proposals &/or publications; at least one acceptance; cross-disciplinary and/or interdepartmental collaboration with students and faculty

## Assessment Program Goal 1 IDEA Evaluations

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:**

Program Goal 1: Provide course instruction that models evidence-based practices in the respective program areas.

**Type of Tool:** Survey

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester

**Rationale:**

**IDEA evaluations** (administered every semester)**:** Course evaluations for each faculty member are implemented and maintained through the IDEA evaluation system, and are used by faculty members to refine instructional practices and modify course content based on student feedback in support of program goals and student learning outcomes.

The IDEA evaluation survey is nationally normed, standardized instrument. These evaluations allow for national comparisons against similar courses with student ratings of progress on relevant objectives and teacher and course effectiveness. IDEA evaluations are used at higher education institutions all over the US. The evaluations have the support of 45 years of research and include questions to account for variables such as class size, student motivation, and other student and course characteristics.

Scores are used to gauge curriculum and faculty efficacy with respect to program goals and SLOs. The IDEA evaluation reports incorporate resources to support instruction development and improvement.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – IDEA**

- Acceptability: 3.5 score
- Expectation: 4.0 score
- Exceptionality: ≥ 3.8 score

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 Comprehensive Examination

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills
**Type of Tool:** Graduation Rate
**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester
**Rationale:**
**Comprehensive examinations** are administered near the end of each semester as needed, typically in conjunction with *Research Seminar in Education* (EDU 7920), after all other coursework has been completed (SLOs 1 & 2). Rigorous comprehensive examinations provide an opportunity for ELPhD students to provide evidence of proficiency in and mastery of expected learning outcomes (SLOs 1 & 2). Students illustrate mastery of theory, research proficiency, professional skills, and concentration-specific content through their comprehensive exam responses. Students must pass their comprehensive exams in order to move on to Ph.D. candidacy and continue in the program.

At the beginning of *Research Seminar in Education* (EDU 7920), the student and his/her Chair will select a series of four consecutive days during which the comprehensive examination will take place. Each committee member submits an exam question or set of questions to the Chair. The student typically has 4–8 hours in which to craft a response to each member's question/set of questions. Committee members may elect to allow the use of resources or to prohibit them. Responses are written to one committee member's question at a time. A student should not work on multiple responses at once. The questions must be answered with appropriate detail, clarity, and insight, and display strong comprehension and integration of fundamental concepts.

Once complete, the student submits the response to the Chair. If the question being answer was the Chair's, the Chair will then grade the response. If the question was submitted by a committee member, the Chair shares the response with the appropriate member. Responses on the qualifying exam are scored by their program chair and members of their graduate committee.

Scores (high pass, pass, low pass, fail) are based on pre-determined performance criteria devised by their committee and informed by evidence-based practices, discipline content knowledge, and professional skills introduced and reinforced in previous coursework taken by the student. Upon passing the comprehensive exam, students move into Ph.D. candidacy.

If an answer lacks the desired mastery, committee members have two options. If the response is reasonably close to the expected level of proficiency and fluency, the committee member may choose to ask for more detail and offer a student an opportunity to elaborate if necessary. Alternatively, the committee member may fail the student. Students who fail the comprehensive exam must wait a semester before retaking their exam. Students may only retake their comprehensive exam one time. A failure of any part of a student's retake examination warrants academic dismissal from the program.

Student pass rates are monitored every semester. Any signs of declining competence and response quality are reviewed as a means of maintaining and/or improving curricular efficacy as well as ensuring student success.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Comprehensive Exams**

Acceptability: students pass the comprehensive exam in no more than two attempts.

Expectation: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt with no more than one Low Pass score.

Exceptionality: students pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt and receive High Pass for one or more sections.

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 Dissertation Defense

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Type of Tool:** Graduation Rate

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester

**Rationale:**

**Dissertation defense** (Presented each semester as needed). The dissertation defense occurs each semester as needed. Graduates must successfully complete a written and oral dissertation defense, scored by their dissertation advisory committee (minimum four qualified members) (SLOs 1 & 2).

Building upon the prospectus work, the Ph.D. candidate works closely with committee members throughout the dissertation process in preparation for the dissertation defense. A Ph.D. candidate regularly submits dissertation chapters to each committee member for feedback (schedule determined by Ph.D. candidate and committee Chair). The Ph.D. candidate incorporates feedback from all members and continually seeks additional guidance on revisions and refinement. The full dissertation must be submitted to the dissertation advisory committee and Director of Graduate Programs at least two weeks prior to the scheduled defense date, though earlier is encouraged when possible.

