



## 2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

### **PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT AY 2008-2009**

**Report Date:**

**School/College:** University of San Francisco

**Department/Program:** **Catholic Educational Leadership**

**Person completing the Report:** Dr. Doreen F. Jones

1. **Overview Statement:** Briefly summarize the assessment activities that were undertaken this academic year, indicating:

YEAR ONE: Three courses—CEL-700 (Introduction to Doctoral Research), CEL-640/740 (Ecclesial Principles of Catholic Education), CEL-641/741 (School Law and Private Education)—were evaluated relative to USF School of Education Catholic Educational Leadership program goals and outcomes for both the doctorate and master degree in Catholic Educational Leadership. Faculty alone assessed the CEL-700 course, while both faculty and students evaluated the CEL-640/740 and CEL-641/741 courses.

2. **Please Answers the Following Questions for Each of the Student Outcomes Assessed:**

2A. *Data Relative to CEL-700 (Introduction to Research)*

a. What did you do?

The course instructor evaluated academic competency in coursework and application of research skills to Catholic education, in particular, and to the field of education, in general through the written assignments of the students and the one-on-one conversations that occurred between the instructor and respective students relative to the course's assigned readings and reflective activities.

b. What did the faculty in the department or program learn?

*Strengths:* The one-on-one course format permitted learning to be personalized to each student's interests. It also permitted a personal and professional relationship to develop between the instructor and the student, which in turn, provided the essential foundation for honest, critical discussions and for meaningful teaching and learning relative to the science of research.

*Weaknesses:* Evaluative input from students is non-existent in this course. In addition, the instructor permitted each student to schedule his/her tutorial sessions upon completion of the required class assignments. This practice promoted procrastination and resulted in several students not completing the course in the enrolled semester

c. What will be done differently as a result of what was learned?

*First,* students will henceforth be given the opportunity to evaluate this course, as their input is invaluable to measuring whether the course's goals and objectives were being met from the students' perspective.

*Secondly,* the course instructor and students will henceforth schedule all sessions at their first meeting to ensure that all six sessions occur and are completed within the given semester.

*Thirdly,* the course's syllabus will be reviewed and revised to include student outcomes and the curriculum will be adjusted to include the following best practice strategies--holistic, reflective, and social (scaffold learning).



## 2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

### 2B. Data Relative to CEL-740/640 (*Ecclesial Principles of Catholic Education*)

#### a. What did you do?

The instructor assessed the course's goals and outcomes (See attached matrixes for both MA & Ed.D. goals and outcomes) through a variety of means: class discussions of assigned readings, written assignments, oral reports, and the final independent student project. Students evaluated the course (its objectives and the instructor's pedagogy) through a program-designed student survey (See student survey).

#### b. What did the faculty in the department or program learn?

Student survey evaluations indicate that CEL-740/640 course objectives and learning outcomes were congruent with assignments given and were met with great satisfaction. They also noted that instructor's caring relationship with students, his availability to them, his expertise in and current research-based knowledge of the subject matter, and his ability to accommodate various learning styles were highly demonstrated, and indicative of Ignatian pedagogy. In addition, "excellent" was the score most reported relative to students' satisfaction with the course, in general, and its relevancy to their respective ministries. One student reported that the course's scope and sequence was too comprehensive for coverage within CEL's three-week Summerwest period and suggested that its material should be divided into two courses. On a positive note, both the masters and doctoral students reported that the course promoted community building and an appreciation and understanding of the ecclesial foundation of Catholic education. A key learning point was that there is no instrument (i.e., survey or written evaluation) in place specifically designed for the course instructor to assess his/her class relative to the goals and outcomes listed on CEL's matrix either at the masters or doctoral level. In addition, this review revealed that the program-designed student survey must be revised to include questions relative to all of CEL's goals and outcomes listed on the attached matrix.

#### c. What will be done differently as a result of what was learned?

CEL faculty will work collaboratively to revise the student survey to make it a more valid instrument as well as to create a comparable instructor's survey so that the data collected from both can be compared, and that proper assessment of all variables can be made.

### 2C. Data Relevant to CEL-641/741 (*School Law and Private Education*)

#### a. What did you do?

The instructor assessed the course's goals and objectives through a variety of means: class discussions of assigned readings, analysis of legal cases, evaluation of legal briefs, and a final exam. Students evaluated the course through participation in a program-designed student survey.

#### b. What did the faculty in the department or program learn?

Student survey evaluations indicate that CEL-641/741 course goals and objectives were achieved due to the professor's expertise in the subject matter and because of her engaging, practical, and entertaining teaching style. Students perceived the course's content to be coherently organized and well executed. Students reported that the instructor's practical and experiential approach to school law facilitated their understanding of constitutional law, contract law, canon law, and issues of liability and their respective relationship to Catholic schools. A key learning point is that presently there is no instrument (i.e., survey or written evaluation) or procedure in place for the course instructor to assess her class relative to the goals and outcomes listed on CEL's matrixes for both the masters and doctoral levels. In addition, the program learned that the student survey must be revised to include questions regarding all of the variables listed as CEL's goals and outcomes matrixes so that a comprehensive assessment of all variables may be undertaken.



## 2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

- c. What will be done differently as a result of what was learned?  
CEL faculty will work collaboratively to revise the student survey to make it a more valid instrument as well as to create a comparable instructor's survey so that the data collected from both can be compared, and that proper assessment of all variables can be made.

General Summary: Resolutions of above stated issues are in process.

3. **Attach a copy of the components of the department/program assessment plan that have been modified since its initial submission: (See attach folders)**
  - a. Program Mission
  - b. Program Learning Goals
  - c. Program Learning Outcomes
  - d. Program Learning Rubrics aligned with outcomes
  - e. Program Curriculum Matrix

**Please return to: Provost Office by June 1, 2009**

**You can send your replies as either a Word attachment (to: [marin@usfca.edu](mailto:marin@usfca.edu)) or as a hard copy to: Provost Office, Lone Mountain Rossi Wing 4<sup>th</sup> floor.**

**If you have any questions, please contact: William Murry, Director of Institutional Assessment ([wmurry@usfca.edu](mailto:wmurry@usfca.edu) or x5486).**