

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 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: Ed.S. in School Administration **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Brad Balch Brad.Balch@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 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.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>1. ELCC Standard Element 1.1: Candidates can develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies. Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments. Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession. Justification of Standards: The ELCC Standards are the accreditation standards for licensing in</p>	<p>Participation Journal Assignment in EDLR 759 – Seminar in the Superintendency Internship Journaling and completion of Indiana District Administrative Standards Assignment in EDLR 790/792, Superintendent/Central Office Internship. Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor via TK20.</p> <p>Please note that this outcome was assessed as part of a normal assessment cycle.</p>	<p>We established 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, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in each of the three (3) rubrics in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>In each of the assignments the student is required to identify projects that develop, articulate, or implement a shared vision. Feedback is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor).</p>	<p>Score of 4: 5/25 Score of 3: 19/25 Score of 2: 1/25 Score of 1: 0/25</p> <p>96% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>In 2018-19, candidates scoring a 3 or higher was 94%</p> <p>In 2017-18, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 94%.</p> <p>In 2016-17, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 100%.</p>	<p>Previously, the summer, nine-hour internship experience and seminar (i.e., EDLR 759/790/792) only accounted for 160 or the required 300 hours. Other EDLR courses were to accumulate the remaining hours of internship. The effort yielded inconsistent results based on the instructor (i.e., includes adjuncts and full-time faculty) and course assignment expectations. This academic year, beginning Fall 2020, we've moved to a yearlong internship experience (i.e., EDLR 790 in the fall and EDLR 792 in the spring) in which all 300 hours will be evidenced with a single university supervisor and site supervisor. It is hoped this is more aligned with the spirit of NELP Standard 8 and the intended rigor of this capstone experience.</p>

<p>terms of program accreditation. These are established for all university educational leadership programs. Additionally, for Indiana, this program must meet the Indiana Professional Standards for District-Level Leadership to allow students to develop the skills necessary to be licensed as a superintendent in Indiana. The above listed ELCC standard is cross-referenced with the appropriate Indiana Standard. It is noteworthy that the program migrated from ELCC Standards last academic year to National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards with full implementation beginning Fall 2020.</p>				
<p>2.ELCC Standard Element 2.2: Candidates can create and evaluate a comprehensive rigorous curricular and instructional district program. Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession. Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using</p>	<p>Curriculum Vitae and Placement Filer Assignment in EDLR 759 Seminar in the Superintendency Internship Journaling and completion of Indiana District Administrative Standards Assignment in EDLR 790/792, Superintendent/Central Office Internship. Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office</p>	<p>We established 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, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome. In the Curriculum Vitae and Placement File Assignment the student needs to demonstrate (through the</p>	<p>Score of 4: 16/38 Score of 3: 22/38 Score of 2: 033 Score of 1: 0/33</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Students continue to demonstrate effectiveness in creating and evaluating the curriculum and the instructional program in support of continuous improvement and student success. This remains a strong part of the program. Emphasis has been to keep an accurate focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, knowing that professionally, strong instructional leadership</p>

<p>appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Justification of Standards: The ELCC Standards are the accreditation standards for licensing in terms of program accreditation. These are established for all university educational leadership programs. Additionally, for Indiana, this program must meet the Indiana Professional Standards for District-Level Leadership to allow students to develop the skills necessary to be licensed as a superintendent in Indiana. The above listed ELCC standard is cross-referenced with the appropriate Indiana Standard. It is noteworthy that the program migrated from ELCC Standards last academic year to National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards with full implementation beginning Fall 2020.</p>	<p>Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor via TK20.</p> <p>Please note that this outcome was assessed as part of a normal assessment cycle.</p>	<p>inclusion of knowledge and skills listed on the vitae) the talents necessary to create and evaluate an instructional program. In the journaling assignments for EDLR 790/792 the student must demonstrate the ability to use the knowledge and skills to create and evaluate an instructional program that provides a personalized learning environment. Feedback to determine if the student did effectively create and evaluate a rigorous instructional program is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the intern, mentor, and university supervisor).</p>	<p>In 2018-19, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 100%.</p> <p>In 2017-18, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 94%.</p> <p>In 2016-17, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 100%.</p>	<p>remains a district leadership imperative.</p>
<p>3. Indiana Superintendent Licensure Composite Scores G4 Achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam</p> <p>Please note that this outcome was assessed as part of a normal assessment cycle.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Currently, 6/6 (100%) candidates passed the Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam in the Academic year 2019-2020.</p> <p>In 2018-19 86% (8/9) of students passed the licensure examination.</p> <p>In 2017-18 100% (6/6) of students passed the licensure examination.</p>	<p>Domain scores across each section remain strong, indicating we are teaching the Indiana standards for district leadership as well as the ELCC standards for accreditation.</p>

			In 2016-17 100% (8/8) of students passed the licensure examination.	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, 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.
- 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.)
- 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:

- Cohort Size: 35 (30 in 2019)
- Year-to-Year Retention: 100% (63.16% reported in 2019)
- 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate): NA Average time to completion (graduate): 2 years