During the dissertation defense, the Ph.D. candidate has 20–40 minutes to review the information covered in the prospectus proposal (e.g., context, problem addressed, significance, methodology) and present the original dissertation research findings, conclusions, and implications (defense time is determined by the Chair). The defense includes written materials and a formal presentation. After the presentation has concluded, the committee and any others present may pose questions to the Ph.D. candidate. Once all questions have been answered satisfactorily, the Ph.D. candidate and any guests are dismissed from the room. The dissertation advisory committee then deliberates about whether the Ph.D. candidate's defense was successful. Once a decision has been reached, the Ph.D. candidate is brought back and the decision is shared.

If the dissertation defense was successful, the committee signs the *Dissertation Defense* form and submits it to the Director of Graduate Programs and Graduate Studies. If the defense was not successful, the committee also provides additional feedback and outlines revisions that need to be made before scheduling a second defense.

The dissertation defense serves as the final assessment of a Ph.D. candidate's content mastery, course competency, and professional skill development as well as their development as scholars and leaders. Students' must have mastered and integrated the content and skills acquired throughout the ELPhD program in order to pass the dissertation defense. Historical data show that students are well-prepared and generally pass on the first attempt. This pass rate (graduation rate) is monitored every semester.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Dissertation Defense**

Acceptability: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense in no more than two attempts; candidate answers to defense questions, but answers may lack some of the desired complexity/depth; dissertation and defense presentation address all the required elements (study context, problem description, study purpose, significance, theoretical lens, connections to relevant literature, research methodology, findings, conclusions, and implications), but may need additional information; major revisions may be required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

Expectation: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense on the first attempt; Ph.D. candidate adequately answers defense questions; dissertation is thorough and well-crafted, addressing all required elements in sufficient detail; minor revisions required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

Exceptionality: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation defense on the first attempt; candidate's answers to defense questions are exceptional and demonstrate deep understanding of and connection to the work; defense presentation is engaging, informative, and shows Ph.D. candidate's expertise as a scholar and appropriate professional skills; dissertation displays thoughtful organization, relevant study purpose, clear significance, excellent methodology, clear findings, and insightful, nuanced conclusions and implications; minimal, if any, revisions are required before submitting to Graduate Studies and ProQuest.

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 Dissertation Prospectus

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Type of Tool:** Other

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester

**Rationale:**

The **dissertation prospectus** is presented and defended each semester as needed, in conjunction with or immediately following *Research Seminar in Education*, EDU 7920 (SLOs 1 & 2: successful written and oral prospectus defense to graduate advisory committee). **Note:** *Ph.D. candidate is used in place of student as the individual will typically have passed comprehensive exams before presenting the prospectus.*

Ph.D. candidates prepare their dissertation prospectus in *Research Seminar in Education* (EDU 7920). In this course, the Ph.D. candidate crafts the research design and write the prospectus for the proposed study. After receiving iterative feedback on the first three chapters of their research proposal from the course instructor and making revisions, the Ph.D. candidate presents a practice prospectus defense. The course instructor and candidate's Chair attend, though all committee members are welcome. Input from the course instructor and Chair is given at the end of the practice defense. The Ph.D. candidate then incorporates the feedback into the prospectus presentation and the dissertation prospectus.

After the practice prospectus defense, the Ph.D. candidate is directed to either schedule a formal prospectus defense with his/her dissertation advisory committee (after successful defense) or is directed to continue working on the prospectus and presentation with guidance from the Chair and committee members.

Once a formal prospectus presentation and defense date has been selected, the Ph.D. candidate is required to submit the dissertation prospectus to committee members at least two weeks prior to the scheduled prospectus date, though earlier is encouraged when possible.

At formal prospectus defense, the Ph.D. candidate presents the prospectus using PowerPoint, Prezi, or Keynote (other mediums may be acceptable) and provides handouts for the committee. The presentation is 20–30 minutes long. The Ph.D. candidate covers study background and context, problem description, study purpose, significance, theoretical lens, connections to relevant literature, and a detailed description of the proposed research methodology. Other pertinent information may also be included. After the presentation has concluded, committee members pose questions that the candidate must answer. The Ph.D. candidate is then dismissed from the room, while the committee members deliberate on whether or not the candidate should pursue the proposed research. Once a decision has been reached, the Ph.D. candidate is brought back and the decision is shared. The committee also provides additional feedback on the prospectus. If the prospectus defense was not successful, the committee will ask the Ph.D. candidate to revise the proposal and convene at a later date to present the revised prospectus. Ph.D. candidates who successfully defend the dissertation prospectus are given permission to proceed with their dissertation work.

Dissertation prospectus defense pass rates are regularly monitored. Historical data suggest students are well-prepared and indicate the ELPhD program is meeting PGs & SLOs, however, should a decrease in preparedness and pass rate occur, it will be recognized quickly and corrective action can be taken.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Dissertation Prospectus Defense**

Acceptability: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation prospectus defense in no more than two attempts; Ph.D. candidate answers defense questions, but answers may lack some of the desired complexity/depth; prospectus addresses all the required elements (study context, problem description, study purpose, significance, theoretical lens, connections to relevant literature, and research methodology), but may need additional information; major revisions may be required.

