Institution: Emporia State University

Accredited By: ☑ KSDE ☑ NCATE

Date Submitted: 07-26-10

Name of Preparer(s): Nancy Hite

Unit Head Name: Phillip Bennett

Unit Head Phone Number: 620-341-5367 Unit Head Email: pbennett@emporia.edu

Level of the Program: ☑ Advanced

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared:

☑ K-6 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 6-12 ☐ K-12

Is this program being offered at more than one site? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list the sites at which the program is offered:

☐ New Program ☑ Continued Program ☐ Dormant Program
GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete this program report. To complete the report, institutions must provide data from multiple assessments that, taken as a whole, will demonstrate candidate mastery of the Kansas standards. These data will also be used to answer the following questions. Reviewers expect these prompts to be answered by the report.

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the subjects they will teach or the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan their teaching?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

I. **Contextual Information** – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program.

II. **Assessments and Related Data** – provides the opportunity for institutions to submit multiple assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.

III. **Standards Assessment Chart** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.

IV. **Evidence for Meeting Standards** – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards.

V. **Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, and skills; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type. Each attachment required in Sections I and IV of the report should be kept to a maximum of five text pages. Although attachments longer than five pages will be accepted electronically, staff will require institutions to revise reports submitted with lengthy attachments.

Except for the required attachments, institutional responses can be entered directly onto the form. Specific directions are included at the beginning of each section.
SECTION I—CONTEXT

Complete the following contextual information:
1. A program of study that outlines the courses and experiences **required for all candidates** to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles and hours of credit per course. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet-- maximum of five text pages.) NEW PROGRAMS MUST SUBMIT SYLLABI IN THE DOCUMENT WAREHOUSE AND IN A FOLDER ON THE CD.
2. Chart with the number of candidates and completers. (Title-Chart with Candidate Information)¹
   **Limit of 6 pages, not including the charts.**

1. **Program of Study:**
   Provide the following contextual information:

   - *Description of the relationship of the program to the unit’s conceptual framework.*

   The Teachers College Conceptual Framework reflects the philosophy that for educators to help all students learn, they must have a command of content, critical ideas and skills, and the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and learn from their practice so that it continually improves. The candidate preparing for a career in education is immersed in an academic milieu that values a number of tenets the faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of teachers, other school personnel, and others in the helping professions: especially, the value of diversity; the relevance of authentic assessment; the essentials of professionalism; the importance of collaboration; the value of leadership; the significance of access to information; the usefulness of appropriate technology, and the power of reflection. ESU’s professional education programs offered through The Teachers College are devoted to the proposition that candidates who learn and grow in such an atmosphere and who integrate knowledge, theory, and practice begin their professional lives as professional educators.

   The unit embraces the idea that while successful professional educators can be highly effective in different ways, common proficiencies draw on shared understanding of how to foster student learning. The Conceptual Framework identifies six proficiencies resulting from this shared understanding. The candidate who is competent in these proficiencies becomes *The Professional*. Specifically, the Professional provides service to society, applies interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engages in effective practice, responds to uncertainty and change, relies on self-reflection, and belongs to a professional community.

   This program relates closely to the unit’s conceptual framework. Specifically, it provides opportunities for candidates to expand their business education content knowledge and, as professional educators, provide a valuable service to society. The program also provides for candidates to develop professionally, to acquire the knowledge to teach students new and useful, to evaluate business curricula given the ever-changing state and national standards and requirements, and to reflect on and evaluate their own skills and abilities in order to improve instruction. Overall, the programs overall purpose is to prepare candidates who will equip their own students with the business content knowledge and skills as well as interdisciplinary knowledge in math and English to obtain gainful employment in the business world or pursue further education.

   The graduate program for the Master of Science degree in Business Education is designed for teachers...
seeking advanced preparation in the area of business and education. Typically, these individuals are licensed business teachers already or they are employed as trainers in business. Generally, the candidates for this degree are employed full-time and take graduate course work on a part-time basis during the regular semesters and summers. The graduate courses are offered on a rotation basis over a two to three year time period. This is a 35 credit hour degree program. Candidates have a maximum of seven years to complete the degree. The program of study follows:

**Master of Science in Business Education**

**Degree Requirements**

**35 Credit Hours**

**Required Core Courses: 23 Credits**

- BE 882 Business & Computer Curriculum Development 3 credits
- BE 884 Business Education Teaching Methods/Materials 3 credits
- BE 850 Emerging Issues in Computer & Business Education 3 credits
- BE 890 Research in Business & Computer Education 3 credits
- BE 840 Instructional Technology Selection & Facility Design 3 credits
- BE 540 Electronic Communications 3 credits
- BE 702 Methods of Teaching Computer Studies 2 credits
- BE 710 Designing Computer Presentations 1 credit
- BE 701 PC Troubleshooting 1 credit
- BE 721 Windows for Teachers 1 credit

**Elective Credits**

12 credits

**Total Credits**

35 credits
- **Indication of the program’s unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit’s assessment system.**

Candidates in the Master of Science in Business Education program are assessed at regular points within the candidate’s degree program. Assessments are conducted prior to admittance, during the program and prior to completion of the program just as candidates are in the unit’s other programs. Content knowledge in the business field must be shown prior to admittance to the program. During the program, candidates are assessed on content knowledge, curriculum planning skills, and pedagogical planning. The ability to conduct research in the business education field is also assessed prior to degree completion. These assessments are all related to the unit’s assessment system. Assessment includes a unit of instruction, a curriculum project, a subject-matter content exam, a literature review, a research study, a student reflection assignment, and a media presentation.

