

**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: \_\_Ph.D. Program in Educational Leadership Contact Name(s) and Email(s) \_Terry McDaniel; tmcdaniel@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><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>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.</b></p>
<p><b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b></p> <p>knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought and EDLR 850(Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 2 (6.25%) Meets Expectations; 28 (87.5%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 1.1.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning</p>

				<p>outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b> ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in in EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education) and EDLR 850(Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework. After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 708 and EDLR 850.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 708 and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 4 (12.5%) Meets Expectations; 26 (81.25%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 1.2.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b> ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership,</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Leadership for Learning in Educational Administration (EDLR 683); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 708</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=</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 683, EDLR 708, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u></p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 1.3.</p>

<p>in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>(Foundations of Modern Education); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 683, EDLR 708, and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>Exceeds Expectations; 0 Meets Expectations; 30 (93.75%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b> ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</b> and <b>1.5 Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using</b></p>	<p>Practiced as a Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657);Reinforced in EDLR 683 (Leadership for Learning) and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657 and EDLR 683.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 0 Meets Expectations; 30 (93.75%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 1.4.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of</p>

<p>appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>the performance in EDLR 657 and EDLR 683.</p>			<p>courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b> ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims regarding application of research.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</b></p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Inquiry of Higher Education in Educational Administration (EDLR 761); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought) and EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); Reinforced in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency as well as in EDLR 899 (Dissertation); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, and EDLR 899.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, and EDLR 859, A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 5 (15.6%) Meets Expectations; 25 (78.13%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 2.1.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning</p>

				<p>outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b> facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</b></p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Foundations of Modern Education in Educational Administration (EDLR 708); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational thought); Reinforced in EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 5 (15.6%) Meets Expectations; 25 (78.13%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 2.2.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b> ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency); Reinforced in EDLR 899 (Dissertation) and</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=</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and EDLR 859. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 2.3</p>

<p>to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> <p>and</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 859 and EDLR 899.</p>	<p>Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 2 (6.25%) Meets Expectations; 28 (87.5%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>2.4 An Understanding of Research</b> understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Statistical Methods in Educational Psychology (EPSY 612); Practiced as a concept in EPSY 712 (inferential Statistics or EPSY 710 (Qualitative Research); Reinforced in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency) and EDLR 899 (Dissertation) and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, and EDLR 859. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 5 (15.6%) Meets Expectations; 15 (46.86%) Developing; 12 (37.5%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that some of our candidates are the development stage of this standard element while others met or exceeded embracing the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 2.4.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced</p>

	<p>Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, EDLR 859, and EDLR 899.</p>			<p>in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b> communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 657 (Human Relations in Educational Administration), EDLR 683 (Leadership for Learning), EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education), EDLR 761 (Inquiry of Higher Education), and EPSY 612 (Statistical Methods); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought), EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory), EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency, EPSY 712 (Inferential Statistics or EPSY 710 Qualitative Research, and EDLR 899 (Dissertation); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 708, EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, EPSY 612, and EPSY 712 or EPSY 710. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 2 (6.25%) Meets Expectations; 28 (87.5%) Developing; 2 (6.25%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but two of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 3.1.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review</p>

<p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</b></p>	<p>faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 708, EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, and EDLR 899.</p>			<p>changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.</b></p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 683; Leadership for Learning; Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought) and EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</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.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 0 Meets Expectations; 32 (100%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores on all three measurements indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 4.1.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p><b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b></p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); Reinforced in EDLR</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a</p>	<p>32 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in in EDLR 850 and EDLR 859.</p>	<p>Scores on all three measurements indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and</p>



<p>ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>859 (Seminar in Superintendency); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 850 and EDLR 859.</p>	<p>four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 0 Meets Expectations; 32 (100%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 4.2.</p> <p>Continued concentrated focus on the learning outcomes has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework.</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
---	--	--	--	--

