




Calendar-Year Program Report



Program Title: Early Childhood
Calendar Year: 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Courses and Outcomes Assessed (entered by director of assessment)2
Aggregate Report (entered by director of assessment)3
Discussion of Results (completed at symposia).....4
Data-Driven Decisions (completed at symposia)5
Resource Allocation Requests (completed at symposia)6
Suggestions for Improving the Assessment Process (completed at symposia)8

Appendix: Qualitative and Contextual Information from Taskstream (entered by director of assessment)9

COURSES AND OUTCOMES ASSESSED

ISLO #1: Communication – O,W

ECHD PLO #2: Identify, create, and implement developmentally appropriate learning activities

ECHD 125

ECHD 201 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking

ECHD PLO #3: Understand the sequence of typical milestones of development for children . . .

ECHD 125

ECHD 131 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking

ECHD PLO #5: Evaluate and demonstrate various methods of developmental assessments pertaining to the whole-child . . .

ECHD 250

ECHD 204 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking

ECHD PLO #6: Discuss and demonstrate differences in curriculum for infants, toddlers . . .

ECHD 121

ECHD 200 (M)

AGGREGATE REPORT

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 1 - PSLO 2 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| ECHD | 125 | 1 | 1 | Not Met | Fall | |
| ECHD | 201(M) | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 2 | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | 2 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | 2 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | 50% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes: | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 3 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| ECHD | 125 | 1 | 1 | Met | Fall | |
| ECHD | 131(M) | 1 | 1 | Exceeded | Spring | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 3 | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | 2 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | 2 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | 100% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes: | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 5 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| ECHD | 250 | 1 | 1 | Exceeded | Fall | |
| ECHD | 204(M) | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 5 | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | 2 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | 2 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | 100% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes: | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 6 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| ECHD | 121 | 1 | 1 | Not Met | | |
| ECHD | 200(M) | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring | |
| | | | | | Spring | |
| | | | | | | |
| Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 6 | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | 2 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | 2 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | 50% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes: | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Directions: This portion of the document is designed to provide context for results, to discuss individual instructors' input on whether or not the methods they are using are effective.

Some questions to consider: is the assessment process for the outcome you're assessing sufficiently robust?

Are enough sections of the course being assessed to represent an accurate portrayal of program success?

If the targets have been met, might they be raised in the future?

If targets are consistently exceeded, might the assignment be made more demanding to challenge students effectively?

DATA-DRIVEN DECISIONS

Directions: What will you change as a result of the data?

If targets are not met: best practices suggest we make changes to course content, rubrics, or the assessment process, and spend the next cycle year reviewing the courses for which we didn't meet targets *in addition to* the PSLOs up for that cycle year. If there are problems, we want to catch them quickly. So, if targets are not met, what will be changed, and what is the timeline for addressing the issue?

If targets are met: Many people are under the impression that as long as targets are met, then there is no need to make changes. As evidenced in the directions in the previous section, we can still make changes. Perhaps a new target would be appropriate? Perhaps the assignment should be more challenging for students? Perhaps a more robust measurement of the PSLO or ISLO could be made?

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUESTS

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM

Guidelines for Request:

1. Please ensure the request is linked to learning outcomes (course, program, and/or institutional)
2. Complete this form and send it to your academic dean for review and potential consideration at Provost's Cabinet.

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Applicant's Name: _____

Program Title: _____

- a. Please describe the request (what is the problem that the request is trying to solve?)
- b. Describe and or list the resource(s) you hope to acquire as a result of this request. (For instance, are you looking for course materials, additional instructors, etc.? What is the problem that this request is trying to solve?)
- c. How is the request linked to learning outcomes assessment?
- d. Please include any data that will help support this request (learning outcomes data)
- e. Describe briefly your follow-up assessment (currently we assess on a three-year cycle, but learning outcomes that are addressed with resource allocation should be assessed again as soon as possible to determine the viability and sustainability of resource allocation)
- f. Please include any alternative sources of funding you have considered for this initiative (grants, different pools of money on campus, etc.)
- g. Approximately how many students do you anticipate will be served by this request each Academic year?
- h. Total Amount Requested: _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Directions: some proposed areas of improvement might include: collection of data, distribution of data, what kinds of data is included/omitted, timelines, when or how work is completed, delegation of responsibilities, etc.

APPENDIX A: QUALITATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM TASKSTREAM

ECHD 125 – Communication:

Recommendations:

1. Prior to submission of Formal Lessons - have student submit a "practice" plan.
2. Allow student to revise and submit a 2nd submission to allow for corrections.
3. Require "check-in" meetings with students individually
4. Recommend [highly] utilization of Writing Center

Reflections/Notes:

I am disappointed in the overall results. I provided sample lessons, substantial feedback on every lesson, tips, pre-recorded lectures, explanations, virtual help sessions, etc.

I now have several exemplary samples from fall 2020 students [with permission and personal information deleted]. Perhaps offering more examples will assist.