- **Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program.**

Assessments are conducted prior to admittance to the Master of Science in Business Education, during the program and at the point of completion of the degree program. The unit’s assessment system for advanced programs consists of the following four decision points.

**Decision Point 1: Admission to Program of Study**

Candidates must apply for admission through the Emporia State University Graduate Office by submitting an application form and an official transcript or transcripts. The department admits candidates who meet the following requirements:

- A score of 665 or more on the combined quantitative and verbal portions of the Graduate Record Exam and a 2.5 or higher on the analytical portion of the exam
- Content knowledge in business - 15 undergraduate credits in computer information systems, accounting, finance, management, and marketing
- Minimum cumulative undergraduate grade point average of 2.70 in the last 60 hours taken
- These admission requirements are based on the need for candidates to have a solid background in the field of business, a history of being above-average academically, and strong verbal and mathematical abilities.

For degree candidacy, candidates must have successfully passed the Graduate Record Exam (GRE), with a total score of 665 or more for the quantitative and verbal portions of the test and a 2.5 or higher on the analytical portion. Admission to a program of study is the formal approval by the department for pursuit of a graduate degree or program after it is determined that all specified admission criteria have been met. Candidates are expected to continuously demonstrate personal characteristics appropriate to the profession.

**Decision Point 2: Admission to Field Experience**

The advanced program field experience requires candidates to exhibit up-to-date knowledge of business education curricula in a practicum situation. This practicum project requires candidates to work directly with personnel in a business department in a school to evaluate the business curriculum in a school. Requirements for admission are similar to the unit’s system of assessment. To be permitted to enter this practicum experience, candidates must have a GPA of at least 3.0 as well as meet the following
requirements:
- Minimum grade of B in 500 or 600 level courses
- All C credits must be balanced with an equal number of A credits.

**Decision Point 3: Completion of Field Experience**
Candidates must successfully complete their practicum (field) experience before being assessed for program completion. Based on the candidate’s performance and input from the University supervisor for the practicum, the University supervisor assigns a grade for the practicum (field) experience. The candidate is required to have a minimum grade of “B” for the practicum experience before being allowed to proceed to the program completion decision point. During this practicum, advanced candidates work in a K-12 or post-secondary school setting.

**Decision Point 4: Program Completion**
All advanced candidates must demonstrate a practical knowledge, grounded in theory, of key concepts and skills included in the curriculum pertinent to the field of business education. Program completion requires completion of all content coursework with a GPA of at least 3.0, completion of all pedagogical coursework with a GPA of at least 3.0, completion of departmental requirements, successful completion of the practicum experience, and completion of all degree/program requirements.

- **Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships.**
- In the BE 882 Business and Computer Curriculum course, candidates must exhibit up-to-date knowledge of business education curricula in a practicum situation. This is a practicum project that requires candidates to work directly with personnel in a business department in a school. After reviewing state and national business education standards to determine current trends in business education, candidates work with a mentor who is a practicing business or computer teacher in a school and their instructor. They gather information related to the curricular offerings at that school, analyze that curriculum, and make sound recommendations for changes in the curriculum. Candidates evaluate the business curriculum in a school in relation to national and state standards in business education, analyze skills needed in the local workforce, determine deficiencies in the local curriculum, create an ideal curriculum for that school setting, and prepare a report to be presented to the business department chair at that school.
- This advanced program in business education does not lead to initial licensure; hence, a given number of hours/weeks of student teaching is not a requirement.

---

1 **KSDE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.**

2 **This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under KSDE/NCATE Standard 2.**
2. **Chart with Candidate Information:**

**Directions:** Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Please report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program$^3$</th>
<th># of Program Completers$^4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^3$An enrolled candidate is officially admitted to the program.