Cohort sizes for:

	<u>Campus Residency Cohort</u>	<u>Regional Distance Education Cohort</u>
2019-2020	11	19
2018-2019	12	26
2017-2018	12	24
2016-2017	12	29

	<u>*Enrollment Totals</u>	<u>Graduation Totals</u>	<u>AVE. Final GPA</u>	<u>Total AVE Credits</u>	<u>Ave. Yrs. To Graduate</u>
2019-2020	124	27	3.86	105.4	5.0
2018-2019	129	25			
2017-2018	135	23			
2016-2017	152	24			

\*Represent both K-12 and Higher Education Ph.D. enrollments as Blue Book does not separate these by program.

Each year two new cohorts begin with the Campus Residency Educational Doctorate (CREDS) program beginning in the summer and the Regional Educational Doctorate Program (REDS) beginning in the fall semester. This past year, 2019-2020 the CREDS program replaced the original Wednesday residency program that had been in place for 30 years. The Wednesday Residency program required students to come to campus every Wednesday for the fall and spring semesters and to take four courses each semester while on campus. While this had been a very successful and popular program for years, the enrollment began to decrease significantly. Most of the students in both programs are working K-12 school administrators who are trying to balance their professional position with the Ph.D. program. The students and the sending districts that allowed the student to attend on the 36 required Wednesdays felt it was no longer feasible to allow leaders to miss that much time from their position. After much assessment and discussion the change was initiated to create a program that still had residency on campus but become more “user friendly” to the working professional.

The CREDS program begins with two courses during the summer session. Students work mainly on-line with the instructors for both courses but are required to come to campus for on-campus session four consecutive days. This allows for group work, and other face-to-face activities. During the fall and spring semesters, the students enroll in three courses. One of the three courses ( the required statistics courses) is on-line. The other two courses are partly on-line and meet on campus three Thursdays, three Fridays, and three Saturdays each semester. The following summer students again take two courses in the same manner as the first summer session. The CREDS program requires a total of 26 days on campus for face-to-face instruction. But students who are working professionals are absent from their schools only six school days. The Ph.D. curriculum of 30 hours is covered in 15 months.

The REDS program that had been in place for a decade has become much more popular. Again, most of the students in both programs are working K-12 school administrators who are trying to balance their professional position with the Ph.D. program. This program begins in the fall semester and continues over five consecutive terms. Students enroll in two of the required Ph.D. courses each term. The two fall and spring semesters include one on-line course and one course that is partly on-line but requires an all-day Saturday face-to-face meeting each month or four during each semester. The summer session is identical to the CREDS summer session with most work of the two required courses being conducted on-line but students meet on campus for four consecutive days for face-to-face sessions. This totals a total of 20 face-to-face sessions with 16 off-campus and four days on campus. The Ph.D. curriculum is covered in 20 months.

This was the first year for the CREDS cohort, which was titled as CREDS I. Despite the changes to create a program that more competitive with outer similar programs and would attract more student than the previous Wednesday Residency program, this cohort was small with only 11 students. The first year. (For 2020-2021, this cohort has 13 members and is actually larger than the REDS cohort. The low overall numbers for 2021 are attributed to the COVID-19 virus issues.) Discussion and adjustments were made as the school year developed. Overall the students and instructors felt comfortable with the program. However as the school year progressed students and instructors struggled with the three consecutive days on campus. Missing two school days, and for high school administrators, missing Saturday’s extra-curricular activities after being gone the previous two school days placed a burden on the students. The decision was made to adjust the 2020-2021 cohort to meet only on Fridays and Saturdays, eliminating the Thursday meetings. This would also mean both the REDS and the CREDS cohorts would commit to the same total (20) of face-to-face sessions

