Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2020-21   *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) program; Educational Leadership   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Terry McDaniel tmcdaniel@indstate.edu; Brad Balch brad.balch@indstate.edu**

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *Can expand on this in Part 2.*
1. National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Program **Recognition Standards— District Level** <u>Component 1.1</u> Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively design, communicate, and evaluate a district mission and vision that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community.	Superintendent/Central Office Internship Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792. Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor via TK20) In each of the assignments the student is required to identify projects that design, communicate, and evaluate a district mission and vision. Feedback is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric	We establish a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3=Meets Expectations, 4= Exceeds Expectations) in each of the three (3) rubrics for achievement in this outcome. Assessment (Completed by the site supervisor).	Fall 2020 (n=15) Meets = 5 Exceeds = 10 100% of candidates were at meets expectations or above Spring 2021 (n=13) Meets = 9 4 evaluations were not completed by supervisors 100% of the assessments completed were at meets expectations or above	With the Fall 2021 transition from the ELCC standards to the NELP standards, the program now requires 300 hours of internship for all students spread across an academic year. The adjustment has been made to require students to complete 150 hours each semester of EDLR 790 in the fall and EDLR 792 in the spring. Under the old ELCC standards these hours were spread over many courses. By moving the hours of internship to the two internship courses and supervision being provided by the site supervisor and a single university supervisor, the internship is better aligned with the NELP

				Standard 8 capstone experience.
2. National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Program Recognition Standards— District Level Component 4.4 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to design, implement, and evaluate district-wide use of coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, assessment, student services, technology, and instructional resources that support the needs of each student in the district.	Central Office Internship Assignment. (Completed by the site supervisor via TK 20.) In each of the assignments the student is required to identify projects that design, communicate, and evaluate a district mission and vision. Feedback is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assessment (Completed by the site supervisor).	We establish a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3=Meets Expectations, 4= Exceeds Expectations) in each of the three (3) rubrics for achievement in this outcome.	Fall 2020 (n=15) Meets = 3 Exceeds = 10 No Basis For Judgment = 2 100% of candidates (n=13) were at meets expectations or above Spring 2021 (n=13) Meets = 6 Exceeds = 3 4 evaluations were not completed by supervisors 100% of the assessments completed were at meets expectations or above	Previously, ELCC Standard Element 2.2 was used for this assessment. This has been changed to NELP Standard Component 4.4. ELCC Standard Element 2.2 focused on creating and evaluating the curriculum and instructional programs. ENELP Standard Component 4.4 in more inclusive in assessing the elements of curriculum and instruction. Students continue to demonstrate effectiveness in all elements of the NELP standard component. This is an essential part of our program on the focus of instructional leadership. Research supports the need for strong district leadership in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The program needs to continue to maintain a high level of effectiveness in this area.
3. Indiana Superintendent Licensure Composite Scores G4 Achievement mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline of profession.	Indiana Superintendent Licensure Examination	We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would pass this exam, which is a requirement for national recognition through our accreditation agency.	Currently 21/23 (91%) passed the Indiana Superintendent Licensure Examination in the academic year 2020-2021	We saw a huge increase in the number of students (33) taking the examination this year. Domain scores remain strong as in the past, indicating we are preparing our students through the teaching of the Indiana standards as well as the NELP standards for district-level leadership.

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table
a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities
Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

    1) **Cohort Sizes: Fall 2021= 37**   2) **2020-2021 Ed.S. degrees conferred= 36**   3) **Average time to completion (graduate)= 1.7 Years**

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Migration from the ELCC standards to the NELP standards has been successfully completed. The new focus on student learning outcomes and the use of assessment rubrics more specific to the new standards and standard components has made assessment clearer and most appropriate in terms of assessing and evaluating student performance in meeting the standards. The results have indicated that the assessments indicate overall curriculum, instruction, course assessment rubrics and the overall teaching/learning environments are effective in preparing students for the tasks of superintendent/central office administration. Specifically the skills in all areas of district level administration especially those in budgeting, business administration, personnel, professional development, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and facilities. Results on the Indiana superintendency exam demonstrate this knowledge. The instruction has also placed a high value on the essentials of professionalism, ethics, interpersonal skills, problem solving, and critical thinking.

