

Program Outcomes Assessment

PHD in Education Administration

**Created on: 05/17/2010 01:32:00 PM CDT
Last Modified: 11/24/2015 04:25:39 PM CDT**



Table of Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| General Information | 1 |
| Standing Requirements | 2 |
| Mission Statement..... | 2 |
| Outcomes Library..... | 2 |
| Curriculum Map..... | 3 |
| Communication of Outcomes..... | 3 |
| Archive | 5 |
| Archive..... | 5 |
| 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle | 6 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 6 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 13 |
| Action Plan..... | 28 |
| Status Report..... | 38 |
| 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle | 48 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 48 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 55 |
| Action Plan..... | 69 |
| Status Report..... | 75 |
| 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle | 82 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 82 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 89 |
| Action Plan..... | 107 |
| Status Report..... | 125 |
| 2014-2015 Assessment Cycle | 139 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 139 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 146 |
| Action Plan..... | 165 |
| Status Report..... | 171 |
| 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle | 177 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Assessment Plan..... | 177 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 184 |
| Action Plan..... | 194 |
| Status Report..... | 194 |
| 2016-2017 Assessment Cycle | 195 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 195 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 195 |
| 2017-2018 Assessment Cycle | 196 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 196 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 196 |
| 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle | 197 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 197 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 197 |
| 2019-2020 Assessment Cycle | 198 |
| Assessment Plan..... | 198 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 198 |
| Appendix | 199 |

General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)

Standing Requirements

Mission Statement

OUR MISSION: Our singular mission is to prepare today's practicing and promising educator to be tomorrow's complete administrative professional.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The Ph.D. Program in Educational Administration with a specialization in School Administration is intended for post-educational specialist students who desire a terminal degree preparing them to be scholar/practitioner leaders.

The program is designed to prepare persons for roles in public school administration, educational policy, college teaching and research, and governmental and industrial positions requiring competencies relevant to educational administration and research. The 72 credit hour program consists of 24 hours of coursework taken as part of a required two semester cohort experience (the Wednesday Residency) and 6 hours generally taken in the summer prior or summer after the residency experience.

Outcomes Library

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

| Outcome | Mapping |
|---|------------|
| Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge A comprehensive knowledge of different theories one leadership and management. | No Mapping |
| Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice. | No Mapping |
| Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership. | No Mapping |
| Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting. | No Mapping |

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

| Outcome | Mapping |
|---------|---------|
|---------|---------|



Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments No Mapping

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames No Mapping

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research No Mapping

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research No Mapping

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

| Outcome | Mapping |
|---------|---------|
|---------|---------|

| | |
|--|------------|
| Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills | No Mapping |
|--|------------|

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.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

| Outcome | Mapping |
|---------|---------|
|---------|---------|

| | |
|--|------------|
| Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education | No Mapping |
|--|------------|

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs | No Mapping |
|--|------------|

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps

➤ **PhD in Education Administration Curriculum Map** (See appendix)

Alignment Set: PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

Created: 01/03/2012 2:43:39 pm CDT

Last Modified: 02/01/2013 10:32:23 am CDT

Communication of Outcomes

We plan to present our student outcomes in the following venues: 1) our website, 2) during a summer gathering of stakeholders (to include faculty, alumni, and current students), course syllabi, and 3) to new students each fall through the handbooks we provide for internships. These discussions center on outcomes in line with program Standards where applicable, along with the Unit's Conceptual Framework.

Archive (This area is to be used for archiving pre-TaskStream assessment data and for current documents.)

 **Archive**

2011-2012 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as

reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is

conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional

experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of

each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester,

as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.36 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

integrated philosophy of
education and leadership.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination
(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.45 (meeting expectations). This was found as the highest of the preliminary examination averages, not surprising as the entire experience and preparatory work is set-up as a situation in which candidates construct and support arguments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1

= does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.18 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making

program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.36 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating

the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.09 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 3.1:
Communication,
Interpersonal and Process
Skills**

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.18 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Separate the mastery allowances for copyediting and strengthening this assessment's product with the criterion-referenced responsibility to collect data and evaluate for program considerations. This will allow for a more useful metric in making program decisions and exploring the strengths and weaknesses of our students in Department meetings.

