

**M.A.E. in Elementary
Education
Academic Assessment Plan
2012-2013**

College of Education
Suzy Colvin
scolvin@coe.ufl.edu

Office of the Provost

*University of
Florida*

*Institutional
Assessment*

*Continuous Quality
Enhancement*

Table of Contents

Academic Assessment Plan for M.A.E. in Elementary Education	3
A. Mission	3
B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures.....	3
C. Research.....	4
D. Assessment Timeline.....	4
E. Assessment Cycle	5
F. Measurement Tools	5
G. Assessment Oversight.....	5
Appendix 1: Evaluation of Defense Rubric.....	6
Appendix 2: Thesis Evaluation Rubric	7
Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric	8
University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued....	9

Academic Assessment Plan for M.A.E. in Elementary Education

College of Education

A. Mission

The School of Teaching and Learning departmental mission is “to create and promote new knowledge and understandings about teaching and learning for the purpose of a just, compassionate, and informed citizenry. Using innovative, evidence-based practice and theory, faculty prepare and develop humane teachers, scholars, and other educational professionals to work in diverse contexts with diverse learners.” The departmental mission aligns directly with the mission of the University of Florida as laid out in the Strategic Plan of the State Board of Governors: “The University of Florida is committed to educating students so they are prepared to make significant contributions within an increasingly global community offering a broad-based, exclusive public education, leading-edge research and service to the citizens of Florida, the nation, and the world. Through its mission of education, research and service, the University of Florida nurtures young people from diverse backgrounds to address the needs of our societies while creating new knowledge and the pursuit of new ideas.” In support of both the institutional and departmental mission, the aim of the Master of Arts in Education degree is to cultivate expert academic scholars and leaders in educational institutions and organizations who will produce and implement knowledge for the continuous understanding and improvement of schools in Florida, the nation, and beyond.

B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

SLO Type	Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Method	Degree Delivery
Knowledge	The student will apply research-based knowledge of teaching and learning in elementary education.	The students' Master's theses will be evaluated as does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectation by MAE committee members, with the minimum outcome as “meets.”	Campus
Knowledge	The student will critique teaching practices based on knowledge of the developmental and socio-cultural context of the learner.	The students' Master's theses & defense will be evaluated as does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectation by MAE committee members with the minimum outcome as “meets.”	Campus
Skills	The student will investigate a problem or question within the field of elementary education.	The students' Master's theses will be evaluated as does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectation by MAE committee members with the minimum outcome as “meets.”	Campus
Professional Behavior	The student will present a written and oral presentation and defense of a topic of investigation in elementary education that demonstrates critical thinking and effective communication skills.	The students' Master's theses & defense will be evaluated as does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectation by MAE committee members with the minimum outcome as “meets.”	Campus

C. Research

Students pursuing a Master of Arts in Education degree in Elementary Education are required to produce a Master's thesis. As preparation for this requirement students take EDG6971: Research for Master's Thesis as well as one of the following: (1) EDG 6971: Qualitative Foundations of Educational research or (2) EDF6481: Quantitative Research Methods in Education. The Master of Arts in Education (M.A.E.) is designed to provide exposure to research and increase the practical knowledge in elementary education. The student will apply knowledge to investigate a problem or question within the field of elementary education. Students work with their committee chairs to develop their research question, design their study, and report their findings. The student will present a written and oral presentation and defense of a topic of investigation in elementary education.

D. Assessment Timeline

Program: M.A.E. in Elementary Education

College: Education

Assessment	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
SLOs			
Knowledge			
#1	Final Term Thesis Evaluation Rubric		
#2	Final Term Thesis Evaluation Rubric	Final Term Evaluation of Defense Rubric	
Skills			
#3	Final Term Thesis Evaluation Rubric		
Professional Behavior			
#4	Final Term Thesis Evaluation Rubric	Final Term Evaluation of Defense Rubric	

E. Assessment Cycle

Assessment Cycle for:

Program M.A.E. in Elementary Education College of Education

Analysis and Interpretation:

Completed by: Oct. 1

Program Modifications:

Completed by Jan 1

Dissemination:

Completed by March 1

SLOs	Year	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Content Knowledge							
#1		√	√	√	√	√	√
#2		√	√	√	√	√	√
Skills							
#3		√	√	√	√	√	√
Professional Behavior							
#4		√	√	√	√	√	√

F. Measurement Tools

The primary assessment method to assess the SLO's is the culminating Master's thesis and thesis defense. A master's thesis rubric is utilized to evaluate the thesis as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or exemplary (Appendix 1.) Additionally, a rubric is used for evaluation of the thesis defense (Appendix 2).

G. Assessment Oversight

Name	Department Affiliation	Email Address	Phone Number
Suzy Colvin & Elizabeth Bondy	School of Teaching and Learning	scolvin@coe.ufl.edu	273-4218
Elayne Colón	Dean's Area	epcolon@coe.ufl.edu	273-4132
Tom Dana	Dean's Area	tdana@coe.ufl.edu	273-4134

Appendix 1: Evaluation of Defense Rubric

Student's Name:

Student's Graduate & Degree Program:

Thesis/Dissertation ORAL DEFENSE Rubric – Completed by:

Date (use M/D/YYYY format):

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for ORAL	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete or require prompting <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Confidential Comments: <input type="text"/>			

Appendix 2: Thesis Evaluation Rubric

Student's Name: _____

Student's Graduate & Degree Program: _____

WRITTEN Thesis/Dissertation Rubric – Completed by: _____

Date (use M/D/YYYY format): _____

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for WRITTEN	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication impact
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Confidential Comments: _____			

Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric

Related resources are found at <http://www.ua.assessment.edu>

Program:		Year:			
Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Mission Statement	Mission statement is articulated clearly.				
	The program mission clearly supports the College and University missions, and includes specific statements describing how it supports these missions.				
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment Measures	SLOs are stated clearly.				
	SLOs focus on demonstration of student learning.				
	SLOs are measurable.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLO.				
Research	Research expectations for the program are clear, concise, and appropriate for the discipline.				
Assessment Map	The Assessment Map indicates the times in the program where the SLOs are assessed and measured.				
	The Assessment Map identifies the assessments used for each SLO.				
Assessment Cycle	The assessment cycle is clear.				
	All student learning outcomes are measured.				
	Data is collected at least once in the cycle.				
	The cycle includes a date or time period for data analysis and interpretation.				
	The cycle includes a date for planning improvement actions based on the data analysis.				
	The cycle includes a date for dissemination of results to the appropriate stakeholders.				

University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued

Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Measurement Tools	Measurement tools are described clearly and concisely.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLOs.				
	Methods and procedures reflect an appropriate balance of direct and indirect methods.				
	The report presents examples of at least one measurement tool.				
Assessment Oversight	Appropriate personnel (coordinator, committee, etc.) charged with assessment responsibilities are identified				