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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories one leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues with education and to relate them to leadership and practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to articulate and integrated philosophy of education and leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

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.

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.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

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.

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.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs
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.)
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

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

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

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...
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): 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
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---

**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

---

**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):**

**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

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

### Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan |

| 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): |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Responsible Individual(s): |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Preliminary Examination Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Responsible Individual(s): |
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): 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): Dr. Ryan Donlan
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

**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**

**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

**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
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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 one 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
(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...
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.
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

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):

Responsibl 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

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
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:

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): Dr. Ryan Donlan

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**

(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**

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

**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 ETLR 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
(An 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 one 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).


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

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Preliminary Examination Rubric.

Resource Allocations: NA

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).
**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/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.
**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

**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 impinging 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
**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).


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
**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


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


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
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

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.
## Assessment Plan

### Outcomes and Measures

**PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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
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

---

**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
Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Education Administration

= 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

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
**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

**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**

**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
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

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

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

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

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
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**

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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings: Measure 1 Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=26</td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings: Measure 2 Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**
(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  
\[ n=17 \quad 9 \text{ (53\%)} \quad 6 \text{ (35\%)} \quad 2 \text{ (12\%)} \]

**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  
\[ n=26 \quad 19 \text{ (73\%)} \quad 7 \text{ (27\%)} \quad 0 \text{ (0\%)} \]

**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 waverimg.

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
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 one 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
**Objective 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 frames.

**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 2 Exceeds Meets Does Not Meet
n=17 8 (47%) 9 (53%) 0 (0%)
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
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 one 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.
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.
Outcomes: 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...
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

**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

**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

**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.
## Assessment Plan

### Outcomes and Measures

#### PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</th>
<th>Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |
| **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). |
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

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

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

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).
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

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

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

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
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.

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

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Measure:** Preliminary Examination

**Direct - Exam**

### 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.
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set</th>
<th>OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).
= 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 programatically, 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 programatically, 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)
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
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)
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

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%)
Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Education Administration

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of K-12 education 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**
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 one 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.


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.


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:**
- Exceeds (50%)
- Meets (50%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Findings for Preliminary Examination**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:**
- Exceeds (58%)
- Meets (42%)
- 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:**
- Exceeds (63%)
- Meets (27%)
- 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.


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%)
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 afford 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.


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

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 facility 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.


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.


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.


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
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
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.


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 one 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

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.


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.


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.


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
**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

**Priority:** Medium
**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.


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.
Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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
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

**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

### 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

**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
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

---

**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: 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

---

**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

---

**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...
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

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

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
Program Outcomes Assessment  
PHD in Education Administration

### 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

**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

---

#### Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

**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 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

---

#### 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
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 one 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.
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

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

**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.
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

---

**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  
**Type:** 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:
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, wherein 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

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.
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

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

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

**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 one 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.
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**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 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
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?


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?


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?

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**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

**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
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
Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Education Administration

### Status Report

#### Action Statuses

**PHD in Education Administration Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge</th>
<th>Action: Rubric Level Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories in leadership and management.</td>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> 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? <strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year. <strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty. <strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics. <strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation. <strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Rubric Level Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> 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? <strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Ongoing throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year. <strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key/Responsible Personnel: All Program Faculty. <strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics. <strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation. <strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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

---

### 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
### 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

---

### 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
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
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

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary

**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.

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

**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

**Measure:** Preliminary Examination
Direct - Exam

**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
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...
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

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.

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

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

Measure: Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration

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
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

**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

---

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**Measure:** Preliminary Examination

**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

---

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

**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

### 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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.1: Understanding of K-12 Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Conceptual Model: Human Relations in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**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

**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**

**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.
**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

**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

**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*
**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

**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

**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

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
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

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

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).
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
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

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
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).
**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
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## Overall Reflection

*No text specified*
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