The survey data from site supervisors at the end of the capstone experience for the program continues to strongly indicate that our students know the essential standards and skills needed and can successfully apply the skills in district-level responsibilities. With assessments in both the spring and fall semesters, evidence of growth throughout the 300 hours of internship will be more evident. Students will be able to determine the professional strengths and challenges of all standards and can focus on improvement during the second semester. The program assessment of student learning outcomes clearly supports the College emphasis on student success.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

COVID-19 and its Delta variant continue to thwart recruitment plans to increase the level of diversity in the program. However, through continued efforts in working with students and school districts, the emphasis is on attracting and retaining a more diverse student enrollment in the program. The elimination of the GRE requirement for enrollment has aided in this process. Grant funds were secured this year to attract more diversified enrollments and an academic year plan has been developed that includes the Master's program as well.

New program changes are still in process and awaiting final approval. The program will be reduced from 66 hours to 60 hours. The two courses being eliminated will be EDUC 660 and EPSY 621.The addition of EDLR 683 as an option for the requirement of EDUC 770 provides students with a course that is fitting from an administrative position. EDLR 683 focuses on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Continued focus on the NELP standards brings the program in alignment with current accreditation and accountability standards. The NELP standards also aligns with other college and university educational leadership programs for equivalent courses considered for transfer into the program.

A new initiative is noteworthy and offers rich potential for future programming. School districts may use COVID recovery federal funds to address critical professional licensure needs within their district. Warsaw Community Schools reached out to the Educational Leadership Department with interest in funding two cohorts of M.Ed. and two cohorts of Ed.S. students. Each Ed.S. cohort is expected to have approximately 15-20 students. Programming will be delivered on site and details of the MOU are being worked out with a mutual signing planned for October 15th.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement
Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:
1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)
2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

All NELP Standards and their elements are assessed through the various coursework in the program. The data from the continued assessments of the SOAS evidence knowledge and understanding in NELP Standard 1, Component 1.1- Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively design, communicate, and evaluate a district mission and vision that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community and NELP Standard 4, Component 4.4 - Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to design, implement, and evaluate district-wide use of coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, assessment, student services, technology, and instructional resources that support the needs of each student in the district. Both support two district leadership imperatives, strategic planning and instructional leadership to assure continuous improvement and student success. Data from the above table includes five years of assessments in three specific learning outcomes. The assessment in each learning outcome exceeded the performance expectation of 80%. In terms of the findings-based plans and actions, while having a huge increase in students (33) taking the district licensing examination, 31 successfully passed. Indiana is in the process or changing the test for administrators. The present Pearson test will be eliminated and a new NELP standards-based test will required. The present Pearson test is based on Indiana proficiency-based standards that has been unique to Indiana. The new test will relate to national standards. (During the transition Indiana students presently can select either test.) Our program will work with students as this transition is made, providing guidance and availability to test tutorials are they are made available. As for sharing information with stakeholders, the report will be shared with all K-12 educational leadership faculty and discussed at a fall faculty meeting at the end of the fall semester. Program updates are shared in the fall at the annual statewide principal and superintendent conferences, reaching hundreds of both principals and superintendents.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2020-21 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: District Level School Administration Ed.S.	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
• Learning outcomes are the professional standards for the field and are clear and measurable. An (presumed) analytical rubric is used to align to each outcome for evaluation purposes and to provide feedback to learners. • High-impact, experiential opportunities serve as the assessments for these outcomes. • Expectations for student performance are clear and appropriate, and actual data is clearly described by performance level on the rubric. • A licensure exam is used as a measure, and rates of students taking and passing the exam are discussed in terms of past rates, as well as accreditor standards. • Good discussion of the impact of prior changes on student learning success, as well as of areas of importance to continue to monitor. • Clear information is provided about how results are shared and used to support ongoing strong performance, as well as how information is shared with appropriate constituents and why.	•

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcome is assessed this cycle.	Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.	No learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings. Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).	Performance goals are clear and appropriate. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.	Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity. Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.	Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality. Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description. Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.	No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.	A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content. Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results. Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No evidence of reflection on results in provided.
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**