I do feel, based on the virtual individual meetings I had this semester, many students did not devote the time [5-6 hours to the course] or utilize all of the resources to assist with course success. Those that did continued to progress and do well in the course.

ECHD 125 was offered in a merged modality. Many students - local commuters and residential [dorms] opted to take the course fully online. I feel students would have been more successful if they attended the class in person or virtually in real-time. It would have guaranteed 3 hours of time devoted to ECHD 125 coursework.

ECHD 201:

Create an EC Critical Thinking Rubric and Communication Rubric to replace the AACU Rubric. The EC Critical Thinking and Communication Rubric would be similar to the ISLO 5 Rubric using the NAEYC Professional Standards as a guide.

Take a closer look at the alignment of Course SLO's to ISLO's. This course has been identified in program assessment maps as the competency or mastery checkpoint for Communication Written and Critical Thinking.

Reflections/Notes:

COVID 19 affected this course and students ability to be at placement sites. The content of the course was adjusted to provided opportunities for students to achieve the SLO's of the course.

Target Achievement: Met

Results :

Recommendations:

Create an EC Critical Thinking Rubric and Communication Rubric to replace the AACU Rubric. The EC Critical Thinking and Communication Rubric would be similar to the ISLO 5 Rubric using the NAEYC Professional Standards as a guide.

Take a closer look at the alignment of Course SLO's to ISLO's. This course has been identified in program assessment maps as the competency or mastery checkpoint for Communication Written and Critical Thinking,

ECHD 131

Family members are the most important people in young children's lives. Students will learn how family-centered practice, strong family engagement, and positive communication all contribute to high-quality early childhood practice. Students will also learn effective strategies for working with and strengthening families of children with special needs, military families, and families facing challenges.

Students will read and watch five modules that focus on families, promoting family engagement, communicating with families, working with families of children with special needs, strengthening and supporting military families, and families facing challenges.

Students will then respond in writing to questions focused on thinking critically about how family-centered practice, strong family engagement, and positive communication contribute to high-quality early childhood practice.

ECHD 121

Recommendations:

The assignment was originally intended to be conducted in-class. Due to the pandemic - the instructor revised the assignment to reflect like content via a Discussion Board. A total of 7 students did not complete the assignment. This impacted the ability to meet the projected target.

Reflections/Notes:

This assignment should have been completed in written [paper] form. I believe a portion of the students who did not complete the DB in full would have completed the task if it were a written submission.

The Early Childhood Program SLO Assessment May [Active Curriculum Map] was modified January 16, 2020. Upon completing the spring 2020 course assessment [ISLO 2] it appears that the Course Outlines and SLO's as written on the Master Syllabus do not reflect the Active Curriculum Map. This is problematic. winter 2020 - Jan. 2021, the ECHD Curriculum Coordinator will revise all ECHD Course Master Syllabus to ensure all reflect the Active Curriculum Map. For spring ISLO 2 Critical Thinking ECHD 121 is listed on the Active Curriculum Map as a Mastery course. This is correct. In error is the Master Syllabus SLO and ISLO mapping. See Master Syllabus attachment for clarification [highlighted in yellow] used for this assessment cycle

ECHD 200

Recommendations: Although the projected target was reached - 3 students received grades between 70-78. Many of the points lost had to do with spelling and grammatical errors on the final cumulative Classroom Website.

Reflections/Notes: I did not allow for draft submissions for the above. I did provide much feedback on each assignment. In the future I will require submission of a complete, but draft version of the Classroom website. This may assist with having the final project be free from errors. In the past the instructor met with students during office hours for such feedback - however with remote instruction this was not possible.

The students did well given we lost in-class time for instruction on navigating the Weebly Website Program and for one-on-one feedback. We did utilize the shared screen feature on Blackboard Ultra Collaborate and I offered a virtual "help" session 2x's weekly.

ECHD 250

Recommendations: Create an EC Critical Thinking Rubric to replace the AACU Rubric. The EC Critical Thinking Rubric would be similar to the ISLO 5 Rubric using the NAEYC Professional Standards as a guide.

Take a closer look at the alignment of Course SLO's to ISLO's. This course has been identified in program assessment maps as the competency or mastery checkpoint for Communication Written, I would like to revisit that.

Reflections/Notes: 8 (30% of the enrolled students) of students did not submit this specific task. Of those 8 only 1 student passed the course.
Those 7 students have various reasons for not passing the course; working full time, lack of effort, family/personal issues, etc.
The students did receive a great deal of outreach from myself, their advisor, and other campus resources, yet were unsuccessful.

ECHD 250 – section II

Reflections/Notes:

6 (20% of the enrolled students) of students did not submit this specific task. Of those six students, three students passed the course.

Those three students who did not submit the assignment and failed the course had various reasons; working full time, lack of effort, family/personal issues, etc.

The students did receive a great deal of outreach from myself, their advisor, and other campus resources, yet were unsuccessful.