Reflections/Notes : The intent of this assignment as a formative measure of student doctoral competencies needs refinement prior to the next assessment cycle.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Criterion Assurance Measures

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continue moving forward with smarter measures and sharper assessments, beyond the pilot data gathered thus far.

Reflections/Notes : Successful pilot year, in that the groundwork has been set for more meaningful formative and summative assessments. Still have to work out the kinks.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Preliminary Examination

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

 **Action Plan**

Actions

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1:
Comprehensive Knowledge**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None Needed

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.36 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance

on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ Action: Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ Action: Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.45 (meeting expectations). This was found as the highest of the preliminary examination averages, not surprising as the entire experience and preparatory work is set-up as a situation in which candidates construct and support arguments.

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The faculty to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.18 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.36 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.09 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

Communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

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.

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ Action: Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2.18 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the entire cohort technically "exceeded expectations" on this Outcome; however, it should be noted that the construction of the initial doctoral conceptual models took place over the duration of an entire semester, as it was a collaborative project with mastery through revision and instructor allowed. Thus, these data run the risk of not clinically evaluating our program with the fidelity that we would desire.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of findings indicate that the average of cohort performance on this measure fell far below that experienced on the conceptual model. That was understandable for two reasons, even though this was the more "summative" of the two assessments -- (1) A different cohort participated in this assessment, as during this pilot year, the on-campus cohort participated in the preliminary examination assessment and the off-campus cohort participated in the conceptual model assessment, and (2) The conceptual model activity during this pilot year was delivered as a mastery activity, which impinged upon its ability to serve as a viable source of information. Cohort average for this assessment, this year, was calculated as a 2 (meeting expectations).

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

📄 **Status Report**

Action Statuses

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1:
Comprehensive Knowledge**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None Needed

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ Action: Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication,

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ Action: Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 Data Collection in Progress

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination

Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Action:** Criterion Assurance Measures

Action Details: Disallow practice of assessing measures of learning after multiple revisions with support of instructor.

Implementation Plan (timeline): To be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Conceptual Model Rubric as Constructed.

Resource Allocations: None needed.

Priority: Low

Status for Criterion Assurance Measures

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: NA

Next Steps/Additional Information: 2013 data collection is ongoing.

▼ **Action:** Preliminary Examination



Action Details: Continue assessing in future years as in 2011-2012. Good assessment plan.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2012-2013 and beyond.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric

Resource Allocations: NA

Priority: Medium

Status for Preliminary Examination

No Status Added

Status Summary

This pilot year under the newly formulated doctoral program standards has been a valuable learning experience. We will be better positioned to utilize meaningful data collection methods in 2012-2013.

Summary of Next Steps

Utilize assessments as noted in action plans toward more meaningful assessment in 2012-2013 and beyond.

2012-2013 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of

study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the

outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1

= does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content

application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 11 (42%) 15 (58%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Good process launch!

Substantiating Evidence:

 PhD K12 Data Findings 2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 5 (29%) 9 (53%) 3 (18%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process. The fact that 18% did not meet the comprehensive knowledge standard during preliminary exams, as we currently have them designed, merits a closer look.

Reflections/Notes : Good process launch!

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 24 (92%) 2 (8%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process. Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 24 (92%) 2 (8%) 0 (0%)

