The MEd in Curriculum and Instruction (MEd in CI) Program Committee oversees the MEd in C&I (G17N). This report covers calendar year 2007. It provides the answers to the questions identified in the Rubrics for Reviewing the Work of Program Committees and ends with the recommendations that were made based upon its review work.

The MEd in C&I Program Committee consists of the faculty who teach the core classes in the program and other interested graduate faculty in the department and met monthly during 2007. The primary foci of those meetings were on clarifying the rubrics for the common assessments in the program, gaining common understanding of the assessments, identifying new sites for the fall, student recruitment, and the annual Showcase. The MEd in Curriculum and Instruction Program Committee is advised by the MEd in C&I Advisory Council. The Advisory Council consists of the graduate program faculty, 1-2 site facilitators from each of the sites, and a representative from ESSDACK. During academic year 2006 the Advisory Council did not meet.

Cohorts in Progress, Calendar Year 2007

Fall 2007-Spring 2009
- Mayberry, Dr. Johnnie Thompson
- McPherson, Dr. Darla Smith
- Online Cohort 1, Dr. Jeri A. Carroll
- Oxford, Dr. Deb Hamm

Fall 2006-Spring 2008
- Newton, Dr. Jeri A. Carroll
- Northwest, Dr. Mara Alagic

Fall 2005-Spring 2007
- ElDorado, Dr. Dennis Kear
- McPherson, Dr. Darla Smith
- Wichita North, Dr. Deb Hamm
Core Questions:

1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:
   a. program standards
   b. Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and
   c. if an education personnel program, types of NCATE Knowledge as set forth in Standard 1?

Program Standards: Data indicate the MEd in CI is effective in preparing candidates to meet the goals of the program:

- Assessment #2 Research Proposal 100% met proficiency (n=45)
- Assessment #3 Research Report 100% met proficiency (n=67)
- Assessment #4 Writing Inquiry 100% met proficiency (n=63)
- Assessment #5 Portfolio 100% met proficiency (n=66)
- Assessment #5 Thesis 100% met proficiency (n=1)
- Assessment #6 Literature Review 98% met proficiency (n-48)

The assessments for the MEd in C&I are all coded to the goals of the program, the proficiencies of the unit’s conceptual framework and the type of NCATE knowledge of Standard 1. All candidates must score proficient or above on the required assessments in order to progress and eventually graduate from the program. The assessments are noted below in Table 1 in terms of the type of NCATE knowledge and proficiency of the conceptual framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Percent Passing</th>
<th>Guiding Principles</th>
<th>NCATE Standard 1 Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foundations: Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>WIR, PLR</td>
<td>100% 98%</td>
<td>CKS1; HDD1; CTA5; CTA2; PR2,</td>
<td>Content, Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assessment</td>
<td>PLR, ARP-IRB,</td>
<td>98% 100%</td>
<td>CKS1; CTA2; PR2; CKS1; PR3; CTA1, T1</td>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Designing Curriculum</td>
<td>WIR, ARR</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>CKS1; HDD1; CTA5, CTA3)</td>
<td>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills, Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Are candidates’ performances at transition points predictive of their ultimate success/exit performance (i.e., predictive validity)?**

Candidates who successfully complete a given semester in the program are ultimately successful in the program. No candidate who fails a required assessment at the end of a semester is allowed to progress unless they work to remediate the problems that they have had.

For the newly established online program, one candidate did not successfully complete the first semester (a second did not successfully complete the second semester). At the time of this writing the first has not chosen to continue in the program; the second has switched to a non online section.

3. **What conclusions do data at transition points lead to concerning program effectiveness?**

Transition points are entrance to the program, entrance to a field experience identified as an action research semester, exit from the field experience semester, and exit from the program.
If students drop the program, it is typically early in the first semester. Few drop out in successive semesters.

4. **What differential program performance is there, if any, for candidates from different backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity, gender)?**

Core Question 4 is considered two times, once for each of the following:
   a. Gender (no data)
   b. Ethnicity (no data)

(Data for Core Questions 1, 2, 5, and 10 are to be disaggregated by the above variables and examined for potential problems.)

