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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 studies, international education, and multicultural education, interaction and media sciences (formerly 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 PhD program in Teacher Education currently has 16 students enrolled.

2. Which learning outcomes were assessed?

According to the Assessment Plan for this program, each SLO was evaluated during the Spring, Summer, & Fall 2017 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 Fall 2017 Academic Semester included an annual review/response to surveys (the Doctoral Student Annual Review (SAR) and the Doctoral Program Evaluation (DPE)), with a corresponding meeting with an advisor regarding their progress at various stages (i.e. course study plan, comprehensive exam, proposal, and dissertation). In addition, data from the Graduate College Survey (GCS) were included when relevant.

The SAR survey included progress, courses, and other milestones. The DPE 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. These data are reported in aggregate for all T&L doctoral programs to highlight progress toward and achievement of SLOs.

The expanded 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/2016
| Student Annual Report (SAR) | 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 | SLO1 - Have an understanding of the theoretical and historical foundations of education. | GCS #13: Demographics  • Area of Emphasis  • GPA  SAR #2: Academic Progress  • Area of Emphasis  • Grade (B or higher)  ]  DPE #2: Educational Theories  DPE #3: Literature Review | Annual, December |
| Graduate College Survey (GCS) | The GCS is a survey distributed to students in all graduated programs. It contains items that range from university resources to career goals. There are multiple sections: 1. University resources 2. Student support 3. Communication 4. Graduate assistantships 5. Program challenges and opportunities 6. Program experiences 7. Advising | SLO2 - Demonstrate knowledge and synthesis of major research in teaching and schooling. | GCS #6: Program experiences  • Completion time  GCS #7: Advising  SAR #2: Academic Progress  • Milestones (e.g., qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, dissertation)  SAR #3: Scholarship and Research Activities  • Conferences  • Publications  SAR #4: Teaching & Supervision  DPE #2: Educational Theories  DPE #3: Literature Review | Annual, December |
| | | 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. | GCS #6: Program experiences  • Completion time  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 | Annual, December |
| | | SLO 4 - Demonstrate college-level teaching experience. | GCS #4: Graduate Assistantships  GCS #6: Program experiences  GCS #7: Advising  SAR #4: Teaching & Supervision | Annual, December |
4. Undergraduate results.

N/A.

5. Graduate results.

In the Fall 2017 semester, 44 students completed DPE survey and 28 students completed the SAR survey. Doctoral enrollment for 2017-2018 was 92 active students and the return rates were 47.8% and 30.4%, compared to a return rate of 36.8% for 2016. Among these 44 responses from the DPE survey, no one indicated that they were enrolled in the EdD program, 2 were enrolled in the Teacher Education PhD program, and 42 were enrolled in the C&I PhD program. A total of 19 students indicated that they had a GA, 23 indicated that they were employed elsewhere, and 2 indicated that they were not employed. According to the Grad College survey, roughly 2/3rds of students (66%) attend full time. Students reported that they had an average of 4 semesters in the program. This duration was considerably lower than the previous report of an average of 7.5 years, indicating that our departmental efforts to complete students have been successful.
Because the SAR was anonymous, it contained demographics. Of the 28 students responding to the SAR, the majority (68%) of respondents were female. White/European American/Caucasian was the most common identified race (44%), followed by Black/African American and Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, into which 16% of respondents identified with each category. One participant identified as Hispanic/Latina/o and five participants (20%) reported their race as “other,” including mixed and white/Asian.

These data are reported in aggregate for all T&L doctoral programs to highlight progress toward and achievement of SLOs. Please see the table below for data from the students reporting on the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Evidence of Progress:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.                      | All but one student indicated they were making adequate progress toward their degree. **All** 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. In addition, students reported at least some level of agreement in areas associated with understanding and SLO1.  
  - Educational Theories (DPE #2):  
    - Understand the importance of educational theories (91% agree)  
    - Developed satisfactory knowledge of theories (89% agree)  
    - Learned how to apply educational theories (84% agree)  
  - Literature Review (DPE #3):  
    - Understand the importance of a literature review in educational research (93% agree)  
    - Learned how to develop a review (91% agree)  
    - Have successfully done so (86% agree) |
| 2., 3., 4., and 5.      | In terms of knowledge, teaching, and progress, 5 students completed a program of study, 4 completed their qualifying exams, and 2 completed their dissertation proposal and advanced to candidacy. One respondent indicated that they defended their dissertation. Across students, there were 20 presentations made to regional, national, and international conferences. Across the students, there were also 4 articles published or in press during the evaluation period, with another 3 that were accepted for publication. A total of 2 were listed as under review. In terms of other research activities, there were 12 active research projects in various stages of data collection, all with approved IRBs. Although our sample includes part time students, the limited data indicate that a total of 16 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 (91% agree)
  - Developed satisfactory knowledge of research methods (81% agree)
  - Learned how to apply research methods (79% agree)

- **Professional Experiences (DPE #5):**
  - Have opportunities to work with faculty on research (67% agree)
  - Presented at conferences (40% agree)
  - Have submitted manuscripts for publication (or been published) (38% agree)

- **Scholarly Identity Development (DPE #6):**
  - My professional identity is being changed (74% agree)
  - I am developing a scholarly identity (83% agree)
  - I understand the expectations of me (83% agree)

All but one student 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. What was learned from the assessment results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Collectively, the data from the surveys provide information about perceptions of and performance in our programs. From these, we were also able to discern that students are receiving the appropriate instruction in order to make progress toward the SLOs. Students indicated high levels of agreement with respect to theory, research, and methods. Although the response rate was somewhat lower than expected, a large portion of students are actively engaged in publications and research. However, the data also uncovered an unfortunate reality; some students lack access to research opportunities. The responses from DPE #5 distribution (have opportunities to work on research with faculty) exhibited the most negatively skewed results in our survey. This indicates that although students enjoy access on average, a few students lack opportunities to work with faculty on research. This important point will be raised at upcoming meetings of faculty.
In addition to performance in the program, we 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. Further, there appears to be some room for improvement when it comes to research. These data also reflect another reality of our programs: they are diverse in their goals and approaches to scholarship. It is clear from the preparation of students, they are receiving multiple messages about what is necessary for job preparation. Some programs approach preparation in terms of research publications, while others approach it from a more advocacy and engagement perspective.

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 and opportunities for research engagement. 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. One insight from these data and from feedback pertaining to doctoral colloquium relates to the intellectual diversity of our programs. While there is an advantage of meeting and engaging in meaningful discourse across content areas and disciplines, students requested time with their area faculty and peers to engage in more targeted discussions. This idea, supported by the DPE and SAR data, was endorsed by the department chair. In the last year, content area groups (aligned with degree sub-plans) were asked to meet with their areas outside of doctoral colloquium. As a result, the continued development of a department-wide community has been maintained, while an additional emphasis has been placed on area-based communities of learners.

Beyond addressing culture, both scholarship and grantsmanship have become stipulations for hiring in our department. Faculty are encouraged to continue to seek and provide opportunities for students to meaningfully engage in research.