Reflections/Notes : Standards are seemingly increasing as the program continues, as measure 1 occurs earlier in the program. Faculty will need to take care to stabilize their metrics across course experiences pertaining to the same outcome expectations.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 1 (6%) 14 (82%) 2 (12%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Good process -- Illustrates what we know about ourselves as instructors and provides guidance in how we can improve in our assessment processes.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of

study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 26 (100%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Process has resulted in increased dialogue and productive conversations.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 4 (24%) 11 (65%) 2 (12%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Performance standards continue to be held at a higher level toward the back end of the program.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 19 (73%) 7 (27%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted prior.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 8 (47%) 9 (53%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted prior.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 23 (88%) 3 (12%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted prior.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n = 17 2 (12%) 13 (76%) 2 (12%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted prior, with continued notice of the variance in expected performance standards near the beginning and end of program.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet

n=26 18 (69%) 8 (31%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted prior -- same trends continue.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 4 (24%) 11 (65%) 2 (12%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 8 (31%) 18 (69%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 6 (35%) 10 (59%) 1 (6%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Same trends continue.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 0 (0%) 26 (100%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Trends continue.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 8 (47%) 8 (47%) 1 (6%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 24 (92%) 2 (8%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research

and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 9 (53%) 6 (35%) 2 (12%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 19 (73%) 7 (27%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 7 (41%) 10 (59%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 4 (15%) 22 (85%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Noted -- Trends not wavering.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 3 (18%) 14 (82%) 0 (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued analysis of the data as these are the result of a small sample size. Further study of inter-rater reliability among faculty would be a good step, and this can be accomplished through the dialogue that takes place during the preliminary examination process.

Reflections/Notes : Consistent.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Stabilization of Performance Expectations
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally

develop as they matriculate.

Overall Reflection

Continued dialogue and conversation regarding inter-rater reliability, transparency of grading outcomes with students, and the need for stabilization of expectations and evaluations will become a healthy part of the conversation, department-wide, in the year ahead.

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
 (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
 n=26 11 (42%) 15 (58%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
 n=17 5 (29%) 9 (53%) 3 (18%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty.

Measures: Same

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
 (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
 n=26 24 (92%) 2 (8%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 1 (6%) 14 (82%) 2 (12%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 26 (100%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 4 (24%) 11 (65%) 2 (12%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 19 (73%) 7 (27%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 8 (47%) 9 (53%) 0 (0%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 23 (88%) 3 (12%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n = 17 2 (12%) 13 (76%) 2 (12%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 18 (69%) 8 (31%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 4 (24%) 11 (65%) 2 (12%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 8 (31%) 18 (69%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 6 (35%) 10 (59%) 1 (6%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

paradigms.

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 0 (0%) 26 (100%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 8 (47%) 8 (47%) 1 (6%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 3.1:
Communication,
Interpersonal and Process
Skills**

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.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 24 (92%) 2 (8%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 9 (53%) 6 (35%) 2 (12%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 19 (73%) 7 (27%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 7 (41%) 10 (59%) 0 (0%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=26 4 (15%) 22 (85%) 0 (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 3 (18%) 14 (82%) 0 (0%)

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

📄 Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014 school year

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty.

Measures: Same

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same Assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations**

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations**

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is

no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Action:** Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Action: Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Action Details: Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership must ensure that they are utilizing the same standards of performance for the ELCC concepts embedded within each Standard Element for assessments earlier in the program, as well as those later in the program. Assessment results data should mirror the skills increase that students naturally develop as they matriculate.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-2014

Key/Responsible Personnel: All program faculty

Measures: Same assessments

Resource Allocations: None

Priority: Medium

Status for Stabilization of Performance Expectations

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Upon further review, the new ELCC Standards and Standard Elements do not reflect the preparatory skills that align nicely with our outcomes for Ph.D. students. While the ELCC Standard Elements have merit for all educational leaders, we believe that after two levels of ELCC development (M.Ed. and Ed.S.), we are better utilizing our doctoral-level competencies as Outcomes for Assessment purposes. Thus, this action is no longer necessary and we will move into other action steps in future assessment cycles.

Next Steps/Additional Information: None needed.

Status Summary

We are no longer considering focusing on ELCC competencies at the doctoral level.

Summary of Next Steps

Further consideration of action steps is necessary for future assessment cycles.

2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of

study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the

outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1

= does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content

application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (19%)
Meets (81%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of

research” between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Conceptual Model Data Collection Sheet (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (46%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do “just that.”