5. **Is the program effective in preparing graduates for state licensure exams (if required)?**

NA

6. **What changes, if any, do the results of assessments suggest for the Conceptual Framework or the program’s Guiding Program Document (if any)?**

Core Question 6 is considered twice, once for each of the following:
   a. Unit’s Conceptual Framework
   b. Program’s Guiding Program Document (if the program has one).

No changes are suggested for the Unit Conceptual Framework. The program has no additional Guiding Program Document.

7. **What changes, if any, do data and/or information suggest for (a) the program, (b) the assessments, (c) the assessment criteria/rubrics, and/or (d) operational elements—advisement, instruction, assessments, faculty, field/clinical placements, field/clinical supervision, record keeping, or resource?**

**Program**

An examination of the enrollment in the campus model and the fit of it to the alternative certification program made a case for eliminating the campus delivery model beginning Fall 2007. Simultaneously, an MAT for the alternative certification population was initiated.

Following a pilot of four candidates from the Newton site participating with the Newton cohort from an online perspective, the first online cohort began in Fall 2007. Modules were created for each week, mirroring the campus activities and with the same required assessments. Following the fall implementation, lengthier modules were developed for biweekly dissemination, thus allowing longer for the candidates to complete the work…the same work, but just more time.
Assessments
The Technology Presentation Rubric was to be used in 2007, but data are not reported for that assessment, and it is not in the data management system.

Assessment Criteria/Rubrics
In 2006, clarity was sought in order to increase consistency and fairness…Teams of faculty worked to clarify each rubric. They came back to the committee for further clarification and were approved during the summer retreat and into the fall semester. Those rubrics were used in 2007. It was determined during that time that the proficiencies of the conceptual framework needed to be added to the rubrics, as well as the connections to the program goals. That work was continued into 2008.

Operational Elements
The evaluations of site facilitators were put into a survey format and placed in Blackboard. In this manner, the evaluations were done anonymously and tabulated electronically. SPTEs for the online cohort were delivered online as well.

Identification of sites for fall beginning was to have been moved back to January, in time to be published in the Fall schedule which also moves recruitment back. That did not happen. Enrollments for Fall 2007 were therefore lower than expected. The same goal is set for Fall 2008/Spring 2009.

8. Are common program assessments “common” across the program, especially across sections and semesters? If any changes have been made in assessments, were they approved by the Undergraduate Teaching Program Committee (UTPC) for initial teacher education programs, Advanced Program Committee (APC), or department/program committee for non-education personnel programs, as appropriate?
   a. New rubrics were approved for use in Fall 2006 with those in the first and third semesters of the program. Substantive changes were not made; only changes for clarification and to improve reliability across graders. The full implementation of the set of rubrics was then to be completed in Spring 2008. Key assessments are common to all sections and semesters.

9. Do clinical placements cumulatively meet program diversity requirements (e.g., student/client, setting)?
   a. Candidates in the MEd in C&I are practicing teachers who use their own classrooms for their action research projects. They examine the differing needs of their students, and address the needs through a set of action research projects. The MEd in C&I faculty have discussed a process whereby candidates analyze the diversity in their own classrooms and seek opportunities to work with students who are diverse in ways their own students aren’t. At this time, this strategy has not been implemented.

10. Is the program successful in preparing candidates for effective practice?
The Graduate Student Exit Survey completed by the WSU Graduate School indicates that candidates rated the following questions as satisfied or higher:

4. On a scale of one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied), rate your overall satisfaction with your program of graduate studies at WSU:

2007-2008 73.9% satisfied or higher.

10. Your satisfaction with the quality of instruction in courses required by your program:

   2006-2007 71.3% satisfied or higher
   2007-2008 72.7% satisfied or higher.

11. Your satisfaction with the overall course instruction you received in your graduate studies at WSU:

   2006-2007 75.5% satisfied or higher
   2007-2008 77.5% satisfied or higher.

The program is designed to prepare classroom teachers to be teacher leaders. All activities and assessments are designed to prepare them for those roles. The success on the assessments indicates that they are prepared for effective practice. In addition, the following shows the professional recognitions for the Spring 2007 graduates:

**Publications**

**Presentations**


Cohn, T., & Gifford, A. (2006, October). *Tools for teachers: Traditional or technology?* Presented at Kansas Association for Teachers of English Conference. Wichita, KS.

