

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

School of Teacher Education

Instructional Design (0428)(0418)

Andrea Paganelli

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**)
The SLO's are not listed in TopNet.

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 demonstrate professional competency in the application of instructional design concepts and principles critical to reflection for completion of the master's program.

Results, Conclusions, and Plans by Academic Year 2021–2022

- **Results:**
100% of students in ID 595 achieved an average rating of 3 or above in both performance and dispositions. All six students successfully completed and submitted their required project documentation and received passing grades.
- **Conclusions:**
Students demonstrated strong professional competency, meeting the program's performance expectations.
- **Plans:**
Faculty will introduce more opportunities for online synchronous meetings (e.g., Zoom) to better support and monitor student progress.

2022–2023

- **Results:**
Students continued to demonstrate high levels of success in the capstone project. They benefited from increased online synchronous meetings, including Zoom sessions.
- **Conclusions:**
Additional online support positively impacted student performance and engagement.
- **Plans:**
 - Expand synchronous communication (e.g., virtual Q&A sessions, individual consultations).
 - Regularly update course content to reflect current trends in instructional design and technology.

2023–2024

- **Results:**
Continued student success was observed. New strategies—virtual Q&A sessions and individual consultations—further improved students' understanding of the course and project process.

	• Conclusions: Expanded interaction and support enhanced student engagement and comprehension. • Plans: ○ Introduce course entry phone consultations to foster early connection and engagement. ○ Maintain and improve synchronous support mechanisms.
Evaluation	Student Learning Outcome 1 remains highly relevant as it ensures that graduate students develop and demonstrate professional competency in applying instructional design principles within real-world contexts. As the instructional design and technology field continues to evolve with new tools, methodologies, and learner needs, the ability to thoughtfully integrate theory with practice is critical. This outcome not only reinforces foundational knowledge but also encourages reflective practice, professional growth, and adaptability—skills that are essential for success in dynamic educational and organizational environments. By requiring students to engage in authentic project work, receive multi-source evaluations, and articulate their learning and development, the outcome supports the program’s mission to prepare competent, reflective practitioners equipped for long-term career success.
Measurement Instruments	The measurement instrument for Student Learning Outcome 1 effectively assesses students’ professional competency in applying instructional design principles through a structured, real-world capstone experience. Students complete tasks based on their individual learning objectives and project contracts, with performance evaluations conducted by both faculty and site supervisors to capture academic and practical perspectives. They are required to maintain detailed activity logs and submit weekly progress reports via Blackboard, promoting accountability and consistent engagement. A reflective paper at the project’s conclusion allows students to critically evaluate which objectives were met, how the experience contributed to their professional growth, and their future development plans. Additionally, students submit capstone products as tangible evidence of their applied skills. Performance and professional dispositions are rated using structured rubrics, with a minimum average score of 3 required for success. This comprehensive approach ensures the outcome is measured through academic knowledge, real-world application, reflective learning, and professional behavior.
Criteria & Targets	The criterion for success for Student Learning Outcome 1 is clearly defined and remains appropriate for measuring student achievement. It requires students to receive an average rating of 3 (Satisfactory Progress) or above on both performance and professional dispositions, with no individual rubric area or disposition averaging below a 3 across all students. Additionally, the program sets a target for at least 90% of students to meet these benchmarks. This criterion is positively framed, rigorous, and aligns well with the program’s goal of ensuring professional competency. It sets high expectations while allowing for some variability in student performance. Given the consistent achievement of 100% success in recent years, the criterion appears effective; however, if this trend continues, the program may consider refining the rubric to include an “Exemplary” category to better capture and encourage advanced performance.
Results & Conclusion	Student Learning Outcome Results and Conclusions (2021–2024) Results: The results over the past three assessment cycles (2021–2022, 2022–2023, and 2023–2024) consistently exceeded expectations. In each year, 100% of students enrolled in ID 595 achieved an average rating of 3 or above in both performance and professional dispositions, meeting and surpassing the program’s success criteria. No rubric area or individual disposition showed an average score below 3. This high level of performance suggests strong alignment between course expectations, instructional strategies, and student preparedness. What stood out across all three years was the positive impact of increased synchronous support mechanisms—such as Zoom check-ins, virtual Q&A sessions, and one-on-one consultations—which appear to have significantly contributed to students’ project success and deeper understanding of the course requirements. Conclusions: The instructional and assessment strategies implemented in recent years have proven highly effective. The integration of synchronous online support, including scheduled Zoom meetings, Q&A sessions, and individualized consultations, has enhanced student engagement, facilitated