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don’t as much have an increase in “exceeds expectations” on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in “does not meet expectations.” We’re a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We’ll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Preliminary Examination Data Collection Sheet (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (94%)

Meets (6%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (60%)

Meets (40%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)

Meets (50%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)

Meets (50%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1

= does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (80%)
Meets (20%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (58%)
Meets (42%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16
Exceeds (63%)
Meets (27%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors

needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (31%)
Meets (69%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (54%)
Meets (34%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (25%)
Meets (75%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (38%)
Meets (58%)
Does Not Meet (4%)

n = 16
Exceeds (44%)
Meets (56%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16
Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this

coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (42%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing

coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (75%)
Meets (25%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (94%)
Meets (6%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding

scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (6%)
Meets (94%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : It appears that under the guidelines we have set (average of "2" or above), we have met our goals. We have seen a natural growth from "understanding of research" between the conceptual model and the preliminary examinations. To state definitively areas of exceptional performance and areas of growth is still difficult, as the 3-point scale makes the discernable variance differences hard to identify. We are moving to a 4-point scale for the next academic year and will keep watch of student progress closely.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (23%)
Meets (77%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (27%)
Meets (63%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Movement to 4-point scale is recommended, as variances between groups and assessment cycles is difficult under a 3-point scale. Expanded dialogue regarding scope and sequencing of skill development in different courses under different instructors needs a more careful review. We will be meeting more frequently as a K-12 Ph.D. faculty this coming year to do "just that."

Reflections/Notes : Assessment results seem to indicate that we don't as much have an increase in "exceeds expectations" on preliminary examinations, as we do a decrease in "does not meet expectations." We're a bit light on 4.2 programmatically, and we need to examine this from a curricular gap analysis standpoint. The 3-point scale is still presenting difficulties in identifying areas of peak performance and areas for growth. We'll be moving to a 4-point scale this next school year and are hopeful this will allow for a more effective programmatic review.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Research Course Pilots

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Rubric Revision and Implementation

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

Syllabus sharing and a review of the scope and sequence of the curriculum should take place to ensure balanced and adequate coverage of program standards. This will take place in more frequent meetings of PhD faculty in the coming school year. Department Chairperson Steve Gruenert has begun the process of scheduling meetings for the purpose of gap analysis and continued conversation regarding what each faculty member is covering, per course expectations and individual assignment preferences. This will be of significant benefit to the department. We are thankful to have Dr. Brad Balch back from the Dean-ship to help with this very important work.

Overall Reflection

Although we have done an effective job of meeting each of our goals for the K-12 PhD program, we believe strongly that we are only as good as our next day's best work. We are mindful of our obligations within our mission to make a positive difference on behalf of program and students.

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (19%)
Meets (81%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (46%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

-  Draft Syllabus EDLR 761 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
-  Draft Syllabus EDLR 859 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (19%)
Meets (81%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (46%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (94%)
Meets (6%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (94%)
Meets (6%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that

this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (80%)
Meets (20%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (58%)
Meets (42%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient

for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (50%)

Meets (50%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (80%)

Meets (20%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (58%)

Meets (42%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (56%)

Meets (44%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (63%)

Meets (27%)

Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (31%)
Meets (69%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year - EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 - 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (63%)
Meets (27%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (31%)
Meets (69%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)

Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (54%)
Meets (34%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of

the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (54%)
Meets (34%)
Does Not Meet (12%)

n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

**Outcome 2.2: Employ
Multiple**

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The faculty to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (25%)
Meets (75%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (38%)
Meets (58%)
Does Not Meet (4%)

n = 16
Exceeds (44%)
Meets (56%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (25%)
Meets (75%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (38%)
Meets (58%)
Does Not Meet (4%)

n = 16

Exceeds (44%)
Meets (56%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (42%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing

expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (42%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (0%)
Meets (100%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (42%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (8%)

n = 16

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (75%)
Meets (25%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (94%)
Meets (6%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (75%)
Meets (25%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (60%)
Meets (40%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (94%)
Meets (6%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (50%)
Meets (50%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (30%)
Meets (70%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16