What worked well in supporting student success this year? Migration to a new national accreditor (i.e., CAEP) and new national standards (i.e., NELP) created the impetus to review all courses for relevance, rigor, and overall alignment. Further, all assessments related to this report and other accreditation-driven needs were created from scratch during the 2019-20 academic year; a daunting task given a more simple standards' crosswalk (i.e., from ELCC to NELP) was initially desirable, but not possible and likely not in the program's best interests to oversimplify such an important appraisal consideration. The result is a renewed focus on student learning outcomes and more relevant means to appraise student success via the assessment rubrics with strong instructor buy-in as they've had the opportunity to participate in developing the assessments. However, this SOAS does reflect the prior standards (i.e., ELCC), but the migration to new standards over the past 12 calendar months has greatly contributed to student success as we've revised many aspect of the Ed.S. program (i.e., final Curriculog approval received in September of 2020). Further, the results of the preceding representative assessments indicate the curriculum, instruction, and overall teaching/learning environment is supporting student success by addressing the expectations of both the ELCC standards and the Indiana district-level leadership professional standards. These standards and the curriculum focus on essential student needs to develop specific skills in budgeting, facilities, and professional development in curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as emphasizing 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 strongly suggests that our students know and understand these essentials. New this year will be the administration of site supervisor feedback once in the fall and once in the spring, such that student growth is more evident than a single appraisal administration, or two appraisals of a brief 10-week period. The College in in the second year of a strategic plan, which clearly focuses on student success and programs are expected to be in alignment with. The program assessment of student learning outcomes clearly supports the College's emphasis on student success.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year? One year ago, I noted that a recruitment plan should be developed and implemented, evidencing our commitment to diversifying the educational leadership ranks in Indiana. It was noted that although program enrollments remain healthy, it is largely due to self-selection and predominately white in terms of race. I'm pleased to share that a recruitment plan was

developed for all PK-12 leadership programs. However, spring recruitment plans were thwarted due to COVID-19. Despite of this challenge, on June 9th the EDLR Department did co-sponsor with the Indiana Association of School Principals, an aspiring leaders pre-conference focused on attendees other than non-white males. Attendee demographic data was kept so we might track them through the admissions, programming, and graduation pipeline. Program faculty will continue this year with a virtual recruitment plan and opportunities are being discussed in program area meetings. Also discussed last year was the need to address program selectivity criteria, including the elimination of the GRE and heightened expectations for GPA (i.e., from 2.5 to 3.0). Additionally, two course changes should be made to eliminate two 600-level courses that have typically included in programs of study, but not recognized in the Graduate Catalog. This was accomplished. New program changes this year will include:

- Adding EDUC 611 into the program as a requirement for the basic professional courses
- Changing the following language for the basic professional courses: “EPSY 620, EDUC 610, or equivalent research course approved by advisor.”
- Changing CIMT 770 to EDUC 770
- Allow EDUC 770 or EDLR 683 as an option
- Reduce from 66 hours to 60 hours - Remove EPSY 621 and EDUC/ELED 660
- Remove EDLR 799 Advanced Thesis since this no longer meets licensure criteria.

Finally, a crosswalk will need to occur in select courses offered in Spring 2020 as the program completes its migration from ELCC to NELP Standards. This migration will entail changing all rubrics and course syllabi in which the Standards are addressed for remaining spring and summer courses.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components> : NA

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**

From last year’s assessments, candidates evidence the knowledge and understanding to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision. Additionally, candidates evidence the knowledge and understanding to create and evaluate a comprehensive rigorous curricular and instructional district program. Both strengths support two district leadership imperatives – strategic planning and instructional leadership to ensure continuous improvement and student success. As noted in the preceding table, four years of data were shared across the three assessments and in each case, the expected outcome was exceeded as per site supervisor feedback, instructor feedback, and licensure exams. In terms of findings-based plans and actions, the statewide test pass rate mean of this year’s cohort is 100%, and now above the statewide mean of 94%. The Pearson tutorial available to students for preparation is only of medium difficulty and was our primary

tutorial for test preparation. Another test-prep resource became available and was be used with year, evidencing improvement. As such we will continue using multiple resources for test preparation. It is noteworthy that our overall number of test takers is down this year due to the closure of Pearson Testing Sites shortly after the pandemic began to unfold in March of 2020. We expect increased test taking numbers next year. Other changes are at the course, program and admissions levels and driven by standards changes and accreditation expectations as articulated in Part 1. Licensure changes at the state level have also influenced changes. Moving the internship from a 10-week summer experience to a fall/spring academic year experience is under way and we hope it provides a more robust capstone experience with better and more effective opportunities to appraise the intern throughout the year by both the university supervisor and the site supervisors. In terms of sharing information with stakeholders, this report will be shared with all K-12 leadership faculty once submitted and discussed at a faculty meeting before the end of the fall semester. Updates for this program are also shared annually at the statewide superintendents' conference, in which about 200 district leaders attend. This year, the conference is virtual and pre-recorded Zoom sessions with program updates were prepared. Elements of this report will also be shared via Curriculog (i.e., program revisions detailed in the "opportunities for improvement" section, in which a variety of stakeholders will have access to elements of this report.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 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: EdS School Administration	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This report is a thorough representation of your exemplary assessment practice. Thank you for concisely and meaningfully sharing about the work and the learning of assessment this year. • Learning outcome is clear and measureable and aligns with established standards and GSLOs. • A licensure exam and measures from high-impact internship practices provide data for analysis. • Multiple points of data are gathered to reflect student learning achievement. • Information about how data were collected and evaluated to yield expected and actual results is clear and demonstrates strong methods (e.g., use of rubrics, mapping sections to outcomes, etc.) • Reported findings are compared to past performance to show overall gains. • Thoughtful reflection on past changes to curriculum and/or pedagogy to improve student learning. • Thoughtful action plans for continuing to support strong student performance through curricular changes and collaboration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear information provided about sharing findings and the overall assessment cycle. | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
Performance Goals & Measures	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results in provided.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.