	timely feedback, and contributed to student success in the capstone experience. These changes, combined with consistent faculty oversight and evaluation from both site and faculty supervisors, have ensured that students remain on track and supported throughout the project. Additionally, the continued review of course outcomes by program faculty has ensured content remains current and responsive to changes in the instructional design field. However, the consistently high success rate raises a potential concern: the current assessment criteria and rubric may no longer be adequately distinguishing levels of mastery. The lack of variation in scores suggests a need for a more refined evaluation tool that can better differentiate between satisfactory and exemplary performance. There is also an opportunity to re-examine the types of artifacts collected to ensure they reflect the evolving demands of the profession. No significant issues were identified with course sequencing, content delivery, or facilities, though faculty should continue to update instructional materials and technologies to reflect industry trends.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Three-Year Assessment Plan (2025–2028) Over the next three years, we will implement a series of strategic improvements to enhance the assessment of Student Learning Outcome 1. In 2025–2026, we will begin by revising the assessment rubric to include an “Exemplary” performance level, which will allow faculty to better differentiate and recognize advanced levels of student achievement. This year, we will also evaluate whether the current capstone project artifacts fully capture students’ ability to apply instructional design principles in contemporary, real-world settings. If necessary, we will revise the required artifacts or supplement them with additional components such as project presentations or multimedia design briefs. In 2026–2027, we will revisit our program-level outcomes and curriculum map to ensure alignment with current professional standards and student learning needs. This may include refining the outcomes themselves or adjusting the sequencing of key courses to better prepare students for the capstone experience. We will also review whether additional preparatory content in reflective practice or project management should be embedded earlier in the curriculum. If warranted, new modules or minor course revisions will be introduced. By 2027–2028, we will collect and analyze student data using the newly implemented rubric and revised assessment artifacts. We will also provide training to faculty supervisors on the updated evaluation process to ensure consistent application of criteria and high-quality feedback. Throughout the cycle, we will continue to integrate student feedback and course review data to inform improvements. The overarching goal is to ensure that our assessment practices remain rigorous, meaningful, and aligned with the evolving expectations of the instructional design profession.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will design and develop instructional solutions, including appropriate combinations of traditional/- instructor-led strategies, constructivist techniques, technology systems, and performance support systems. Student Learning Outcome 2 Summary Outcome Statement: Students will design and develop instructional solutions using a mix of traditional, constructivist, and technology-based strategies. Measurement 1 – ID 587 Final Project (Trends Application): Students applied four current trends in instructional design to address performance problems. Success required a grade of C or higher. • 2021–2022: 100% of 9 students met the target. • 2022–2023: 94% of 18 students completed the course and met the target. • 2023–2024: 90% of 18 students met the target. Measurement 2 – ID 570 Final Project (Print-Based Unit): Students created self-paced, print-based instructional units. Success required meeting at least five checklist criteria with a C or better.