$^4$KSDE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.
SECTION II—ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED DATA

In this section, list the multiple assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the Kansas standards for this content area. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments, maximum of eight assessments; assessments #1-6 are required for all programs. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is required/administered in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
<th>Type or form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Required/Administered</th>
<th>Data Results</th>
<th>Action Taken/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. [Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment] ( ^8 ) ( ^9 ) (Required)</td>
<td>This is not a degree that leads to initial teacher licensure so the Praxis II and PLT exam requirements are not applicable.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. [Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction] Unit of instruction assignment</td>
<td>Instructional planning assessment rubric and Student learning reflection report (1)</td>
<td>BE 884 Business Education Teaching Methods</td>
<td>All program candidates met or exceeded the minimum expectations, indicating they have a firm grasp of instructional planning. The overall average was 2.7 on a 3 pt. scale with 3 indicating candidates exceed expectations and 2 indicating student meet expectations. The range of scores was from 2.0 – 3.0. Candidates have met expectations of Standard 5 as addressed by this assessment.</td>
<td>No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [Assessment of clinical experience] Business curriculum project in a clinical setting</td>
<td>Content knowledge checklist /rubric (1)</td>
<td>BE 882 Business and Computer Curriculum</td>
<td>All business education program candidates met or exceeded minimum requirements for this assessment indicating a high level of ability to work in a clinical setting. The overall average was 2.6 on a 3 pt. scale. The range of scores was from 2.0-3.0. Candidates have met expectations of Standard 2 as addressed by this assessment.</td>
<td>No changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Assessment of candidate effect on student learning
Student learning reflection project
- **Content and pedagogical knowledge rubric (1)**
- **BE 884 Business Education Teaching Methods**
- All program candidates exceeded or met expectations for this assessment and, therefore, have met the expectations of Standard 5. The average score was 2.6 on a 3 pt. scale. The scores ranged from 2.0 to 3.0.
- None at this time.

### 5. Content-based assessment
Knowledge of computer-related technology
- **Content knowledge exam (1)**
- **BE 540 Electronic Communications**
- All business education program candidates met or exceeded minimum expectations. Therefore, the candidates have met the expectations for this assessment and Standard 1. The overall average was 2.9 on a 3.0 scale. The range was from 2.0-3.0.
- None taken at this time.

### 6. Content-based assessment
Media-based presentation
- **Checklist (1)**
- **BE 710 Designing Computer Presentations**
- All business education candidates either exceeded expectations or met expectations for this assessment and for Standard 1. The overall average was 2.9 on a 3 pt. scale. The range was from 2.0-3.0.
- None at this time.

### 7. Content-based assessment
Knowledge and skills for professional development
- **Follow-up survey of graduates (11)**
- **After graduation**
- Ninety percent of candidates indicated the program content was good or excellent and provided them with the knowledge and skills needed for continued professional development. Six percent indicated the program content was fair and no candidates indicated the program was poor.
- None at this time

### 8. Content-based assessment
Knowledge of current business education research
- **Review of current business education research criteria checklist (1)**
- **BE 890 Research in Business Education**
- All candidates met or exceeded expectations for this assessment. This demonstrates that candidates have successfully met Standard 3. The overall average was 2.8 on a 3 pt. scale with a range of
- None at this time
| 9. [Content-based assessment] | Business education research study | Report evaluation using criteria checklist (1) | BE 890 Research in Business Education | Seventy-five percent of the candidates who completed this assignment exceeded expectations and 25% met minimum expectations for conducting a research study and writing a research report. The overall average was 2.8 on a 3 pt. scale with a range of 2.0-3.0. This demonstrates that all candidates have met Standard 4. | Prior to 2006, changes were made in learning activities to provide more practice in writing various sections of a research study. Those changes improved the class achievement so no further changes are needed. |

*Required Assessments*
For each Kansas standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. **One assessment may apply to multiple Kansas standards.** In Section IV you will describe these assessments in greater detail and summarize and analyze candidate results to document that a majority of your candidates are meeting Kansas standards. The standards reflect the recommendations of the National Association for Business Teacher Education and are based on the need for advanced study in business education across the nation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kansas Standards</th>
<th>Applicable Assessments From Section II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1 Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the use of computer information technologies for business and educational applications.</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2 Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of current trends in business and computer education and curriculum development.</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3 Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of current business education research.</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4 Candidates will develop and conduct a research study in the business or computer education fields.</td>
<td>7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5 Candidates will facilitate the learning of current business education subject matter.</td>
<td>2, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the multiple assessments listed in Section II and the data findings must be reported in this section. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards.

For each assessment, the evidence for meeting standards should include the following information:

- A brief description of the assessment, project, portfolio and its use in the program. Explain specificity of the assessment to the standard/s. An assessment may assess several standards at the same time;
- The alignment of the assessment with the specific KSDE standards addressed by the assessment, as they are identified in Section III;
- A brief summary of the data findings;
- An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.

The response to each assessment is limited to the equivalent of two text pages.

For each assessment listed, you will need to attach the following:

- Scoring guides, criteria or rubric (specific to content of standard/s) used to score candidate responses on the assessment;
- A table (include # of candidates) with the aggregated results of the assessment providing, where possible, data for at least the most recent three years. Data should be organized according to the categories used in the rubrics/scoring guide/criteria. Provide the percentage of candidates achieving at each category.

