Annual Academic Assessment Report Cover Sheet
Assessment reports are due the 1st Wednesday after the Fall Term
Email to: assessment@unlv.edu

Program Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Assessed</th>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction Ph.D. (various emphasis areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Emily Lin, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>PG Schrader, Ph.D. (Co-coordinator of doctoral programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>2/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person for This Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>PG Schrader, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>5-3331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pg.schrader@unlv.edu">pg.schrader@unlv.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please attach a narrative (not to exceed 4 pages, excluding appendices) addressing the following:

1. What are the student learning outcomes? Please provide a numbered list.
2. Which learning outcomes were assessed?
3. How were they assessed? (Programs must use at least one direct assessment of student learning.)
4. Undergraduate programs should assess at least one University Undergraduate Learning Outcome (UULO) each year, which may or may not overlap with a program learning outcome.
5. Graduate programs should assess at least one outcome related to one of the following graduate level requirements each year:
   a. student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.
   b. activities requiring originality, critical analysis and expertise.
   c. the development of extensive knowledge in the field under study.
6. What was learned from the assessment results?
7. How did the program respond to what was learned?

Please limit the narrative portion of your report to no more than four pages. You may attach appendices with data, tables, charts, or other materials as needed. Please explain the relevant conclusions from any appendices in your narrative. Please contact the Office of Academic Assessment if you have questions or need assistance.
1. What are the Student Learning Outcomes?

Upon completion of the program, graduates will:

1. Have an understanding of the theoretical and historical foundations of education.
2. Demonstrate knowledge and synthesis of major research in teaching and schooling.
3. Demonstrate knowledge and research application in the area of emphasis: (e.g., cultural and international studies in education, instructional technology, literacy, mathematics education, science education, teacher education).
4. Demonstrate college-level teaching experience.
5. Understand and apply the major tenets of research design and analysis spanning quantitative and qualitative methods. Begin to disseminate findings in refereed journals.
6. Demonstrate the ability to successfully design, defend, and complete an extended educational study resulting in a defensible dissertation.

Our Ph.D. program in Curriculum and Instruction currently has 62 students enrolled across the following emphasis areas:

- Career and Technical and Postsecondary
- Cultural Studies, International Education, and Multicultural Education
- Educational Technology
- Literacy
- Mathematics Education
- Science Education
- Teacher Education

2. Which learning outcomes were assessed?

According to the Assessment Plan for this program, each SLO was evaluated during the Spring & Fall 2015-2016 Academic Semesters.

3. How were they assessed?

Planned assessments: Methods, Instruments and Analysis. According to the Assessment Plan for this program, the planned assessments to be conducted during the Spring & Fall 2015-2016 Academic Semesters included an annual review with a corresponding meeting with an advisor regarding their progress at various stages (i.e. course study plan, comprehensive exam,
The form was updated during the spring 2016 semester to include additional sections (listed in the matrix below). These added categories contained items that were scored on a seven-point Likert-type scale.

In the spring 2016 semester, the survey was completed by 24 of the current doctoral students (N=84) for a 28% return rate. Among these 24 responses, 1 was enrolled in the EdD program, 3 were enrolled in the Teacher Education PhD program, and 20 were enrolled in the C&I PhD program. These data are reported in aggregate for all T&L doctoral programs to highlight progress toward and achievement of SLOs.

The planned assessment matrix was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SLO’s Assessed</th>
<th>Expected Measures</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Annual Report</td>
<td>The annual report form is a survey conducted during the Spring semester in conjunction with faculty advising. There are multiple sections: 1. Demographics 2. Coursework 3. Scholarship 4. Academic progress 5. Doctoral Content (e.g., educational theories, literature, research methods) 6. Doctoral Program 7. Doctoral Experiences (professional and scholarly)</td>
<td>SLO1 - Have an understanding of the theoretical and historical foundations of education.</td>
<td>2. Coursework • Area of Emphasis • Grade</td>
<td>Annual, Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO2 - Demonstrate knowledge and synthesis of major research in teaching and schooling.</td>
<td>3. Scholarship • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation) • Conferences • Publications • Teaching &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>Annual, Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO3 - Demonstrate knowledge and research application in the area of emphasis: cultural and international studies in education, instructional technology, literacy, mathematics education, science education, teacher education, and teaching English as a second language (TESL).</td>
<td>3. Scholarship • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation) • Conferences • Publications</td>
<td>Annual, Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 4 - Demonstrate college-level teaching experience.</td>
<td>3. Scholarship • Teaching &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>Annual, Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 5 - Understand and apply the major tenets of research design and analysis spanning quantitative and</td>
<td>3. Scholarship • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)</td>
<td>Annual, Spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
qualitative methods. Begin to disseminate findings in refereed journals.

