

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18**

*Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

**Unit/Program Name:** EDLR PhD K-12

**Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Terry McDaniel (Director) [terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu](mailto:terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

**Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities**

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p><b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b> knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 1.1 Score of 4: 4 (11%) Score of 3: 30 (81%) Score of 2: 3 (8%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 1.1 Score of 4: 5 (33%) Score of 3: 9 (60%) Score of 2: 1 (7%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>

			<p>Prelims 2015 1.1 Score of 4: 10 (43%) Score of 3: 11 (49%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b> ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 1.2 Score of 4: 2 (5%) Score of 3: 32 Score of 2: 3 ((8%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 1.2 Score of 4: 9 (60%) Score of 3: 6 (40%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 1.2 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>

			the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.	
<p><b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b> ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 1.3 Score of 4: 2 (5%) Score of 3: 33 (89%) Score of 2: 3 (8%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 1.3 Score of 4: 5 (33%) Score of 3: 9 (60%) Score of 2: 1 (7%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 1.3 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b> ability to exercise leadership within an</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657);</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 1.4 Score of 4: 7 (19%) Score of 3: 29 (78%)</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only</p>

<p>educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</b>  <b>and</b>  <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>and  Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Score of 2: 1 (3%)  Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016  1.4  Score of 4: 5 (34%)  Score of 3: 10 (66%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015  1.4  Score of 4: 8 (35%)  Score of 3: 13 (57%)  Score of 2: 2 (8%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b>  ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657);  and  Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017  2.1  Score of 4: 3 (8%)  Score of 3: 28 (76%)  Score of 2: 6 (16%)  Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and</p>

<p>regarding application of research.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>			<p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 2.1 Score of 4: 1 (7%) Score of 3: 14 (93%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 2.1 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b> facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 2.2 Score of 4: 1 (3%) Score of 3: 22 (59%) Score of 2: 14 (38%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 2.2 Score of 4: 4 (27%) Score of 3: 11 (73%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number</p>

<p>environments.</p>			<p>the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 2.2 Score of 4: 10 (43%) Score of 3: 11 (49%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b> ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> <p>and Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 2.3 Score of 4: 2 (5%) Score of 3: 21 (57%) Score of 2: 14 (38%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 2.3 Score of 4: 10 (66%) Score of 3: 4 (27%) Score of 2: 1 (7%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 2.3 Score of 4: 11 (49%) Score of 3: 10 (43%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>

			<p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	
<p><b>2.4 An Understanding of Research</b>  understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and  Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017  2.4  Score of 4: 3 (8%)  Score of 3: 28 (76%)  Score of 2: 6 (16%)  Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016  2.4  Score of 4: 1 (7%)  Score of 3: 14 (93%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015  2.4  Score of 4: 8 (35%)  Score of 3: 13 (57%)  Score of 2: 2 (8%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>

<p><b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b> communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 3.1 Score of 4: 9 (24%) Score of 3: 28 (76%) Score of 2: 0 Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 3.1 Score of 4: 3 (20%) Score of 3: 12 (80%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 3.1 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b> theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 4.1 Score of 4: 11 (30%) Score of 3: 24 (65%) Score of 2: 2 (5%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many</p>



<p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>			<p>the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 4.1 Score of 4: 1 (7%) Score of 3: 14 (93%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 4.1 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
<p><b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b> ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student <b>Conceptual Model of Human Relations</b> in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); and Completion of <b>Preliminary Examinations</b> at End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Conceptual Model 2016-2017 4.2 Score of 4: 1 (3%) Score of 3: 26 (70%) Score of 2: 10 (27%) Score of 1: 0</p> <p>% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Conceptual Model 2015-2016 4.2 Score of 4: 1 (7%) Score of 3: 14 (93%) Score of 2: 0 (0%)</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, and only a few others are still developing. Of course, some candidate possess knowledge from previous education and practical experience that helps in this regard. The philosophy of many of our faculty is to use mastery learning in doctoral study and that is also why we typically see the vast majority of candidate meeting or exceeding expectations. We spend that time encouraging and facilitating that learning and development. It is</p>