In the two columns for attachments, click in the box for each attachment to be included with the report. Each attachment should be no longer than five pages. The two attachments related to each assessment must be included for the program report to be complete. The report will not be reviewed until it is complete.

Assessment 1: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Not required as this graduate program does not lead to initial teacher licensure.

Assessment 2: (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of instructional planning – creation of a unit of instruction</td>
<td>Check the box if attached x</td>
<td>Check the box if attached. x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
To show candidates’ knowledge of business course content and their ability to utilize appropriate pedagogies, they are required to create a unit of instruction for a business or computer course. This unit of instruction includes the following sections: goals, objectives, learning activities, assessments, and reflection on student learning. The unit of instruction is graded using a rubric with the rubric scores converted to a three-point scale: 0 points = Not observed; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; 3=Exceeds expectations. The BE 884 Business Education Teaching Methods course includes this assessment activity. (See file attached named Assessment 2 Rubric)

Alignment with Standards
Standard 5 Candidates will facilitate the learning of current business education subject matter. In the BE 884 Business Education Teaching methods course, candidates demonstrate knowledge of pedagogical theory as well as subject-matter content in business education. This assessment is directly related to pedagogy in terms of the learning activities section of the unit of instruction. Knowledge of current content in business education courses (subjects) is demonstrated through the choice and alignment of goals, objectives, learning activities, and assessments in the unit of instruction.

Summary of Data
Using the assessment scoring scale of 1-3 points with 3 indicating candidates exceed expectations, of the 7 candidates who completed this activity in FY2009, 0% received a score of 0 or 1; 29% (2) received a score of 2; and 71% (14) received a score of 3. No data was available for FY 2008 and FY 2010 because the BE 884 course was not offered during those years. The overall average score was 2.7 on the 3 point scale with a range of scores from 2.0 to 3.0 with 2 indicating candidates meet expectations and 3 indicating candidates exceed expectations. See Assessment 2 Data file.

Interpretation
Whereas as the average score was 2.7 on a 3 point scale (indicating mastery) and the range of scores was from 2.0-3.0, the data collected would indicate that candidates have met this Standard. This method of assessing a unit of instruction appears to be appropriate for candidates in terms of meeting this standard as it addresses candidates’ ability to facilitate the learning of current business education subject matter. No changes are planned based on the results of this form of assessment as it appears to be effective in terms of determining candidates’ knowledge of business course content as well as their ability to choose appropriate content, teaching pedagogies, and evaluation techniques.

Assessment 3 (Required)   PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge and skills are applied effectively in practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business education curriculum analysis in a practicum setting</td>
<td>Check the box if attached</td>
<td>Check the if attached.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
In the BE 882 Business and Computer Curriculum course, candidates must exhibit up-to-date knowledge of business education curricula in a practicum situation. This is a practicum (field) project that requires candidates to work directly with personnel in a business department in a school. After reviewing state and national business education standards to determine current trends in business education, candidates work with a mentor who is a practicing business or computer teacher in a school as well as the course instructor. Candidates gather information related to the curricular offerings at that school, analyze that curriculum, and make sound recommendations for changes in the curriculum. Candidates evaluate the business curriculum in a school in relation to national and state standards in business education, analyze skills needed in the local workforce, determine deficiencies in the local curriculum, create an ideal curriculum for that school setting, and prepare a report to be presented to the business department chair at that school. This practicum project is assessed using a rubric. See file named Assessment 3 Rubric.

Alignment with Standards
Business Education Standard 2: Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of current trends in business and computer education and curriculum development. This assessment is directly related to Standard 2 as it involves utilizing current state and national business education standards to determine curricular trends in business education and use those state and national standards to analyze the business education curriculum in a local school practicum setting.

Summary of Data
The business education curriculum trends and analysis project is graded using a rubric. See the file attached named Assessment 4 Rubric. The rubric scores are based on a three-point scale: 0 points = Not observed; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; 3=Exceeds expectations. In 2007-2008, eight candidates completed the assessment with 63% exceeding expectations (receiving scores of 3) and 37% meeting expectations (receiving scores of 2) for the unit of instruction. Data is only available for one year since the BE 882 Business & Computer Curriculum course was only offered once during this time period. The average score was 2.6 with a range of scores from 2.0 to 3.0. See Assessment 3 Data file.

Interpretation
This assessment process involves having candidates identify curricular trends and analyzing a business education curriculum in a practicum setting based on state and national business education standards. Whereas as the average score was 2.6 on a 3 point scale (indicating mastery) and the range of scores was from 2.0-3.0, the data collected would indicate that candidates have demonstrated their knowledge and skills in terms of current trends in business education and business curriculum standards in a practicum setting. They have met or exceeded expectations. The data show that no changes are needed; therefore, none are recommended in terms of pedagogy, type of assessment, or the grading rubric used.

Assessment 4 (Required) EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ effects on student learning.