While the regional program has been in place going into its tenth cohort, we continue to assess it as well. This year we initiated requiring students in the regional REDS program to also come to campus in the summer for the four day intensive sessions for two courses. This was initiated because in our assessment of the program we saw a disconnect with the students and the resources of campus. Students were struggling to make the necessary connections with resources such as the library, the staff at the educational leadership department, and even knowing all the faculty who were available as possible dissertation committee members. In this past summer's sessions, cohort members from the REDS program also began discussion how the four day intensive brought the cohort members closer together. Many of the out-of-town cohort members stayed in Terre Haute during the intensive sessions. This created social activities for cohort members to get better acquainted and feel as if the program had more of a personal meaning. It has been suggested that we consider beginning the regional cohort with the intensive four day summer session as a better orientation to the program. this will be considered for the 2021-2022 cohort.

As for program content, careful curriculum mapping continues to occur. As new knowledge and research develops the faculty strives to bring the current research to students. This requires constant communication to assure courses do not overlap with similar content yet continue to have basic knowledge included.

## **Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement**

The summer sessions created a desirable element to both programs. The summer brought actually three cohorts together. The CREDS I cohort was finishing their coursework. The REDS VI were involved in their summer sessions. The CREDS II were experiencing their initial coursework. Having a group at the beginning, the middle, and the end of coursework provided wonderful opportunities for discussion and collaborative learning. The students could talk and share dissertation topics, issues they face as leaders and goals for the future. The CREDS I cohort could share experiences and advice about the program. The CREDS II cohort could ask questions about expectations of the program.

The program continues to focus on a scholarship-practitioner model, with the purpose to develop school leaders who are well versed in scholarship and current research that can be put to use in the schools. Graduates of the program continue to be public school leaders at the Pre K-12 level in the roles of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals with a few moving on to positions on higher education. This year's assessment continues to indicate that our students are successful K-12 educational leaders at the building and district level who are making academic gains and building a strong practitioner/scholarship knowledge base as indicated by the outcomes assessed. They continue to experience pressure to attain a high level of student performance accountability and through the program are exposed to knowledge and research that requires them to seek practical solutions to the problems and challenge they face through the development of higher-order thinking skills. The Ph.D. program challenges their practices, especially those based on only experiences and the values and beliefs developed through the culture of their experiences. This challenge comes through the theory and research of educational leadership and the foundations of education. The true learning happens at the edge of discomfort, with a healthy level of positive anxiety, and the assessment of their performance bears out that they rise to our expectations for research and scholarship, under the performance standards we have established. The result is leaders who lead based on scientifically based research and not based solely on cultural norms and experiences.

This year's outcomes on the preliminary examinations indicate our students are performing at about 94% in terms of meeting expectations. Two specific students struggled with expectations and were basically assessed at the "developing" stage. These two student were required to participate in in class sessions of EDLR 850 to focus on understanding research. Both successfully completed this additional training. Also fewer students were

assessed at exceeding expectations. This issue may be the result of the level of expectations by the faculty conducting the oral examinations. This indicates a strong need to reexamine the rubric and the expectations of those faculty members involved in assessment. Two specific issues of assessment need to be addresses; first, understanding the purpose of the program. The criticism of two faculty members was that the students seemed less versed in theory. This resulted in the lowest level of meeting expectations for Standard 2.4 “Understanding Research”. However the questions asked in oral preliminary examinations allowed little time for students to respond and the questions asked seemed to cause confusion with the students. Second, it is possible that the expectation level of the faculty has changed. Are faculty members consistent in their expectations of the levels of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations”? Are students being measured by the rubric or being compared to the performance of past cohorts? Is there an expectation that each new cohort must perform higher than the past cohort? This will definitely be a topic of discussion throughout the K-12 program meetings for the current academic year. These scores are the outcomes that are determined through a final assessment after they have completed all coursework and have taken the preliminary examinations for admission to candidacy to the Ph.D. The expectation will continue to be not accept anything less than meets expectations for our Ph.D. program. this has created various direction for the department in terms of findings-based plans and actions to improve the student learning and success.