	• 2021–2022: 100% of 11 students succeeded (90% A, 10% B). • 2022–2023: 94% of 18 students succeeded (94% A, 6% B). • 2023–2024: 100% of 17 students succeeded (94% A, 6% B). Measurement 3 – ID 588 Final Project (Multimedia Instruction): Students developed multimedia instructional content. Success required a grade of C or better. • 2021–2022: 100% of 6 students succeeded (all received A). • 2022–2023: 100% of 6 students succeeded (1 did not complete; all others received A). • 2023–2024: 90% of 10 students succeeded (1 did not receive C or above). Actions & Follow-Up: Across all three years, course content in ID 588 was reviewed and updated based on student feedback. Improvements included refined materials, updated technologies, and additional learning resources to scaffold student understanding. Feedback remained positive each year. The program will continue offering the course, updating ID 570, ID 587, and ID 588 to align with emerging trends and support continued student progress.
Evaluation	Student Learning Outcome 2 remains highly relevant as it aligns directly with the evolving demands of the instructional design and technology field. In today’s diverse learning environments, professionals must be able to design flexible instructional solutions that integrate traditional methods, constructivist approaches, and modern digital tools. The ability to thoughtfully combine these strategies ensures learners receive effective, engaging, and contextually appropriate instruction. As the field continues to be shaped by technological advancements and changing learner needs, equipping students with the skills to create adaptive instructional solutions ensures they are prepared to meet current and future challenges in educational and training settings.
Measurement Instruments	Student Learning Outcome 2 is measured through a series of structured projects across three courses—ID 570, ID 587, and ID 588—which collectively assess students’ ability to design and develop comprehensive instructional solutions. Each project targets a specific aspect of instructional design: applying current trends to solve performance problems (ID 587), creating a print-based, self-paced instructional unit (ID 570), and developing multimedia instructional materials (ID 588). These assessments require students to demonstrate practical application of design principles, technological integration, and instructional strategy selection. By using rubrics that evaluate key performance criteria, the measurement tools effectively capture how well students are meeting the outcome, offering both breadth and depth in assessing their instructional design competency.
Criteria & Targets	The criteria and targets set for Student Learning Outcome 2 are appropriate and well-aligned with both academic expectations and industry standards. Requiring students to achieve a minimum score of C or above ensures that they demonstrate at least a foundational level of competency in applying instructional design principles across various formats—print-based, multimedia, and trend-driven design. Additionally, the target of 90% of students meeting or exceeding this benchmark is ambitious yet reasonable, reflecting a high standard of program quality while allowing for occasional individual challenges. The use of detailed rubrics for project evaluation also ensures consistent, objective assessment and provides students with clear expectations for success. These criteria support continuous improvement while maintaining rigor, preparing students for real-world professional demands.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Over the past three academic years, students consistently met or exceeded the success criteria for Student Learning Outcome 2 across all three measurement areas. In ID 587, success rates remained strong, with 100% completion in 2021–2022, 94% in 2022–2023, and 90% in 2023–2024. ID 570 also showed high achievement, with 100% of students meeting the criteria in 2021–2022 and 2023–2024, and 94% in 2022–2023. Similarly, ID 588 maintained strong results, with 100% success in the first two years and 90% in 2023–2024. These results

	indicate that students are consistently acquiring and applying the knowledge and skills necessary to design effective instructional solutions using a variety of strategies and technologies. Conclusions: The consistently high success rates suggest that the instructional methods, course structure, and project-based assessments used in ID 570, ID 587, and ID 588 are effective in helping students achieve the intended learning outcome. Continued updates to course content, technology tools, and instructional resources have contributed to student success and engagement. The decision to refine course materials and integrate more scaffolding based on student feedback has proven beneficial. However, slight declines in completion or performance in some years highlight the need to maintain flexibility and responsiveness in instruction and support. Future improvements could include enhancing early engagement, offering targeted support for at-risk students, and continuing to align course content with evolving industry trends to maintain high levels of student achievement.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Three-Year Assessment Cycle Plan for Student Learning Outcome 2 (2025–2028): To continuously improve our assessment practices and ensure alignment with industry trends and student needs, we will implement the following three-year assessment cycle for Student Learning Outcome 2: 2025–2026: We will begin by refining the rubrics used in ID 570, ID 587, and ID 588 to ensure greater clarity and alignment with current instructional design competencies. In ID 587, we will pilot a revised project framework that emphasizes emerging trends such as AI-enhanced learning and adaptive learning systems. We will also collect student feedback through post-project reflections to better understand their experience and perceived preparedness. Additionally, we will begin gathering data on specific rubric criteria to identify potential areas for instructional emphasis. 2026–2027: Based on data from the previous year, we will adjust course sequencing if necessary and revise instructional materials accordingly. For example, we may introduce a preparatory module on multimedia authoring tools earlier in the program to better support students in ID 588. We will also explore the possibility of incorporating peer review elements into project assessments to encourage collaboration and reflection. During this year, we will conduct faculty training sessions focused on applying updated rubrics consistently and effectively across courses. 2027–2028: We will evaluate the cumulative impact of the implemented changes by conducting a comparative analysis of student performance data from the three-year cycle. If learning targets are consistently exceeded, we will consider raising benchmarks or modifying the criteria to ensure continued growth and challenge. This year will also include a comprehensive curriculum review, assessing how well each course supports the SLO and identifying opportunities to integrate more real-world, client-based projects. At the end of the cycle, we will update the program’s curriculum map and assessment plan based on findings, effectively closing the loop and setting a foundation for the next assessment cycle.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will develop adequate knowledge of the instructional design field and related theories and approaches. Student Learning Outcome 3 (SLO 3) for the academic years 2021–2024: Student Learning Outcome 3 Goal: Students will develop adequate knowledge of the instructional design field and related theories and approaches.