Candidates’ Reflection Assignment Based on Their Students’ Achievement
Description

After creating and teaching a unit of instruction, the candidates will determine the effects their teaching has had on student learning during that unit. To determine the effect of their teaching, candidates will (1) analyze their students’ pre-test and post-test scores and compare the results to the competencies/outcomes listed in the unit of instruction, and (2) reflect on student achievement in light of the pedagogies used to teach the unit and the assessment tools used to assess their students’ competencies. The overall purpose of the analysis and reflection is for continuous improvement of instruction including both teaching methods and course content, based on how well the candidates’ students have learned the content taught in the unit of instruction.

The course that includes this assignment is BE 884 Business Education Teaching Methods. The unit of instruction is graded using a rubric. The rubric scores are based on a three-point scale: 0 points = Not observed; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; and 3=Exceeds expectations. See file named Assessment 4 Rubric.

Alignment with Standards
Standard 5 Candidates will facilitate the learning of current business education subject matter. This assessment is directly related to candidate’s ability to facilitate their own students’ learning by analyzing students’ pre-test and post-test scores, comparing their students’ strengths and weaknesses in content knowledge, and recommending changes in pedagogies and content based on those analyses and comparisons.

Summary
The average score was 2.6 on a 3 point scale with a range of scores was from 2.0 (meets expectations) to 3.0 (exceeds expectations). Four candidates (57%) received scores of 3 and three candidates (43%) received scores of 2. The course that includes this assessment was not offered in 2007-2008 and 2009-2010. Therefore, the 3-year average scores for candidates are the same as for 2008-2009. See Assessment 4 Data file.

Interpretation
Whereas 57% of the completers received a score of “3” (indicating mastery) and 43% of the completers scored a “2” (meets expectations) and whereas the average score was a 2.6, one can conclude that the candidates are proficient in terms of analyzing the effect their teaching has had on their own students’ learning. They have demonstrated the ability to reflect on their students’ achievement, their own teaching methods, and continuously improve their instructional performance; hence, they have met Standard 5 in terms of facilitating student learning in business education.
Assessment 5: (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-related technology exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
The content knowledge covered in the BE 540 Electronic Communications course is related to computer and information technologies. Candidates are assessed over their knowledge of various forms of technology that are used in businesses and schools. Candidates are assessed using objective exam questions. Results of the exams are converted to a 3 point scale with 3 indicating “exceeding expectations,” 2 indicating “met expectations,” 1 showing “improvement is needed,” and 0 indicating no data is available. To receive a 3, candidates had to have 90-100% of the answers correct; to score a 2, candidates had to have 80-89% of the answers correct; to score a 1, candidates had to have 79% or fewer answers correct on the exam.

**Alignment with Standards**
Standard 1: Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the use of computer information technologies for business and educational applications. This assessment is directly related to Standard 1 as candidates are evaluated on their knowledge of various types of computer information technologies and their application in schools and businesses.

**Summary of Data**
After exam scores were converted to the 3 point scale, the aggregate student average over the three years was 2.9 on a 3 point scale with 3 indicating students exceeded expectations. No program completers were enrolled in the course in 2007-2008; therefore, no data is presented in this report. In 2008-2009, one program completer exceeded expectations (receiving a 3 on the 3 point scale) on the computer and information technology exam and one met expectations (receiving a 2 on the 3 point scale); the average score was 2.5 for that year. In 2009-2010, 14 candidates (95%) scored at the 90% level or higher on the computer and information technology exams, receiving a score of 3 on the 3 point scale. One candidate scored between 80-89% on the exams, receiving a 2 on the 3 point scale. The average score was 2.9 for the year. The three-year average score for candidates was 2.9 on a 3 point scale with a range of 2.0-3.0. Eighty-eight percent of the candidates scored above 90% of total points possible on the objective exam questions over the three year period. See Assessment 5 Data file.

**Interpretation**
Whereas 100% of the candidates during the three years met or exceeded expectations related to proficiency in the use of computer information technologies, the aggregated data collected indicates that the business education candidates have met the standard dealing with knowledge of computer and information technologies. Therefore, no changes in the assessment method are recommended.
However, because of changes in electronic communications technology and computer networking, the content covered on the computer and information technology exams will evolve to keep up with the rapid changes in technology.

**Assessment 6: (Required)**
Media Based Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Based Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
In the BE 710 Designing Computer Presentations course, candidates are assessed on their proficiency in using computer technologies to create a computer presentation. Specifically, candidates create a multimedia-based presentation that follows recommended principles of good presentation design and uses a variety of software features. The presentations must cover business or computer content in a course the candidates teach. A criteria sheet is used to evaluate the presentations. The criteria sheet scores are converted to a 3 point scale: 0 points = Not observe; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; 3=Exceeds expectations. See Assessment 6 Grading Criteria.

**Alignment with Standards**
Standard 1: Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the use of computer information technologies for business and educational applications. This assessment involves having candidates learn multimedia software and having them create a presentation for a business or computer class. Candidates must demonstrate proficiency in the use of computer software in order to successfully achieve this standard.