The scores on the course assessments for EDLR 755 and EDLR 806 did not indicate the same issues as with the oral preliminary examinations. In every standard, a greater percentage of students were indicated in the “Exceeds Expectations level (See Appendices A-D). A slightly lower percentage was indicated in many of the standards in EDLR 755 and EDLR 806. The two course assessments demonstrated a greater consistency in terms of student ratings when trying to triangulate the data.

The setting is quite different for students when taking a course compared to when being questioned in an oral setting with time limits. In courses, students have the opportunity to see a rubric of expectations. Time is allowed to research and identify scholarly work that supports the projects being graded. They benefit from the guidance provided by discussion and the knowledge of the instructor. This gives some indication that course ratings would assume to be greater than oral preliminary examinations. Again the faculty needs to consider questions about assessment. Are faculty members consistent in their expectations of the levels of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations”? Are the three assessments the best indicator of true scholarly levels? How can the faculty find better consistency in the evaluation of Ph.D. standards? Is the method presently employed for preliminary examinations the best measurement? Should the faculty consider another tool for preliminary examinations? Some of these questions have surfaced in recent program meetings. The need exists to continue to focus on these concerns through discussions with faculty and students.

New challenges face K-12 leaders every school year. Discussions continue with present alumni, school superintendents, principals, and cohort members to determine the needs in the schools and for educational leaders. Presently issues such as COVID-19, virtual learning, and social justice have become critical issues for school leaders. Continuing challenges such as teacher shortage, social-emotional learning, child trauma, and new academic achievement testing and standards continue to be issues that need addressed with new research and the development of higher order thinking skills. We must continue to reach out to the K-12 leaders and find what skills we may need to address or what areas the program needs to focus. This will be done through the use of our advisory council of school superintendents. They will be asked for input in terms of what skills are needed for future Ph.D. students in K-12 leadership. This is also accomplished by our presence in consulting opportunities, internships in the school districts, continuing to be a presence at all leadership conferences as well as working with faculty form other universities and attending national leadership conferences.

We need to carefully study the program outcomes. As a department are we satisfied with just meeting expectations or should we be designing a program where we expect a higher number of outstanding students to exceed expectations? The Ph.D. program is to be the ultimate model of student success. Is just meeting expectations a high enough expectation for Ph.D. candidates? This is a question we must address through assessment and

discussion . While the program continues to produce strong leaders and quality dissertations, the number of students continuing to develop scholarly documents for per reviewed publications continues to be relatively low, though slightly improving.. The K-12 educational administration faculty will continue to address how we can help students develop scholarly publications. This will be a continued focus of the assessment plan for the coming school year. Information will be shared at our continued attendance at the state-wide educational conferences such as the Indiana School Principals Conference, the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents Conference and others.

With the national focus on social justice, a very significant opportunity comes this year to attempt to add more diversity to our program in terms of student population. A large majority of white leaders dominate the field of educational administration, especially in district-level positions. The goal is to at least have education leadership positions be held by a percentage of minority leaders equal or greater than the percentage of minority population of the State of Indiana. Recruitment dinners (depending on the COVID-9 restrictions are planned to be a part of the accreditation process of our MED and Ed.S. licensure programs for educational leaders. The desire is to attract minority candidates to these dinners and encourage their enrollment in the Ph.D. program. Efforts to recruit minority candidates will also take place at the leadership conferences by having tables and booths with faculty members present to encourage minority enrollment. We have made improved efforts in this area. We are in the process of filling an approve pre-doctorate fellowship with the direction it will be a minority candidate. We have also presented diversity recruiting seminars in both our MED internship program as well as at the Indiana Association of School Principals Winter Conference. We hope to do the same at an Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents conference in the near future. We also hope to make recruitment efforts at the 2021 Black Expo held in Indianapolis.

### PhD Master Assessment Rubric

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please evaluate and score your student's ability on each of the following outcomes, as they pertain to Doctoral Prelims:

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), and Does Not Meet Expectations (1)</b>
<b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.

