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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 Teacher Education PhD program currently has 20 students enrolled. There are a total of 95 students enrolled in the department. All students are combined in terms of evaluation of programs and departmental activities.

2. Which learning outcomes were assessed?

According to the Assessment Plan for this program, each SLO was evaluated during the Spring & Fall 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 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, proposal, and dissertation). Based on previous iterations of the survey, the items remained, but were reorganized to better align with SLOs and allow anonymous responses. As a result, two surveys were distributed for this review: a) The Doctoral Student Annual Review (SAR) and b) The Doctoral Program Evaluation (DPE). The first survey included progress, courses, and other milestones. The second survey included student perceptions of their doctoral experiences across several different dimensions of advanced graduate study, the sections for which are listed in the table below. While data for the Doctoral Student Review were collected with identity information (i.e., to audit and verify progress), data for the Doctoral Program Evaluation were collected anonymously. Both surveys were distributed via Qualtrics using the T&L list serv.

In the Fall 2016 semester, 35 students completed both the SAR and DPE surveys. With doctoral enrollment for 2016-2017 of 95 active students, the return rates were 36.8%. This return rate exceeded the previous year’s returns of 28%. Among these 35 responses, 3 indicated that they were enrolled in the EdD program, 6 were enrolled in the Teacher Education PhD program, and 26 were enrolled in the C&I PhD program. Students reported that they had an average of 7.5 semesters in the program (fewer than 4 years). Roughly half of students (51.4%) indicated that
they were attending full time. The majority (60%) of respondents were female. White/European American/Caucasian was the most common identified race (40%), followed by Black/African American and Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, into which 17% of respondents identified with each category. 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 (SAR)</td>
<td>The SAR is a survey distributed to students in conjunction with faculty advising. There are multiple sections: 1. Demographics 2. Academic Progress 3. Scholarship and Research Activities 4. Teaching and Supervision</td>
<td>SLO1 - Have an understanding of the theoretical and historical foundations of education.</td>
<td>SAR #2: Academic Progress  • Area of Emphasis  • Grade (B or higher)  DPE #2: Educational Theories  DPE #3: Literature Review</td>
<td>Annual, December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO2 - Demonstrate knowledge and synthesis of major research in teaching and schooling.</td>
<td>SAR #2: Academic Progress  • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)  SAR #3: Scholarship and Research Activities  • Conferences  • Publications  SAR #4: Teaching &amp; Supervision  DPE #2: Educational Theories  DPE #3: Literature Review</td>
<td>Annual, December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO3 - Demonstrate knowledge and research application in the area of emphasis: cultural studies, international education, and multicultural education, interaction and media sciences (formerly instructional technology), literacy, mathematics education, science education, teacher education.</td>
<td>SAR #2: Academic Progress  • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)  SAR #3: Scholarship and Research Activities  • Conferences  • Publications  • Research projects  DPE #3: Literature Review  DPE #4: Research Methods  DPE #6: Scholarly Identity Development</td>
<td>Annual, December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 4 - Demonstrate college-level teaching experience.</td>
<td>SAR #4: Teaching &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>Annual, December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 5 - Understand and apply the major tenets of research design and</td>
<td>SAR #3: Scholarship and Research Activities</td>
<td>Annual, December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Program | The DPE is an anonymous survey | | | |
Evaluation (DPE) distributed to students about their perceptions of doctoral study. There are multiple sections:
1. Demographics
2. Educational Theories
3. Literature Review
4. Research Methods
5. Professional Experiences
6. Scholarly Identity Development
7. Program

Analysis spanning quantitative and qualitative methods. Begin to disseminate findings in refereed journals.

- Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)
- Conferences
- Publications
DPE #4: Research Methods
DPE #5: Professional Experiences
DPE #6: Scholarly Identity Development

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

SAR #2: Academic Progress
- Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)
SAR #3: Scholarship and Research Activities
- Conferences
- Publications
- Research projects

Annual, December

4. Undergraduate results.
N/A.

5. Graduate results.

Please see the table below for data from the 35 students reporting on the survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome:</th>
<th>Evidence of Progress:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 35 students indicated they were making adequate progress toward their degree. All 35 students reported continuous enrollment in doctoral research and content courses or dissertation hours with grades meeting the department criteria of B or better. These data were confirmed by the graduate coordinator through consultation with student advisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, students reported at least some level of agreement in areas associated with understanding and SLO1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Theories (DPE #2):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understand the importance of educational theories (91% agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed satisfactory knowledge of theories (88% agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learned how to apply educational theories (82% agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review (DPE #3):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understand the importance of a literature review in educational research (94% agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2., 3., 4., and 5. | In terms of knowledge, teaching, and progress, 12 students completed a program of study, 7 completed their qualifying exams, and 8 completed their dissertation proposal and advanced to candidacy. One respondent indicated that they defended their dissertation. Across students, there were 23 presentations made to regional, national, and international conferences. Across the students, there were also 2 articles published or in press during the evaluation period, with another 5 in review. In terms of other research activities, there were 5 approved IRBs, 18 projects in data collection, 6 projects undergoing data analyses, and 9 project involved in writing results since the last evaluation. Although our sample includes part time students, a total of 28 courses were taught, not including the role of site facilitator.

In addition, students reported at least some level of agreement in areas associated with scholarship, research, and practice and SLO2, SLO3, and SLO5.

- **Research Methods (DPE #4):**
  - Understand the importance of research methods (82% agree)
  - Developed satisfactory knowledge of research methods (76% agree)
  - Learned how to apply research methods (74% agree)

- **Professional Experiences (DPE #5):**
  - Understand the importance of a literature review in educational research (94% agree)
  - Learned how to develop a review (91% agree)
  - Have successfully done so (82% agree)

- **Scholarly Identity Development (DPE #6):**
  - My professional identity is being changed (74% agree)
  - I am developing a scholarly identity (76% agree)
  - I understand the expectations of me (79% agree)

| 6. | All students indicated that they were making adequate progress toward their degree. When possible, these findings were confirmed with their faculty advisors, who were asked to meet with their students. A total of 19 students reported meeting with their advisor (56%), two scheduled a meeting (6%), and the remaining 13 had not yet scheduled a meeting (38%).

| Overall Program |  |
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, the mean ranges for these items were noticeably lower than the other categories. Anonymous student comments from the results confirm that recent changes (i.e., credit changes, structure changes, qualifying exam changes) were received well, but that more work needs to be undertaken to continue to move students forward.

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 and that the program is meeting students’ needs overall. 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. 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 broader perspective and area of research through guest speakers. In the last year, we formed a sub-committee to plan and deliver Doctoral Colloquium. As a result, additional emphasis has been placed on building a community of learners and professionals. Anecdotally, the changes are positive, with high levels of student satisfaction. Beyond addressing culture, both scholarship and grantsmanship have become stipulations for hiring in our department. Faculty continue to seek and provide opportunities for students to meaningfully engage in research.