**Summary of Data**
In the BE 710 Designing Computer Presentations course, candidates are assessed on their proficiency in using computer technologies by creating a multimedia-based presentation. In 2007-2008, of the seven degree completers enrolled in the class, six (86%) exceeded expectations, one (14%) met expectations and 0 needed improvement. The average score was 2.9 with a range of 2-3 on the 3 point scale. In 2008-2009, the class was not offered. In 2009-2010, of the seven program completers in the class, seven (100%) exceeded expectations with an average score of 3.0. The three-year average score for candidates was 2.9 with a range of 2.0-3.0. Over the three years, 91% of the candidates exceeded expectations and 9% met expectations for this assessment See Assessment 6 Data file. 

**Interpretation**
Over the three year period, since 91% of the candidates exceeded expectations and 9% met expectations for this assessment, the aggregate data indicates that candidates are achieving this standard related to proficiency in the use of computer information
technologies. All program candidates either met or exceeded expectations. The consistency of the students’ proficiency over the three years is another positive indicator that this standard is being met. Based on the data, no changes in the assessment activity or criteria are needed. This course-embedded measurement shows that candidates have achieved the learning standard. Because the grading criteria are based on generic design principles for the preparation of any type of computer presentations, no changes in the criteria rating system are suggested based on these results; however, to keep up with current technology, the software program or version of the program used may change over time.

Assessment 7
Follow-up Survey of Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 7</td>
<td>Check the box if attached</td>
<td>Check the box if attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of graduates’ evaluation of program</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
A follow-up survey of graduates is conducted every two years. Along with employment data such as current position and salary, graduates are asked their overall perception of how well they have met standards related to teaching and business curricula using a scale with the categories of excellent, good, fair, and poor. The survey is mailed in the fall semester to graduates from the previous two years by the Associate Dean in the School of Business with results compiled by a secretary. See Table 2.

Alignment with Standards
Standard 1 Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in the use of computer information technologies for business and educational applications.
Standard 2 Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of current trends in business and computer education and curriculum development.
Standard 3 Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of current business education research.
Standard 4 Candidates will develop and conduct a research study in the business or computer education fields.
Standard 5 Candidates will stay current in their knowledge of training methods, career and technical education, entrepreneurship, office systems and other business and computer related fields

This assessment is related in a broad sense to all five business education standards. On the follow-up survey, graduates of the program were asked their perception of how well the program prepared them to meet the standards. The choices provided to the survey respondents included excellent, good, fair, and poor.

Summary of Data
Since follow-up survey data is gathered every other year, only results of the 2008-2009 survey are provided in this report. In 2008-2009 of the 20 graduates from the previous two years who responded to the survey, 13 graduates (65% of the respondents) indicated
that they believe the overall Master of Science in Business Education program provided “excellent” preparation in terms of meeting the business education standards. Five graduates (25%) indicated that the program provided “good” preparation; and 2 graduates (10%) indicated the program provided “fair” preparation. None of the completers indicated the program was poor. See Assessment 7 Data file. The survey was not conducted in 2007-2008 or 2009-1020 as it is a biennial survey.

Results indicate that 18 out of 20 graduates responding to the survey, or 90% of the candidates, perceive that the program provided “good” or “excellent” preparation related to the five standards with only 2 graduates. None of the graduates indicated the program provided “poor” preparation.

**Interpretation**
Whereas the biennial follow-up survey of graduates indicates 90% of the graduates’ perceptions of the quality of the program are “good” or “excellent” in terms of meeting the five Standards and since other assessment data corroborates the data gathered with this assessment tool, the aggregate data indicates that candidates have met the standards for this degree program. Therefore, no major changes are recommended to the program at this time.

**Assessment 8**
**Review of current business education research assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Assessment 8</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of current business education research assignment</td>
<td>Check the box if attached X</td>
<td>Check the box if attached X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
In the BE 890 Research in Business Education class, students conduct an extensive review of literature on a topic in the business education field and turn in a written report. Their review includes the latest research studies published on the topic chosen as well as opinion-based articles by experts in the business education field. The completer’s literature reviews are evaluated using the criteria listed in the attached file named Assessment 9 Grading Criteria. The scores on the Grading Criteria sheet are converted to a 3 point scale: 0 points=Not observed; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; 3=Exceeds expectations.

**Alignment with Standards**
Standard 3 Students will demonstrate knowledge of current business education research. This assessment activity is closely aligned with Standard 3. It involves having students conduct a review of literature in the field of business education using various current periodicals, theses, dissertations, and other sources and then having the candidates write a formal literature review paper.
Summary of Data
In 2008-2009, three completers (75%) received a score of 3 indicating they “exceed expectations” and one completer received a score of 2, indicating that individual “met expectations. The average score was 2.8 and the range of scores was from 2 to 3. No one scored lower than a 2. No data was gathered in the 2007-2008 or 2009-2010 school years as the course that includes this assessment was not offered those years. See Assessment 8 Data file.