- Conferences
- Publications

SLO 6 - Demonstrate the ability to successfully design, defend, and complete an extended educational study resulting in a defensible dissertation.

3. Scholarship
- Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)

4. Academic progress
Annual, Spring

4. Undergraduate results.

N/A.

5. Graduate results.

Please see the table below for data from the 24 students reporting on the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome:</th>
<th>Evidence of Progress:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>All 25 students reported continuous enrollment in doctoral research and content courses or dissertation hours with grades meeting the department criteria of B or better. In addition, students reported high means in areas associated with Literature Reviews (mean range of 6.3 – 6.4 on a 7 point scale), Educational Theories (mean range of 5.9 – 6.1 on a 7 point scale), and Research Methods (mean range of 6.0 – 6.5 on a 7 point scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2., 3., 4., and 5.</td>
<td>In terms of knowledge, teaching, and progress, 13 students completed a program of study, 8 completed their qualifying exams, and 6 advanced to candidacy. No respondents indicated they had defended a dissertation. Across students, there were 38 presentations made to regional, national, and international conferences. Across the students, there were also 9 articles published or in press during the evaluation period. All but 9 students indicated they had one or more active research projects in various stages. Although our sample includes part time students, a total of 24 courses were taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>All students except one indicated that they were making adequate progress toward their degree. These findings were confirmed with their faculty advisors, who were asked to meet with their students.¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Per request of the academic assessment review, these data indicate our first attempt to validate progress with objective and direct measures.
6. What was learned from the assessment results?

From these data, we infer that our students are actively teaching, doing research, and engaged in campus service activities, particularly in the GPSA organization. They graduate and go on to positions in academe at major universities (e.g. Vanderbilt, Boston College), and state colleges (e.g. in the California State University system). Their career trajectories result in promotion and tenure at these institutions, reflecting very positively on the doctoral student experience in our department, college, and at UNLV.

With the additional items, we were also able to discern that students are receiving the appropriate instruction in order to make progress toward the SLOs. However, we have also elected to capture information pertaining to the doctoral program and student preparation for work beyond graduation. Although the overall evaluation of the program was relatively high (mean ranges of 5.2 – 6.0 on a 7 point scale), the mean ranges for these items were noticeably lower than the other categories (mean range 3.8 – 5.3 on a 7 point scale).

These data will be conveyed to the Doctoral Studies Committee for additional recommendations. Based on this annual report, we believe our doctoral students are making good progress toward graduation. However, we have reason to explore improvements to their preparation for academic careers. We will continue to expand our faculty ranks, as well as seek ways to involve students in research projects that will be meaningful for all doctoral students.

7. How did the program respond to what was learned?

Although we have not yet had the opportunity to respond directly to these data, we continue to refine our Doctoral programs. One example of this is a sweeping programmatic revision from 72 total credit hours to 60 credit hours, based on several issues we observed and confirmed with students. The new program is simultaneously more focused and flexible. Additionally, we have been fortunate to invite several faculty to join our ranks each year. The recruitment of these faculty is largely poised on their ability to conduct scholarly research and secure grants, which are both intended to support doctoral students directly through funding and opportunities for collaboration. Both scholarship and grantsmanship have become stipulations for hiring in our department. Lastly, we continue to refine and offer a Doctoral Colloquium multiple times a year. One session is typically focused on student progress and models of success (i.e., student presentations of research), another is focused on instruction to new faculty and existing faculty members’ lines of research, and a third colloquium is dedicated to introducing students to a more broad perspective and area of research through guest speakers.