Expectation: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation prospectus defense on the first attempt; Ph.D. candidate adequately answers defense questions; prospectus is thorough and well-crafted, addressing all required elements in sufficient detail; revisions to the prospectus are required. After revisions, Ph.D. candidate will be ready to enter dissertation work.

Exceptionality: Ph.D. candidate passes the dissertation prospectus defense on the first attempt; Ph.D. candidate's answers to defense questions are exceptional and demonstrate deep understanding of the problem to be addressed and its relevance; prospectus displays thoughtful organization, relevant study purpose, clear significance, excellent methodology, and sophisticated insight; minimal revisions are required; Ph.D. candidate is clearly ready to enter dissertation work.

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 ELPhD Academic Achievement table

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Type of Tool:** Tracking Spreadsheet

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester

**Rationale:**

Students are required to maintain a 3.25 GPA while enrolled in the ELPhD program. A grade of B or better demonstrates sufficient content mastery for each course, whether that content is methods, practical application of professional skills, theory, or any combination of the three. Failure is considered a *C* or below. Students are allowed one *C* during their time in the ELPhD program. A second *C* is grounds for academic dismissal from the program. The attached PDF file demonstrates course alignment to SLOs & PGs; attainment of an acceptable grade or higher in these courses aligns with progress toward and attainment of SLOs & PGs.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Academic Achievement**

Acceptability: 3.25 GPA (mainly *B*s)

Expectation: 3.5 GPA (*A*s & *B*s)

Exceptionality: ≥ 3.9 GPA (almost all *A*s or all *A*s)

Attached Files

ELPhD course alignment to outcomes 2018-2019 7-15-19.pdf

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 Grant Proposals

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Type of Tool:** Tracking Spreadsheet

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each summer semester

**Rationale:**

**Grant proposals** for submission to an external funding agency are crafted each Summer semester in *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) (SLOs 1 & 2).

*Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) incorporates theoretical program planning perspectives; in-depth discussion of various program planning models; and effective program development, planning, and evaluation practices for a variety of educational settings. This class includes a focus on adult learners as exceptional learners, in and out of traditional educational environments, and their particular needs. These theories, skills, and practices are not typically addressed in undergraduate or graduate programs and are especially important in preparing professionals who can lead sustainable change for exceptional learners. This course requires students to prepare products that may have real-world impact.

One of two main project students undertake in EDU 7040 is creation of a grant proposal for a state- or federally-funded program. After completing the proposal, students must defend their proposal in mock “board meeting” discussions, which prepares them for gaining stakeholder buy-in, identifying unintended outcomes, and assessing needs in professional environments. This also provides students a chance to further improve their proposal via incorporation of the feedback given. The course instructor, who has authored or co-authored multiple successful grants over the last decade, evaluates the grant proposals and provides further input. Students who choose to submit proposals to the funding agency are encouraged to do so and directed to the Office of Research for instruction in grant submission policy and procedures.

Grades are monitored and in-class and informal feedback about the grant proposal process and collaboration (development of professional skills) is used to ensure progress toward SLOs and PGs and to improve student success.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Grant Proposals**

Acceptability: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a grade of B or better.

Expectation: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a grade of B+ or better.

Exceptionality: successful completion of a grant proposal as part of *Program Planning and Proposal Development* (EDU 7040) with a grade of B+ or better; grant proposal submission; collaboration with other Tech faculty and students on additional grant proposals.

## Assessment SLOs 1 & 2 Research Sequences

**Goal/ Outcome/ Objective:** SLO 1 Content Mastery and Course Competency & SLO 2 Professional Skills

**Type of Tool:** Graduation Rate

**Frequency of Assessment:** Each semester

**Rationale:**

The research course sequence is an integral part of the ELPhD program. *Theoretical Foundations of Research* (EDU 7010), *Qualitative Inquiry in Education* (EDU 7330), *Data Analysis and Representation in Qualitative Inquiry* (EDU 7340) make up the qualitative series. *Quantitative Inquiry in Education I* (EDU 7420), *Quantitative Inquiry in Education II* (EDU 7430), and *Research Design* (EDU 7300) comprise the quantitative series. Each 3-course series includes foundational theoretical concepts, methods of data collection and data analysis, creation of a research proposal, and an original study.

The research courses build upon one another and are sequential in order, further facilitating theoretical understanding and methodological application. For example, statistical concepts learned in EDU 7420 form the base knowledge for assignments in EDU 7430. Assignments in EDU 7430 are deliberately designed to be further developed in EDU 7300, the culminating quantitative research course. Similarly, theoretical foundations are used to inform a research proposal in EDU 7010 that is then used to enact data collection (EDU 7330), analysis, and interpretation (EDU 7340). This succession allows students to develop the necessary research skills and emerge from the courses with original work that addresses gaps in the literature, investigates theory, uses sound and appropriate methodologies, and contributes knowledge to the discipline.