Interpretation
Whereas 100% of the four completers who enrolled in this course in 2008-2009 received scores indicating they met or exceeded expectations, one can conclude that the completers are meeting Standard 3 in terms of showing they have knowledge of current business education research. All completers appear to have a firm understanding of current literature in the business education field. The results indicate that no action needs to be taken in terms of the type of assessment nor in the criteria checklist used to evaluate the standard.

Assessment 9
Business education research study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business education research study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X

Description
Candidates in BE 890 Research in Business Education conduct a research study and write a research report based on a topic in the business or computer education field. As part of the research study, they conduct an extensive review of current research in the field related to their research topic. They also design a research study, gather and analyze data, draw conclusions and make recommendations. The final research study is presented in the form of a written report created using the APA Style Manual.

A criteria sheet is used to analyze the research reports turned in by candidates. See Table 14. The results are converted into a three point scale: 0 points = Not observed; 1=Needs improvement; 2=Meets expectations; 3=Exceeds expectations.

Alignment with Standards
Standard 4: Candidates will develop and conduct a research study in the business or computer education field. This assessment is directly related to the standard as it measures candidates’ ability to conduct research in business or computer education and to write a research paper. Candidates have the opportunity to exhibit their knowledge of the following: choosing a problem to be researched,
designating appropriate research methodologies for conducting their research study, gathering data, analyzing data, and reporting it in an understandable form.

**Summary**
In 2008-2009, three (75%) of the candidates exceeded expectations and had a score of 3 and one (25%) candidate met expectations with a score of 2 on the 3 point scale. The average score on the 3 point scale was 2.8 with a range of 2.0-3.0. This course was not offered in 2007-2008 or 2009-2010 so no data is available for those years. For the three years, of the four program completers, all of them met or exceeded expectations on their research studies. None of the candidates were in the “need improvement” category related to this particular learning activity – conducting a research study. See Assessment 9 data file.

**Interpretation**
Given the fact that all four program completers met or exceeded expectations research study assignment, one can conclude that these completers have successfully developed and conducted a research study in the business or computer education field and therefore have met Standard 4. Because of the high average score of 2.8 on a 3 point scale and the range of scores being high, one can conclude that no changes are needed in the learning activity being assessed or the checklist used to grade this activity. Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, changes were made in the learning activities to provide more practice in writing various portions of a research study such as a statement of a problem, methodology, and a review of literature before they conducted their own research study. These changes appear to have improved the candidates’ achievement in the class; no other changes are recommended at this time.

---

**SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments, but rather, it should summarize major findings from the evidence, the faculty’s interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty have taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. Limit of three pages. (This will be a summary of the Data Results and Action Taken/Recommendations from the Assessments and Related Data chart in Section II.)

The Department of Business Administration & Education follows the school and university process for curricular change and implementation. Curricular issues related to business education are reviewed by all business education faculty members within the department on a yearly basis. After curriculum changes are discussed and approved by the business education faculty, those changes are brought to the full departmental faculty for approval, sent to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the School of Business as well as the School of Business Chairs Council for approval prior to being communicated to the entire campus community for their reaction. At that stage, the Advanced Program Committee (consisting of graduate faculty from education programs across campus) reviews the proposed changes. All approved changes are forwarded to the University Provost and President for final approval.
The business education faculty members review all assessment data on an annual basis. During this review, faculty members take the opportunity to discuss assessment components, the data results, and the components relevant to the outcomes of the degree program. Because of results of a previous follow-up survey of candidates, the entire curriculum was reviewed but no changes related to the assessments reported in this document were made. During 2007, faculty discussed the courses certain assessments are administered in but decided not to make any changes. Outside influences on curricular change (such as business teacher shortages) were also discussed by the business education faculty. Changes in course content have been made in order to prepare these Master’s students with the latest technological skills. However, the assessment tools described in this report are generic and evaluate general principles and concepts so changes in computer software or technology have not affected the assessment tools used to measure whether Standards for this program have been met.

The business education faculty review data closely. The current data as presented in this report indicates that all Master of Science in Business Education program candidates have met and, in many cases, have exceeded minimum requirements in terms of meeting the Standards. However, following a continuous improvement philosophy, faculty are using not only results of these assessments, but also follow-up surveys, enrollment reports, requirements for alternative licensure students, and other data as they review the current curriculum in this degree program. Those factors are beyond the scope of this report. Other external factors such as changes in technology as well as state and federal funded business education programs in Kansas may affect Emporia State University’s Master of Science in Business Education curriculum in the future.