Exceeds (56%)
Meets (44%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (6%)
Meets (94%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10

Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (23%)
Meets (77%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (27%)
Meets (63%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 16

Exceeds (6%)
Meets (94%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 10
Exceeds (40%)
Meets (60%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Findings for Preliminary Examination

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: n = 26

Exceeds (23%)
Meets (77%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

n = 16
Exceeds (27%)
Meets (63%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment

system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

📄 Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

-  Draft Syllabus EDLR 761 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
-  Draft Syllabus EDLR 859 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty

members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for

students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former

“exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the “Developing” category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between “Met” and “Not Met,” in terms of expectations.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members’ courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious

requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for

students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ Action: Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient

for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1:
Understanding of K-12
Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Action:** Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the “Developing” category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between “Met” and “Not Met,” in terms of expectations.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Action: Research Course Pilots

Action Details: Coursework Revisions Pilot: Two research courses in the Department of Educational Leadership will undergo piloted amendments during the 2014-2015 academic year – EDLR 761 Inquiry in Higher Education and EDLR 859 Research Seminar in Higher Education. The intent will be to more effectively meet the expectations of the course in terms of assessed candidate competencies, as per the course description in the Graduate Catalogue and ongoing expectations of program faculty. Rigor, in general, will increase over the two semesters, and a new textbook will be piloted, as well as will collaborative writing and revision activities and ongoing, scholarly discussions via Discussion Board. Artifact deliverables will be increased for students.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan and Dr. Mark Frederick

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Research Course Pilots

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Revision and Implementation

Action Details: Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program is moving to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. It is the hope that this will accord program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Revision and Implementation

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Status Summary

EDLR 761 and EDLR 859 were piloted in two faculty members' courses. While the textbook was found to be an incredible resource, the ambitious requirement of asking students to complete all three chapters of their Dissertation Proposal was found in need of a slight "scale back," so as to allow them to deepen their attention to a sound literature review and substantive theoretical framework. We are satisfied that the pilot experience is complete and has allowed us to move ahead with clarity on these two courses.

Rubric implementation was successful, and in line with the initiatives, Unit-wide, in the Bayh College of Education and ISU. We found that the "Developing" category reduced the possibility of the overestimation of skills from a forced choice between "Met" and "Not Met," in terms of expectations.

Summary of Next Steps

Continued reflection on data collected, which will inform programmatic planning, curricular revision, and instructional design.

2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The faculty to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in

EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing

coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of

leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

◆ **Assessment Findings**

Finding per Measure

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1:
Comprehensive Knowledge**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.1

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 32%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.1

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 48%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly “all 2’s” across the outcomes in one cycle, or let’s say, mostly “all 3’s.” While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is “developing,” let’s say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.2

Exceeds: 43%

Meets: 48 %

Developing: 9%

Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a “developing” category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former “exceeds,” “meets,” and “does not meet” categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be

overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.2

Exceeds: 35 %
Meets: 56 %
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.3

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 48%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.3

Exceeds: 35%
Meets: 56%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating

the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.4

Exceeds: 43%

Meets: 48%

Developing: 9%

Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 1.4

Exceeds: 35%
Meets: 56%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.1

Exceeds: 43%

Meets: 48%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.1

Exceeds: 35%
Meets: 56 %
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored

mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.2

Exceeds: 14%
Meets: 76%
Developing: 10%
Does Not Meet: 0 %

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be

well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.2

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 48%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.3

Exceeds: 43 %
Meets: 48 %
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is

conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.3

Exceeds: 48 %
Meets: 43%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.4

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 48%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 2.4

Exceeds: 35%
Meets: 56%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 3.1

Exceeds: 43%
Meets: 52%
Developing: 5%
Does Not Meet: 0 %

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to

use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 3.1

Exceeds: 30%

Meets: 61%

Developing: 9 %

Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for

ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 4.1

Exceeds: 38%
Meets: 48%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 4.1

Exceeds: 35%
Meets: 56%
Developing: 9%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in

EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

Summary of Findings: Standard 4.2

Exceeds: 43%

Meets: 43%

Developing: 14%

Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

Summary of Findings: Standard 4.2

Exceeds: 35%

Meets: 56%

Developing: 9%

Does Not Meet: 0%

Rubric Revision and Implementation: The K-12 Ph.D. Program has moved to a 4-point rubric, adding a "developing" category to candidate competencies. As we hypothesized in the last assessment cycle, this has accorded program faculty an opportunity to more accurately assess candidate competencies through the developing stages of their Ph.D. programmatic journey. The former "exceeds," "meets," and "does not meet" categories were insufficient to use our assessment system as a true teaching and learning tool.