Students are

1) required to read extensively, including scholarly writings related to epistemologies and theories that influence and inform social science research, and exemplary studies;

2) expected to submit polished, scholarly papers that undergo intense review, with the expectation of publishing and presenting; and

3) undergo faculty and peer review during class presentations of work in preparation for presenting at discipline-specific conferences and other scholarly forums.

Additional concentration research classes are also required: *Single Subject Design* (EDU 7320); *Topics, Issues, & Research in Early Childhood Special Education* (ABAP 7920), *Advanced Regression Analysis* (EDU 7530); *Theory, Methodology, and Trends in Literacy Research* (EDUL 7700); and *STEM Education Research* (EDUS 7530). The research course sequence and concentration-specific research courses prepare students for carrying out high-quality research, recognizing and utilizing credible research, and teaching research methods courses.

Course instructors work closely with students to ensure their success. If an instructor becomes aware that a student is not prepared to move onto the next course in the sequence, they are connected with peer tutors, additional study materials, and/or other resources to ensure success in the course and preparedness for the next level or, if more appropriate, encouraged to withdraw and re-take the class at a later date.

Starting in Fall 2018, ELPhD faculty and the Director of Graduate Programs have recently implemented a noncompletion identification and intervention procedure to improve student success and identify risk factors to better support students throughout their academic journey in the program. Faculty alert the Director when students are in danger of earning a C, display a marked change in classroom behavior (e.g., a shift from engaged and outspoken to withdrawn), failure to submit multiple assignments, consistent underperformance, and/or knowledge of major life changes that could undermine or threaten academic success. The Director then schedules an interview with each student whom faculty have identified as at-risk for noncompletion. After the interview, the student, faculty, and Director decide on a course of action that best accommodates the student's needs and provides supports and process to assist (e.g., tutoring, weekly meetings with faculty members, peer mentors).

**Thresholds of Acceptability – Research Courses**

Acceptability: successful completion of all research courses with a grade of B or better (research course GPA minimum: 3.0); submission of an original research project (via presentation or manuscript) to a regional, national, or international scholarly conference or publication.

Expectation: successful completion of all research courses with a grade of B or better, with at least two As (research course GPA minimum: 3.3); acceptance of an original research project (via presentation or manuscript) to a regional, national, or international scholarly conference or publication.

Exceptionality: successful completion of all research courses with mainly As (research course GPA minimum: 3.6); submission of original research projects (via presentation or manuscript) to two or more national or international scholarly conference or publication; acceptance to one or more national and/or international scholarly conferences or publications; collaboration on current research projects with ELPhD and/or other Tech faculty, staff, and/or students.

# Results

## Results Program Goal 1 Course Instruction

**Goal/Objective/Outcome Number:** PG 1 - Course Instruction

**Results:**

IDEA evaluations allow for comparison against similar courses on a national level. Fall 2018 faculty scored an adjusted average of **4.68** on a 5-point scale. Spring 2019 faculty scored an adjusted average of **4.71** on a 5-point scale. This exceeds the threshold of acceptability (3.5). Scores indicate faculty and curricula are successful in achieving learning outcomes and objectives.

**Thresholds of Acceptability – IDEA**

- Acceptability: 3.5 score
- Expectation: 4.0 score
- Exceptionality: ≥ 3.8 score

Tables 1 & 2. Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Faculty IDEA Evaluations 2018–2019

**Fall 2018 ELPhD Course IDEA Evaluation Scores**

| *Faculty* | *Course* | *N* | *Overall Ratings* | | | | | | | | *Summary Evaluation* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *B. Progress on Relevant Objectives* | | *D. Excellent Teacher* | | *E. Excellent Course* | | *C. Average of D & E* | | *A. Average of B & C* | |
| | | | *# Obj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* |
| **Akenson, Ashley** | **EDU 7000** | 6 | 6 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| **Arce-Trigatti, Andrea** | **EDUP 7420** | 3 | 10 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| **Baker, Jane** | **EDU 7020** | 3 | 3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Baker, Julie** | **CUED 7803** | 3 | 12 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 5.0 |
| **Chitiyo, George** | **EDU 7350** | 6 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| **Isbell, Janet** | **EDU 7330** | 9 | 3 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Larimore, David** | **EDU 7420** | 7 | 12 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| **Meadows, Jennifer** | **EDUS 7500** | 6 | 3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Spring 2019 ELPhD Course IDEA Evaluation Scores