VI—RESPONSE TO AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM LAST KSDE REVIEW

No areas for improvement were cited as a result of the last program review.
Part VII Supplemental Information for ESU Annual Report; No report required for the ESU Assessment Office at this time.
Required only if submitting simultaneously to the ESU Assessment Office

Part 3: Evaluation Rubric for Assessment System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level A: Beginning Implementation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level B: Making Progress in Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional standards and student learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data collection points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the assessment system does not reflect professional standards/outcomes nor are the standards established by faculty and/or outside consultants.</td>
<td>The assessment plan has only one of the following attributes: 1) multiple direct and indirect assessments are used. 2) assessments are used on a regular basis (i.e., not just given once to get initial data). 3) assessments provide comprehensive information on student performance at each stage of their program.</td>
<td>No data management system exists.</td>
<td>Data are not collected across multiple points and do not predict student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, but the faculty and the professional community were not involved.</td>
<td>The assessment plan has only two of the following attributes: multiple, regular and comprehensive, at each stage.</td>
<td>A data management system is in place to collect and store data but it does not have the capacity to store and analyze data from all students over time.</td>
<td>Data are collected at multiple points but there is no rationale regarding their relationship to student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND the professional community were involved.</td>
<td>The assessment plan has all of the following attributes: multiple, regular and comprehensive, at each stage.</td>
<td>A data management system is in place that can store and process most student performance data over time.</td>
<td>Data are systematically collected at multiple points and there is strong rationale (e.g., research, best practice) regarding their relationship to student success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND professional community are engaged in continuous improvement through systematic (e.g., yearly) activities.</td>
<td>The assessment plan has all necessary attributes and are embedded in the program (versus “added-on”).</td>
<td>A data management system is in place that can store and process all student performance data over time. Data are regularly collected and stored for all students and analyzed and reported in user-friendly formats.</td>
<td>Data are systematically collected at multiple points and provide strong relationship between assessments and student success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level A: Beginning Implementation**

**Faculty involvement**
No faculty involvement is evidenced in department assessment activities.

**Assessment alignment**
No alignment between faculty identified learning outcomes and assessments is evidenced.

**Level B: Making Progress in Implementation**

**Assessment structure**
The assessment plan has only one of the following attributes:
1) multiple direct and indirect assessments are used.
2) assessments are used on a regular basis (i.e., not just given once to get initial data).
3) assessments provide comprehensive information on student performance at each stage of their program.

**Data management**
No data management system exists.

**Data collection points**
Data are not collected across multiple points and do not predict student success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection sources</th>
<th>success.</th>
<th>student success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collected from applicants, students, and faculty, but not graduates or other professionals.</td>
<td>Data collected from applicants, students, faculty, and graduates, but not other professionals.</td>
<td>Data collected from multiple information on/from applicants, students, recent graduates, faculty, and other professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program improvement</th>
<th>Data are only generated for external accountability reports (e.g., accreditation), are not used for program improvement, and are available only to administrators.</th>
<th>Some generated data are based on internal standards and used for program improvement, but are available only to administrators “as needed.”</th>
<th>An ongoing, systematic, objectives based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs within the department.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collected from applicants, students, faculty, and graduates, but not other professionals.</td>
<td>Data collected from applicant, students, recent graduates, faculty, and other professionals.</td>
<td>An ongoing, systematic, objectives based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs both within the department and university-wide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level C: Maturing Stages of Implementation

#### Comprehensive and integrated measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The assessment system consists of measures that are neither comprehensive nor integrated.</th>
<th>The assessment system includes multiple measures, but they are not integrated or they lack scoring/cut-off criteria.</th>
<th>The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with scoring/cut-off criteria.</th>
<th>The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with scoring/cut-off criteria that are examined for validity and utility, resulting in program modifications as necessary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student progress, &amp; managing &amp; improving operations &amp; programs</td>
<td>Measures are used to monitor student progress, but are not used to manage and improve operations and programs.</td>
<td>Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage operations and programs, but are not used for improvement.</td>
<td>Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage and improve operations and programs.</td>
<td>Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage and improve operations and programs. Changes based on data are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data usage by faculty</td>
<td>Assessment data are not shared with faculty.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with faculty, but with no guidance for reflection and improvement.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with faculty with guidance for reflection and improvement.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with faculty with guidance or reflection and improvement. Remediation opportunities are made available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data shared with students</td>
<td>Assessment data are not shared with students.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with students, but with no guidance for reflection and improvement.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with students with guidance for reflection and improvement.</td>
<td>Assessment data are shared with students with guidance for reflection and improvement. Remediation opportunities are made available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments</td>
<td>No steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments.</td>
<td>Assessments have “face validity” regarding fairness, accuracy, and consistency.</td>
<td>Preliminary steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments.</td>
<td>Assessments have been established as fair, accurate, and consistent through data analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part 4: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Rubric Score</th>
<th>Evidence/Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional standards and student learning outcomes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment alignment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment structure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection points</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection sources</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive &amp; integrated measures</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student progress, &amp; managing &amp; improving operations &amp; programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data usage by faculty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data shared with students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, accuracy &amp; consistency of assessments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. General findings

(Copy and paste Part V above here.)

B. Future goals

C. Resources needed to implement assessment system