What we have seen, however, in this assessment cycle is the tendency for ratings to be overly consistent across the outcomes for candidates, whereupon candidates would be scored mostly "all 2's" across the outcomes in one cycle, or let's say, mostly "all 3's." While it is to a large degree true that a candidate who is "developing," let's say, is regarded as such in most demonstrations of coursework proficiencies across the board, we are wondering if even a four-point rubric has enough sophistication to drill-down our evaluation of candidate competencies to a level in which we can most effectively make program adjustments.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections/Notes : Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Overall Recommendations

Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Overall Reflection

We may need to evaluate whether or not the Conceptual Model of Human Relations allows for adequate coverage of doctoral outcomes, in terms of the assignment's breadth and depth, as well as whether or not all of the current outcomes are covered in the preliminary examination experience, to the degree that we can make a more fine distinction of candidate competencies. All this rests upon a supposition that a four-point rubric still lacks the sophistication to adequately assess the nuances of candidate competencies as we would wish as this level, yet admittedly, it is better than a three-point rubric, as we had prior.

❖ Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories of leadership and management.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an “exceeding,” “meeting,” or “developing,” ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient

for implementation.

Priority: Medium

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

❏ Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ Action: Rubric Level Analysis

Action Details: Recommendations: Continued dialogues regarding what each of the outcomes means in terms of an "exceeding," "meeting," or "developing," ranking might be well-suited for ensuring that candidate competencies are most accurately determined for each of the two assessment activities – Conceptual Model of Human Relations and Preliminary Examinations.

Reflections: Might we need to be even more deliberate in the discussions of candidate competencies and further challenge each other to consider that not all of these outcomes might best be evaluated in terms of the assignments selected? Is our assignment selection in need of some scrutiny?

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty.

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Status for Rubric Level Analysis

No Status Added

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2015-2016 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and

▼ Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The faculty to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of

proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in

EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing

coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of

leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

◆ **Assessment Findings**

Finding per Measure

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1:
Comprehensive Knowledge**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1

= does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing

coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education.

▼ **Measure:** Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students design and develop a Conceptual Model of their personal philosophy of human relations in education, a visual representation of their understanding of leadership that reflects their knowledge of the issues and constructs they have been studying in EDLR 657. The final model highlights the various facets of leadership and human relations of study, including the following: Identifying and articulating prominent human relations themes as reflected in course readings and practical application experiences; applying to professional experiences the theories and concepts of human relations introduced in the course; articulating the roles of educators as leaders in larger contexts concerning human relations, and responding to the needs of local communities, the nation, and the world.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Students participate in a rigorous, cumulative oral examination of proficiencies that they have developed throughout the doctoral program, synthesizing coursework, theoretical immersion, and out-of-classroom practitioner experiences in content application. The examination is organized in the areas of education, leadership, and research and aligned with the objectives and outcomes of the Ph.D. experience. Assessment of such is conducted by multiple department faculty members who reach consensus on student proficiency scores.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Preliminary Examination

No Findings Added

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Status Report

2016-2017 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2017-2018 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2018-2019 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2019-2020 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

Appendix

-
- A. **PhD in Education Administration Curriculum Map** (Curriculum Map)
 - B. **PhD K12 Data Findings 2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - C. **Conceptual Model Data Collection Sheet** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - D. **Preliminary Examination Data Collection Sheet** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - E. **Draft Syllabus EDLR 761** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - F. **Draft Syllabus EDLR 859** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
-