| *Faculty* | *Course* | *N* | *Overall Ratings* | | | | | | | | *Summary Evaluation* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *B. Progress on Relevant Objectives* | | *D. Excellent Teacher* | | *E. Excellent Course* | | *C. Average of D & E* | | *A. Average of B & C* | |
| | | | *# Obj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* | *Raw* | *Adj* |
| **Anthony, Holly** | **EDU 7340** | 9 | 4 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| **Arce-Trigatti, Andrea** | **EDUP 7810** | 2 | 6 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Bishop, Tessa** | **EDU 7920** | 3 | 5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| **Chitiyo, George** | **EDU 7430** | 6 | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| **Chitiyo, George** | **EDUP 7810** | 2 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Isbell, Janet** | **EDU 7010** | 8 | 4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| **Kennedy, Krystal** | **EDUB 7810** | 2 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Kennedy, Krystal** | **SPED 6000** | 4 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **King, Seth** | **EDUB 7030** | 2 | 12 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **King, Seth** | **EDUB 7810** | 2 | 12 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Meadows, Jennifer** | **EDU 7950** | 1 | 4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| **Powell, Elizabeth** | **EDUP 7410** | 5 | 3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| **Silber-Furman, Dorota** | **EDUL 7500** | 3 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

**Attachments:**

## Results Program Goals 2 Scholarly Research & 3 Leadership Personnel

**Goal/Objective/Outcome Number:** 2 & 3

**Results:**

Each faculty member provides the program director her or his annual faculty activity report (Program Goals 2 & 3). The reports provide the basis for much of the program's annual report submitted annually to the Dean of Education. The information from these comprises the **Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Faculty Scholarly Activity report**. In addition, the **Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Scholarly Activity report** demonstrates student involvement in and dissemination of scholarly research and development of associated professional skills. The tables below show a high degree of faculty activity for each indicator and respective guided student involvement; student submissions are above the threshold of acceptability. A list of faculty and student scholarly and professional activity is also attached as a PDF document.

*Table 3*. Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Faculty Scholarly Activity

| 2018-2019 Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Faculty Activity (n = 24) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In-Service Workshops | Grant Proposals Funded | National Presentations | International Presentations | Books | Book Chapters | Peer-Reviewed Publications |
| 8 | 20 | 29 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 34 |

*Table 4.* Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Scholarly Activity

| 2018-2019 Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Activity (n = 33) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In-Service Workshops | Grant Proposals Submitted | Regional Presentations | National Presentations | International Presentations | Book Chapters | Peer-Reviewed Publications | Pending Peer-Reviewed Publications |
| 0 | 5* | 24 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 4 |

* One proposal was funded.

**Attachments:** Attached Files

ELPhD IE self-study report PG2&3 results.pdf

## Results SLOs 1 & 2 Content Mastery & Course Competency, Professional Skills

**Goal/Objective/Outcome Number:** SLO 1 & 2

**Results:**

· The majority of students (89%) maintain an A (3.5 or higher GPA equivalent) throughout the duration of the program. In 2018–2019, ELPhD students maintained an A average in the key courses listed in the table above (overall score across all courses: 3.66 out of 4.0). (See Table 5 below)

· Grant proposals for an externally funding source are a required component of EDU 7040. Table 4 above shows the number of proposals written during 2018–2019. Five students crafted and submitted proposals; one of these was funded.

· During the 2018–2019 academic year, ELPhD students belonged to over 30 professional organizations and disseminated original work (either their own or part of an active research collaboration with faculty &/or peers) at 51 scholarly/professional conferences (24 regional presentations, 12 national presentations, 16 international presentations) (see Table 4 below).

· Students enrolled in the ELPhD program during the 2018–2019 academic year submitted seven manuscripts (article, book chapter, or other scholarly work), three of which have been published (see Table 4 below).

· Quantitative research course sequence data—EDU 7420, EDU 7430, EDU 7300—(SLOs 1 & 2) demonstrate students' acquisition and mastery of knowledge of quantitative methods, instruments, analysis, and research design (see Table 5). Results across courses show consistency with each respective student. The higher number of *B*s in EDU 7430 is expected considering the degree of difficulty with cumulative knowledge and application of research analysis skills. During the 2018–2019 academic year, students maintained mainly *A*s (one student earning one *B*), and no student earned a *C*. (see Table 5 below).

· Qualitative research course sequence data—EDU 7010, EDU 7330, EDU 7340— (SLOs 1 & 2) demonstrate students' acquisition and mastery of knowledge of qualitative theory, study design, methods, and analysis (see Table 5). Results across courses show consistency with each respective student and the increased degree of rigor in EDU 7010 and EDU 7430 in comparison to EDU 7330 (where data collection occurs and emphasis is on practical application of research skills). Students maintained mainly *A*s (three students made a *B* in one of the three courses) and no student earned a *C* (see Table 5 below).