<b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.4 An Understanding of Research</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.
<b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.
<b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.

## Appendix A

Ph.D.  
 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment  
 Ph.D. Standards as Assesses in EDLR 755, EDLR 806, and Preliminary Examinations

Student	1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge	1.2 Critical Reflection	1.3 Articulate Philosophy	1.4 Exercise Leadership	2.1 Construct & Support Interpretations & Arguments	2.2 Employ multiple Perspectives & Theoretical Frames	2.3 Read Critically & Review Research	2.4 An understanding of research	3.1 Communication, Interpersonal & process Skills	4.1 Understanding or K-12 or Higher Education	4.2 Plan 7 Evaluate Policies & Procedures
---------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---	--	---	--	---	---

### 2020 Ph.D. Oral Preliminary Examinations Standards Ratings

	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	4.1	4.2
Adams	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Alber	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3
Anderson	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Bletzinger	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
Bowsman	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Brames	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
Conway Stefanko	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cripe	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Evan	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Fuller	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Gonzalaz	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3
Hancock	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
Hughes	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Johnson	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Kile	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Kreig	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3
Marshall	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Martinez	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mickens	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3

Oliver	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
Peo	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3
Pinson	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3
Rose	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Schoene	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3
Stalbaum	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Stevens	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Swayne	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Schimpf	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
Tonagel	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
VanBuskirk	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
Wilfong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Wong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4;2	4;4	4;0	4;0	4;5	4;5	4;2	4;5	4;2	4;0	4;0
	3;28	3;26	3;30	3;30	3;25	3;25	3;28	3;15	3;28	3;32	3;32
	2;2	2;2	2;2	2;2	2;2	2;2	2;2	2;12	2;2	2;0	2;0

### Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations

<u>Standard</u>	<u>Developing</u>	<u>Meets Expectations</u>	<u>Exceeds Expectations</u>
1.1	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%
1.2	6.25%	81.25%	12.25%
1.3	6.25%	93.75%	0
1.4	6.25%	93.75%	0
2.1	6.25%	78.13%	15.63%
2.2	6.25%	78.13%	15.63%
2.3	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%
2.4	37.50%	46.87%	15.63%
3.1	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%
4.1	0	100%	0
4.2	0	100%	0





Stevens	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Swayne	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4
Schimpf	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Tonagel	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
VanBuskirk	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wilfong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4;11	4;12	4;12	4;11	4;6	4;9	4;8	4;10	4;11	4;3	4;8
	3;20	3;19	3;19	3;20	3;25	3;22	3;24	3;22	3;21	3;29	3;24
	2;1	2;1	2;1	2;1	2;1	2;1	2;0	2;0	2;0	2;0	2;0

### Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations

<u>Standard</u>	<u>Developing</u>	<u>Meets Expectations</u>	<u>Exceeds Expectations</u>
1.1	3.13%	62.50%	34.38%
1.2	3.13%	59.38%	37.5%
1.3	3.13%	59.38%	37.5%
1.4	3.13%	62.50%	34.38%
2.1	3.13%	78.13%	18.75%
2.2	3.13%	68.75%	28.13%
2.3	0	75.0%	25.0%
2.4	0	68.75%	31.25%
3.1	0	65.63%	34.38%
4.1	0	90.63%	9.38%
4.2	0	75.0%	25.0%



Stevens	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Swayne	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4
Schimpf	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Tonagel	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
VanBuskirk	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wilfong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wong	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4;5	4;13	4;5	4;7	4;10	4;12	4;4	4;8	4;6	4;5	4;6
	3;27	3;19	3;27	3;24	3;22	3;20	3;28	3;23	3;26	3;27	3;26
	2;0	2;0	2;0	2;1	2;0	2;0	2;0	2;1	2;0	2;0	2;0

### Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations

<u>Standard</u>	<u>Developing</u>	<u>Meets Expectations</u>	<u>Exceeds Expectations</u>
1.1	0	84.38%	15.63%
1.2	0	59.38%	40.63%
1.3	0	84.38%	15.63%
1.4	3.13%	75.0%	21.88%
2.1	0	68.75%	31.25%
2.2	0	62.50%	37.50%
2.3	0	87.50%	12.50%
2.4	3.13%	71.88%	25.0%
3.1	0	81.25%	18.75%
4.1	0	84.38%	15.63%
4.2	0	81.25%	18.75%

## Appendix D

2018- 2019 Ph.D.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Ph.D. Standards as Assesses in EDLR 755, EDLR 806, and Preliminary Examinations

### Comparison of Oral Preliminary Examinations Ratings, EDLR 755 Course Ratings and EDLR 806 Course Ratings

Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations for Preliminary Oral Examinations				Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations for Course EDLR 755				Percentage of Students Developing, Meeting or Exceeding Expectations for Course EDLR 806			
Standard Developing.		Meet	Exceeds	Standard Developing		Meets	Exceeds	Standard Developing.		Meets	Exceeds
1.1	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%	1.1	3.13%	62.50%	34.38%	1.1	0	84.38%	15.63%
1.2	6.25%	81.25%	12.25%	1.2	3.13%	59.38%	37.5%	1.2	0	59.38%	40.63%
1.3	6.25%	93.75%	0	1.3	3.13%	59.38%	37.5%	1.3	0	84.38%	15.63%
1.4	6.25%	93.75%	0	1.4	3.13%	62.50%	34.38%	1.4	3.13%	75.0%	21.88%
2.1	6.25%	78.13%	15.63%	2.1	3.13%	78.13%	18.75%	2.1	0	68.75%	31.25%
2.2	6.25%	78.13%	15.63%	2.2	3.13%	68.75%	28.13%	2.2	0	62.50%	37.50%
2.3	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%	2.3	0	75.0%	25.0%	2.3	0	87.50%	12.50%
2.4	37.50%	46.87%	15.63%	2.4	0	68.75%	31.25%	2.4	3.13%	71.88%	25.0%
3.1	6.25%	87.50%	6.25%	3.1	0	65.63%	34.38%	3.1	0	81.25%	18.75%
4.1	0	100%	0	4.1	0	90.63%	9.38%	4.1	0	84.38%	15.63%
4.2	0	100%	0	4.2	0	75.0%	25.0%	4.2	0	81.25%	18.75%

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: PhD School Administration	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning outcomes are clear, measureable, and aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes.</li> <li>• Points of assessment throughout the program are clearly described, and all outcomes are reinforced throughout the curriculum with opportunities for data analysis through multiple measures.</li> <li>• Clear information is provided about expected and actual student performance. Providing the breakdown of student scores by rubric level is especially helpful for analysis and drawing the insights that you were able to provide.</li> <li>• Use of descriptive rubrics with dimensions that clearly aligned to the outcomes being assessed is strong practice. Thank you for including the rubric information for reference.</li> <li>• Excellent analysis on the validity of the results related to faculty scorers, the influence of the setting of oral examinations on performance, and the structure and interpretation of the rubric. See recommendations about possible strategies for addressing this.</li> <li>• Clear information is provided about sharing and using results, as well as faculty involvement throughout the assessment process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You have multiple points throughout the curriculum where formative assessment results could serve as triangulation for your summative assessment using the preliminary examination scores. These formative assessments could support or provide further data to call to question the prelim results that can better help you target underlying issues (such as faculty interpretations of the rubric, etc.). If there are truly limitations to student learning, they can also help you better target where to adapt curriculum and/or pedagogy to improve results (particularly for the research outcome – performance was otherwise very strong across the board).</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<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 <b>(program)</b> learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<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>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<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>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<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 is 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 is provided.</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>

*Please see reviewer notes for more details.*