

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>College of Education and Behavioral Sciences</i>	<i>Replace this with your Department Name</i>
<i>Gifted and Talented Ed. Certificate #0490 (starting 2024-2025 catalog the number 0503)</i>	
<i>Susan Keesey, Director of STE</i>	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will apply data literacy concepts and strategies.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? If it has recently changed, please explain. Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? Do you have the appropriate numbers of SLOs to measure regularly? Please consider choosing the most important. The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our direct measurements are: ● Research Capstone Project (EDU 699) ○ Developing a rubric.

	● Literature Review (GTE 636) ○ Changing the rubric ■ revised rubric is included at the end of this document ■ revise to include the new standards ■ make more accessible, supportive, instructive, and practical for the students
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful--ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? If you have successfully made your targets consistently, consider a more challenging target. Criteria 1: Capstone Thesis (EDU 699) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: ● 85% or more of the students meet the criteria. ● 100% of students pass the thesis defense. ● Note: Need to develop a rubric with standards alignment. Criteria 2: Literature Review (GTE 636) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ● Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ● We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain <u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: At this point, 100% of EDS students have defended their capstone thesis. The other data have not been collected as this is a newly revised assessment plan. Conclusions: We are eliminating gifted Ed. Praxis II data because there will be a mixture of students that will need different Praxis tests from multiple content areas now that the EDS has expanded in design. The two assignments, Capstone and Literature Review, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.

<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: ● collect a more appropriate artifact ● create new program outcomes ● adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met ● need to reconstruct your curriculum map ● sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have two new/updated rubrics. ● We are collecting two more appropriate artifacts. ● The targets are new. ● We are reconstructing our assessment plan and curriculum mapping. ● We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics.
---	---

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will exhibit data analysis skills.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our direct measurements are: ● Capstone Thesis (EDU 699) ● Research PD Talk (GTE 636) ● Research Design Project (GTE 637) AI will provide a starting point for research for the Research PD Talk.

Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? Criteria 1: Capstone Thesis (EDU 699) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria. 100% of students pass the thesis defense. Note: Need to develop a rubric with standards alignment. Criteria 2: Research PD Talk (GTE 636) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. Criteria 3: Research Design Project (GTE 637) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: At this point, 100% of EDS students have defended their capstone thesis. The other data have not been collected as this is a newly revised assessment plan. Conclusions: We are eliminating gifted Ed. Praxis II data because there will be a mixture of students that will need different Praxis tests from multiple content areas now that the EDS has expanded in design. The two assignments, Capstone and Research PD Talk, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: ● collect a more appropriate artifact ● create new program outcomes

	• adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have new/updated rubrics. • We are collecting more appropriate artifacts. • The targets are new. • We are reconstructing our assessment plan and curriculum mapping. • We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics.
--	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will exhibit proficiency in research methods.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our three direct measurements are: • Capstone Project (EDU 699) • Literature Review (GTE 636) • Research Design Project (GTE 637)
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? Criteria 1: Research Capstone Thesis (EDU 699) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator

	Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria. 100% of students pass the thesis defense. Note: Need to develop a rubric with standards alignment. Criteria 2: Literature Review (GTE 636) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. Criteria 3: Research Design Project (GTE 637) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain <u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: At this point, 100% of EDS students have defended their capstone thesis. The other data have not been collected as this is a newly revised assessment plan. Conclusions: We are eliminating gifted Ed. Praxis II data because there will be a mixture of students that will need different Praxis tests from multiple content areas now that the EDS has expanded in design. The assignments, Capstone, Literature Review, and Research Design Project, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: ● collect a more appropriate artifact ● create new program outcomes ● adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met ● need to reconstruct your curriculum map ● sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided

	Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have new/updated rubrics. ● We are collecting more appropriate artifacts. ● The targets are new. ● We are reconstructing our assessment plan and curriculum mapping. ● We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics.
--	---

To add more outcomes, if needed, select the table above and copy & paste below.