· Students are well prepared for their comprehensive examinations. All students in the last academic year passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt and entered Ph.D. candidacy successfully. Historical comprehensive examination data show successful responses on the first attempt for students taking exams in the past 5 years (see Table 5 below).

· All Ph.D. candidates in the last academic year passed their dissertation prospectus defense on the first attempt. Dissertation prospectus data show successful completion of presentations on the first attempt for all ELPhD students admitted since 2009 (see Table 5 below).

· All Ph.D. candidates in the 2018–2019 academic year successfully passed their dissertation defense on the first attempt. Historical dissertation defense data show successful completion of defense on the first attempt for all ELPhD candidates admitted since 2009 (see Table 5 below).

*Table 4.* Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Scholarly Activity

| 2018-2019 Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Activity (n = 36) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In-Service Workshops | Grant Proposals Submitted | Regional Presentations | National Presentations | International Presentations | Book Chapters | Peer-Reviewed Publications | Pending Peer-Reviewed Publications |
| 0 | 5* | 24 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 4 |

* One proposal was funded.

*Table 5*. Exceptional Learning Ph.D. Student Academic Achievement

Key for table below:

**non completer**

*** proposal funded**

**ˆ second attempt required**

**˜ revised prospectus presentation required**

**≈ not in program of study**

**(ip) = in progress at time of report**

| Admitted | | 7010 | 7330 | 7340 | 7420 | 7430 | 7300 | 7040 | Comps | Prospectus | Defense | Grad |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2009–2010** | 1 | B | A | B | B | B | A | A | F11ˆ | F11 | S13 | M13 |
| **2009–2010** | 2 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A* | S13 | S13 | F13 | F13 |
| **2009–2010** | 3 | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F14 | S15 | M15 | M15 |
| **2009–2010** | 4 | B | A | A | A | B | A | A | S11 | S11 | S13 | S13 |
| **2010–2011** | 1 | A | A | A | ≈ | A | A | A | M13 | M13 | S14 | S14 |
| **2010–2011** | 2 | B | B | B | A | B | C | A | S13ˆ | S13 | – | – |
| **2010–2011** | 3 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | M13 | M13 | S14 | S14 |
| **2011–2012** | 1 | A | A | B | ≈ | C | B | B | M14 | M13 | M16 | M16 |
| **2011–2012** | 2 | B | B | B | A | A | A | A | M14 | F14 | M19 | M19 |
| **2011–2012** | 3 | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | M14 | S14 | M16 | M16 |
| **2011–2012** | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M14 | S14 | S15 | S15 |
| **2011–2012** | 5 | A | B | A | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2011–2012** | 6 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M14 | F14 | S15 | S15 |
| **2011–2012** | 7 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | M14 | S14 | F14 | F14 |
| **2012–2013** | 1 | B | A | A | A | B | ≈ | A | M15 | M15 | M16 | M16 |
| **2012–2013** | 2 | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | M13 | M13 | S16 | S16 |
| **2012–2013** | 3 | B | A | B | A | C | A | A | F15 | F15 | M17 | M17 |
| **2012–2013** | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M15 | S16 | F16 | F16 |
| **2012–2013** | 5 | A | A | A | A | A | ≈ | A | M13 | M13 | S16 | S16 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2012–2013** | 6 | – | – | – | A | – | – | A | – | – | – | – |
| **2012–2013** | 7 | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | M17 | F17 | S20 | S20 |
| **2012–2013** | 8 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | F16 | F16 | S16 | F16 |
| **2012–2013** | 9 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | S15 | S15 | F15 | F15 |
| **2012–2013** | 10 | B | B | B | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2012–2013** | 11 | C | A | A | A | B | A | A | M16 | M16 | F16 | F16 |
| **2012–2013** | 12 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | S16 | M16 | F16 | S17 |
| **2012–2013** | 13 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | S16 | S16 | S16 | F16 |
| **2012–2013** | 14 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | S13 | S15 | F15 | F15 |
| **2012–2013** | 15 | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | F15 | F15 | M16 | M16 |
| **2012–2013** | 16 | B | B | B | A | C | A | B | S16 | S16 | | |
| **2013–2014** | 1 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M16 | F16 | S18 | S18 |
| **2013–2014** | 2 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M17 | M17 | M17 | F17 |
| **2013–2014** | 3 | I | – | – | B | C | – | B | – | – | – | – |
| **2013–2014** | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | S16 | S16 | M16 | M16 |
| **2013–2014** | 5 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | S17 | M17 | S18 | S18 |
| **2013–2014** | 6 | A | A | C | A | B | A | B | M17^ | M17 | – | – |
| **2013–2014** | 7 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | F16 | S17 | | |
| **2014–2015** | 1 | B | A | B | ≈ | A | A | A | S17 | M17 | S18 | S18 |
| **2014–2015** | 2 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | S18 | F18 | M18 | M18 |
| **2014–2015** | 3 | B | C | – | B | B | B | C | – | – | – | – |
| **2014–2015** | 4 | A | A | | A | A | A | A | M19 | M19 | | |
| **2014–2015** | 5 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | F16 | F16 | F17 | F17 |
| **2014–2015** | 6 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | S17 | S17 | S18 | S18 |
| **2014–2015** | 7 | B | – | – | A | C | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2015–2016** | 1 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | M17 | M17 | S18 | S18 |
| **2015–2016** | 2 | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | S18 | S18 | F18 | F18 |
| **2015–2016** | 3 | B | A | B | A | B | A | A | F18 | F18 | | |
| **2015–2016** | 4 | A | A | B | B | B | B | ≈ | S19 | S19 | | |
| **2015–2016** | 5 | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | S18 | S18 | F18 | F18 |
| **2015–2016** | 6 | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F18 | F18 | | |
| **2015–2016** | 7 | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F18 | F18 | F18 | S19 |
| **2015–2016** | 8 | A | B | B | B | B | A | A | F18 | F18 | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2015–2016** | 9 | B | A | A | B | B | A | A | M18 | M18 | | |
| **2015–2016** | 10 | A | A | B | B | A | B | A | M19 | S19 | | |
| **2016–2017** | 1 | A | A | A | A | A | A | (ip) | F19 | F19 | | |
| **2016–2017** | 2 | B | A | A | A | A | A | ≈ | S19 | S19 | | |
| **2016–2017** | 3 | – | – | – | A | B | A | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2016–2017** | 4 | A | I | – | B | W | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2016–2017** | 5 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | F18 | M18 | S19 | S19 |
| **2016–2017** | 6 | B | – | – | C | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2016–2017** | 7 | B | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2016–2017** | 8 | A | A | B | B | B | A | (ip) | F19 | F19 | | |
| **2017–2018** | 1 | – | – | – | A | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2017–2018** | 2 | A | | | A | A | A | | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 3 | A | A | B | A | A | B | (ip) | F19 | F19 | | |
| **2017–2018** | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | (ip) | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 5 | A | A | A | A | A | A | (ip) | F19 | F19 | | |
| **2017–2018** | 6 | B | – | – | A | B | I | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2017–2018** | 7 | A | A | A | A | A | A | (ip) | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 8 | B | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 9 | A | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 10 | A | | | B | B | A | (ip) | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 11 | A | A | B | A | A | A | (ip) | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 12 | A | A | A | A | A | (ip) | A | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 13 | | | | A | | | | | | | |
| **2017–2018** | 14 | A | | | A | A | A | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 1 | A | A | A | | | | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 2 | | | | A | A | (ip) | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 3 | A | | | B | A | (ip) | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 4 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| **2018–2019** | 5 | A | | | A | A | (ip) | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 6 | A | | | A | A | (ip) | | | | | |
| **2018–2019** | 7 | A | | | A | A | (ip) | | | | | |
| | | 7010 | 7330 | 7340 | 7420 | 7430 | 7300 | 7040 | Comps | Prospectus | Defense | Grad |