2021–2022 Summary

- **Measurement Instrument 1 (ID 585 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above
 - **Result:** 100% met target (11 students)
- **Measurement Instrument 2 (ID 560 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above
 - **Result:** 100% met target (21 students; 16 received A or B)
- **Actions Taken:** Course materials updated to support student growth
- **Follow-Up Plan:** Continuous content updates to align with trends

2022–2023 Summary

- **Measurement Instrument 1 (ID 585 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above
 - **Result:** 100% met target (14 students)
- **Measurement Instrument 2 (ID 560 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above
 - **Result:** 100% met target (15 of 17 students completed course; all passed; 15 received A or B)
- **Actions Taken:** Faculty reviewed outcomes; course materials updated
- **Follow-Up Plan:** Continued updates to reflect trends and technologies

2023–2024 Summary

- **Measurement Instrument 1 (ID 585 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above
 - **Result:** 100% met target (14 students)
- **Measurement Instrument 2 (ID 560 Final Project)**
 - **Target:** 90% of students score C or above

	○ Result: 100% met target (22 of 24 completed; all passed; 22 received A or B) • Actions Taken: Continued review and updates by faculty • Follow-Up Plan: Ongoing project updates to reflect current instructional design trends Overall Outcome (2021–2024): Student Learning Outcome 3 was met each year. All students consistently achieved the minimum performance criteria across both key instructional design courses (ID 560 and ID 585), with strong performance in terms of grades and successful project completion.
Evaluation	Student Learning Outcome 3, which focuses on students developing adequate knowledge of the instructional design field and related theories and approaches, remains highly relevant in today’s evolving educational and training environments. As technology continues to reshape how instruction is delivered—particularly through online and blended formats—professionals must understand both foundational instructional theories and current design models to create effective, learner-centered experiences. This outcome ensures that graduates are not only equipped to apply established frameworks like ADDIE or Constructivist approaches but are also prepared to adapt to innovations such as AI-driven personalization, microlearning, and immersive learning technologies. Moreover, the relevance of this outcome is reinforced by the growing demand for instructional designers across education, corporate training, healthcare, and nonprofit sectors. Organizations increasingly rely on evidence-based instructional strategies to enhance performance and learning outcomes. By aligning student work with real-world trends and requiring the application of current technologies in project-based assessments, this SLO ensures that graduates stay competitive and competent in a dynamic field. Continued focus on this outcome also fosters a mindset of lifelong learning and adaptability—key qualities for success in instructional design and technology careers.
Measurement Instruments	The measurement instruments for Student Learning Outcome 3 are closely aligned with both theoretical knowledge and practical application, effectively assessing students’ understanding of instructional design principles. In ID 585, students are tasked with identifying a current trend in distance education and demonstrating how a specific technology can be used to reflect or support that trend. This project requires students to engage with contemporary issues in instructional design, analyze them through the lens of relevant theories or models, and apply their knowledge in a real-world context. The rubric used to assess this project captures students’ ability to synthesize theory and practice, ensuring the evaluation reflects both conceptual understanding and applied skill. In ID 560, the second measurement instrument requires students to develop an instructional system design model tailored to a specific context. This project directly targets students’ ability to translate theoretical knowledge into structured, purposeful design work—one of the most critical competencies in the field. The use of a rubric to evaluate this final project ensures consistent and detailed feedback across multiple components of instructional design, such as needs analysis, design logic, and evaluation strategy. Together, these instruments not only measure knowledge acquisition but also assess students’ ability to apply and communicate instructional design principles effectively, providing a comprehensive evaluation of SLO 3.
Criteria & Targets	The criteria and targets established for Student Learning Outcome 3 are well-suited to evaluating whether students are gaining the necessary knowledge and skills in instructional design. Requiring students to earn a grade of C or above on major final projects in ID 585 and ID 560 ensures that all students demonstrate at least a basic competency in understanding and applying instructional design theories and models. These projects are carefully designed to reflect authentic tasks in the field, meaning the performance benchmarks directly translate to real-world expectations. By setting the bar at a C or higher and evaluating students with detailed rubrics, the program maintains academic rigor while allowing for diverse demonstrations of learning.