Coleman, S., & Grafton, L. (2006, October). *School improvement, assessments, and staff development.* Presented at Abilene Elementary School. Valley Center, KS.


Davis, G., McKenna, D., Raines, K., Kertz, S., & Bruce, B. (2005) “I’m gonna blow this place up:” *Addressing school violence*. Kansas State Department of Education Annual Conference. Wichita, KS.


Mackey, K. (2007, February). *Summer academy notebook*. Presented to the USD 259 Special Education Teachers’ Meeting. Wichita, KS.


Thompson, B. (2005, March). *Four-year old at-risk program*. Presented to Valley Center Board of Education. Valley Center, KS.


Valentas, A., & Kear, D. J. (2007, April). *Writing with a passion!* Presented at the Kansas Reading Association Conference. Wichita, KS.


**Grants**


Cohn, T. (2006). *SMART boards in the English classroom*. Project funded by Education Edge Mini Grant. Wichita Public Schools. Wichita, Kansas. ($1,500.00)

Cohn, T. (2006). *Who moved my cheese classroom set*. TGIF Grant. Project funded by Credit Union of America. ($250.00)


O'Brien, Taryn (2006). *Reaching the stars with Starfall*. Partners in Education. El Dorado, KS. ($76.00)


Stebral, J. (2006). *Integrating expository science and social studies text with language arts and guided reading through technology*. ($4,750.00)

Thompson, B. (2006). *Pre-k school-home connection*. Valley Center School District Education Foundation. Valley Center, KS. ($345.00)


**Honors**


Brewer, K. (2006). *Phi Kappa Phi,* Honor Society of Wichita State University Chapter. Wichita State University, Wichita, KS.


**11. Have changes effected from previous reviews led to desired improvements?**
The rubrics were changed to provide clarity and consistency across sites. In 2007, there was no work to gain consistency across graders. That work was to begin in 2008.

12. Are any faculty development needs apparent from faculty performance assessments (e.g., from SPTE reports, advisement evaluations, faculty technology use surveys, student technology use surveys)? (Unit Assessment Committee only—faculty development activities are undertaken by departments and/or a college, not individual program faculty groups.)

Program Committees are not responsible for Core Question 12.

13. Are there similarities among program-level reviews/recommendations that suggest issues or factors that maybe generalized to the Unit? (Unit Assessment Committee only—a single program committee sees results for one program only so cannot detect this.)

Program Committees are not responsible for Core Question 13.

Non-Core Questions:

14. Is the Program Committee consulting with the Advisory Council in appropriate ways?

During this year the MEd in C&I Advisory Council did not meet. WSU faculty have kept the site facilitators informed about information from meetings and have brought back information and/or concerns from the site facilitators and candidates.

15. Is the Program Committee following Unit procedures for making changes in the Program’s Approved Assessment Plan?

a. Table 1 and Table 2 were finalized in 2006. One assessment was added to the assessment plan (technology presentation) that had not previously been identified as a common assessment. That assessment is not in the data management system; therefore data were not collected in 2007. The committee is discussion what the assessment will include, how the skills will be taught and assessed.

b. At this time there is a need to map each row of the rubrics to the program goals and the proficiencies of the unit conceptual framework.

Summary of Changes:

**Observation:** More and more students are taking fully online classes. In addition, inquiries included those asking for online programs.

**Change:** During the Newton cohort, four candidates completed activities designed for an online delivery. Based on the success of those candidates, and their enthusiasm, the instructors proposed an online delivery to the CI faculty which was approved. The first cohort began Fall 2007.
Carried over from the 2006-2007 Annual Report

**Observation:** The NCATE element related to diversity of field placements is not being met.

**Relevant Core Question:** Core Review Question #9.

**Cause/background:** The majority of candidates in the MEd in C&I are presently teaching in their own classrooms which may or may not contain a diverse set of students. The program crafted a strategy to address this, but has not implemented.

**Change:** The faculty will need to either adopt and implement the strategy or make other arrangements to meet diverse placements.