## Attachments:

# Modifications and Continuing Improvement to Goals/Objectives/Outcomes

## Modifications & Continuing Improvement - PGs 1, 2, 3

**Goal/Objective/Outcome Number:** PGs 1, 2, 3 – Evidence-based Practices, Scholarly Research, and Leadership Personnel

**Program Changes and Actions due to Results:**

ELPhD students participate in seven research courses and use the knowledge gained not only to become successful researchers, but also to understand information in other ELPhD courses and that they encounter in everyday life (savvy research consumers). Developing strong research skills sets ELPhD students up to be active, fruitful collaborators—a hallmark of a great researcher, leader,  and educator. Though they are successful in their ELPhD coursework (see ELPhD Academic Achievement table) and engaged in scholarly activities (see ELPhD Scholarly Activity table), students have mentioned the need for additional encouragement in sharing their work and in collaborating. In response to this informal, formative feedback, the Director of Graduate Programs has highlighted opportunities to use high-quality coursework as ways for ELPhD students to collaborate across concentrations on projects as a pilot program. To do so, the Director has 1) increased regular sharing of conference, seminar, and symposia calls for proposals (CFPs) and calls for publication submissions to increase student awareness of these opportunities, 2) added workshops to support proposal submissions, and 3) provided feedback on proposal and publication submission drafts. The Director also directly encourages faculty to continue to include students in their research activities, and encourages students to work together on submissions for presentations and publications. This also offers multiple opportunities to increase cross-disciplinary knowledge, collaborative skills, and dissemination of scholarship, as well as to heighten exposure to and support of diverse views and scholarship.  The Director will continue this program in the 2019–2020 academic year and solicit feedback to evaluate the initiative's efficacy (paired with ELPhD Academic Achievement table and ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table). (Alignment to: PGs 1, 2, 3; SLOs 1 & 2; Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Student Success, Supportive Environment; SG–1 PAs A,B, D, E; SG–2 PAs B, C; SG4–PAs A, B, D)

**Link to Assessment:**

Though the associated assessments (ELPhD Academic Achievement table and ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table) indicate appropriate progress, the Director of Graduate Programs and Dean of the College of Education recognize this is only part of the picture. In order to maintain the threshold of expectation and move toward exceptionality, student feedback is solicited for the express purpose of program improvements such as is described above.

**Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:** Experiential Learning
Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity
Programs, Certificates, and Training

## Modifications and Continuing Improvement SLOs 1 & 2

**Goal/Objective/Outcome Number:** SLOs 1 & 2 – Content Mastery & Course Competency, Professional Skills

**Program Changes and Actions due to Results:**

Though students generally do well in the research course sequence (see ELPhD Academic Achievement table), informal, formative assessment done through discussions with students in those courses revealed anxiety around course success and the need for additional support. In response, study support sessions for quantitative research courses (all students made *B* or higher) have been implemented in the 2018–2019 academic year as a pilot program. The majority of students made an *A* in in the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semester (only 1 student made a *B*). The Director will continue this program in the 2019–2020 academic year and solicit feedback to evaluate the initiative's efficacy (paired with ELPhD Academic Achievement table). (Alignment to: SLOs 1 & 2; Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Student Success, Supportive Environment; SG–1 PA E, SG–2 PA B)

While students do well their coursework which requires scholarly writing, (see ELPhD Academic Achievement table), students in EDU 7000 requested additional support in mastering academic/scholarly writing. The course offers opportunities to practice scholarly writing and receive feedback. Student, however, have requested additional support as they move on to research, core, and concentration courses. Requests from students further along in their Programs of Study have also been received. In response, one-on-one writing support for research and theoretical papers are offered. Students may also be paired with other students or ELPhD alumni in the area for additional support. This helps students develop skills to succeed in research, core, and concentration classes; enrich quality of scholarly research activities; and enhance program development and contribute to

and across disciplines through research dissemination. The Director will continue this program in the 2019–2020 academic year and solicit feedback to evaluate the initiative's efficacy (paired with ELPhD Academic Achievement table and ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table). (Alignment to: SLOs 1 & 2; Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Student Success, Supportive Environment; SG–1 PA B, SG–2 PA B, SG4–PAs B & D)

As part of their enrollment in the ELPhD program, students are expected to present original scholarly work at academic/scholarly/professional conferences, seminars, and symposia. While students demonstrate a high level of participation in such events (see ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table), some have been more productive than others. It is important that all students take part in presenting original work. Many students have asked faculty and/or the Director of Graduate Programs for additional assistance in preparing proposals for submission. In an effort to increase student scholarly research activity and move more students into the threshold of exceptionality, two tactics have been implemented: 1) regular sharing of conference, seminar, and symposia calls for proposals (CFPs) to increase student awareness of these opportunities and 2) workshops for conference proposal submissions to help students learn discipline-specific protocols and language in support of sharing original research done as part of ELPhD coursework. In addition to presenting scholarly work and developing professional skills, growth in submission to and participation in these events increases exposure to and knowledge of evidenced-based practices– which not only benefits the students, but also offers opportunities to share this knowledge with others in the ELPhD program, College of Education, Tech, and the community. The Director will continue this program in the 2019–2020 academic year and solicit feedback to evaluate the initiative's efficacy (paired with ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table). (Alignment to: PGs 1, 2, 3; SLOs 1 & 2; Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Student Success, Supportive Environment; SG–1 PAs A,B, D; SG–2 PA B, SG4–PAs A, B, D)

Though graduation rate and time to completion (3.68 years) are good, students have informally voiced recurring questions about the Program of Study and dissertation process. In response, the Director of Graduate Programs is creating Program of Study and dissertation workshops, with plans to debut in the 2019–2020 academic year. Student input will be collected as the workshops are created to ensure their concerns are addressed, and faculty will also be consulted as they often field questions and concerns and have valuable insights to share. (Alignment to: SLOs 1 & 2; Core Principles: Academic Excellence, Student Success, Supportive Environment; SG–1 PAs A,B, D; SG–2 PA B, SG4–PAs A, B, D)s

**Link to Assessment:**

Though the associated assessments (ELPhD Academic Achievement table, ELPhD Student Scholarly Activity table, graduation rate, time to graduation) indicate appropriate progress, the Director of Graduate Programs and Dean of the College of Education recognize this is only part of the picture. In order to maintain the threshold of expectation and move toward exceptionality, student feedback is solicited for the express purpose of program improvements such as is described above.

**Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:** Adult Learners
Experiential Learning
Research, Scholar, Intellect, and Creativity
Programs, Certificates, and Training