	The program success target—that 90% of students must meet the criteria and no individual rubric area should average below a C—adds an important layer of accountability and program-level insight. This dual-level expectation not only checks individual student success but also evaluates whether instruction is consistently effective across key learning areas. By monitoring rubric averages in addition to pass rates, the program can identify if particular components (e.g., theoretical application, design structure) need reinforcement, even if overall pass rates are high. This makes the criteria and targets both attainable and meaningful, supporting continuous improvement while maintaining high standards aligned with SLO 3.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Across the academic years 2021–2024, the assessment results for Student Learning Outcome 3 consistently demonstrated strong student performance in both ID 585 and ID 560. In each year, 100% of students who completed the courses earned a grade of C or above on their final projects, successfully meeting the established success criteria. Furthermore, a majority of students earned grades of A or B, indicating a high level of proficiency in identifying trends in distance education and developing instructional system design models. These results show not only achievement of minimum standards but also a trend toward excellence in applying instructional design knowledge and skills. Conclusions: The consistent achievement of SLO 3 suggests that the instructional strategies, course design, and assessments in ID 585 and ID 560 are effectively preparing students in core areas of instructional design theory and application. The use of performance-based assessments, supported by clear rubrics, provides reliable evidence that students are engaging with current trends and theoretical frameworks in meaningful ways. As a result, the program can conclude that the outcome is being met successfully. Ongoing updates to course content and project guidelines will ensure the outcome remains relevant and continues to reflect evolving industry practices and technologies.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Three-year assessment plan for Student Learning Outcome 3 (SLO 3) for the 2025–2028 cycle. This plan emphasizes continuous improvement, reflective practice, and alignment with evolving trends in instructional design. Three-Year Assessment Plan for SLO 3 (2025–2028) 2025–2026: Deepen Rubric Calibration and Expand Feedback Quality In this year, the focus will be on improving the consistency and effectiveness of assessment tools. Faculty will conduct a rubric calibration workshop for both ID 560 and ID 585 to ensure uniform interpretation and application of scoring criteria. Student feedback mechanisms will be enhanced to collect more detailed reflections on the relevance and clarity of the projects. Assessment results will be analyzed not only for grade distribution but also for trends in strengths and areas for growth, especially within specific rubric components. Updates to rubrics may be made to align more closely with current best practices and student learning needs. 2026–2027: Integrate Peer Review and Industry Feedback To enhance the authenticity and real-world relevance of student projects, a peer review component will be introduced into both ID 560 and ID 585. Students will provide and receive structured feedback based on selected rubric dimensions, fostering metacognitive awareness and collaboration. Additionally, feedback from instructional design professionals (e.g., alumni, advisory board members) will be solicited to evaluate how well student projects align with industry expectations. Assessment data will be used to refine project guidelines and ensure alignment with emerging trends in distance learning and instructional systems design. 2027–2028: Evaluate Longitudinal Impact and Revise Curriculum The final year of the cycle will focus on evaluating the cumulative impact of the changes implemented in prior years. Data from the past three years will be analyzed to assess improvements in student learning and performance consistency. The program will review whether the SLO continues to reflect key competencies needed in the field and determine if revisions are necessary. Based on findings, curriculum changes may be proposed for ID 560 and ID 585 to ensure continued alignment with evolving instructional design theories and technologies. A full report summarizing the three-year cycle will be compiled to close the assessment loop and guide the next cycle.

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