			<p>Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>Prelims 2015 4.2 Score of 4: 8 (35%) Score of 3: 13 (57%) Score of 2: 2 (8%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>92% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>believed however, that our expectations of the Ph.D. students continue to rise, therefore lowering the number exceeding and increasing the number of candidates receiving a developing mark.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

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

#### Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

### Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

(1) What do assessments and our assessment processes allow us to know about our Ph.D. students and their learning? Assessment reveals that our students are successful K-12 educational leaders at the building and district level who are making successful strides with their coursework under the outcomes assessed. They experience daily pressures for student performance accountability and strongly desire, upon entry to our program, practical solutions to the problems and challenge they face. The Ph.D. program challenges their practices, especially those based on only experiences and the values and beliefs developed through the culture of their experiences. This challenge comes through the theory and research of educational leadership and the foundations of education. The true learning happens at the edge of discomfort, with a healthy level of positive anxiety, and the assessment of

their performance bears out that they rise to our expectations for research and scholarship, under the performance standards we have established. The result is leaders who lead based on scientifically based research and not based solely on cultural norms and experiences.

#### What do assessments and our assessment processes tell us about our curriculum?

This annual assessment opportunity is actually a more balanced representation than the end-of-course grade distribution, which results in mostly A's. We have through our assessment processes distributed their proficiency in a more balanced way. This is more helpful to faculty, in terms of curricular planning. If we look at the 3's and 4's, except for one area, they make up over 90% of the students, which tells us that we are meeting the needs of over 90% of our students.

With 1's and 2's, the program gives candidates the opportunity to improve on those competencies/learning outcomes. We have talked about the opportunity for candidates to come in and "do it again." Prelims – "mastery learning demonstrations" influence our teaching, so that there are a number of opportunities for students to demonstrate performance success. Candidates are at times asked to do additional written pieces to enhance and re-demonstrate the knowledge that they didn't have in prior assessment opportunities. We have talked about the possibility in the future of their coming back to campus, in order to demonstrate that they have learned to a sufficient level, yet in most all cases, we have left this, thus far, to the responsibility of Dissertation Chairs. Assessments show us that our curriculum is constantly evolving, and that it needs to do so. It is reflective of best practice and legislative mandate. It is based on the latest research, and it is also a balance between being faculty-driven and student-driven – We're working with existing practitioner/leaders. Presently, curriculum mapping is underway to assure in each course, students receive the same curriculum regardless of the instructor.

#### What do assessments and our assessment processes allow us to understand and learn about our departmental processes?

We have monthly program meetings to discuss changes to curriculum and processes. Formative assessment is a practice used in each course. The formative assessment is utilized as both teacher to student and student to teacher input to enhance mid-course adjustments.

(2) Changes – The major curriculum change for this year is the adjustment of the two research courses. The first research course, EDLR 761 will now focus more on the writing process of a dissertation. This will include a heavy concentration on APA writing, proper procedures and resources for related literature, the specific requirements of a strong dissertation proposal, and guided assistance on selecting a dissertation topic and appropriate research questions and methodology. We have also initiated major program changes for next year. The present Wednesday residency program will end its 30-year run. No longer is this program feasible because school districts have difficulty committing 32 Wednesdays of a leader's time to come to campus for the program. To maintain the integrity of the on-campus experience we have developed the Campus Residency Educational Doctorate program (CREDS). This program will incorporate both distance education and on campus residency, students spending four-day intensives sessions on campus in two summer terms and three 3-day sessions each semester (fall and spring) on campus as well. Other coursework will utilize on-line distance education delivery. We have expanded the preliminary exam experience to include multiple professors (practitioners and non-PhD faculty), offering multiple viewpoints and better triangulation of data. It is a collective process where everyone contributes.

(3) Assessment Plan for the Coming Year: Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).

**Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities**

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
<p>1. Faculty will examine each other's course assignments and provide feedback with an intent of fostering higher rigor, deepened relevance, and positive relationships in classes.</p>	<p>-EDLR K-12 Monthly Meeting Updates and Discussion                      -Qualitative data will be collected from both EDLR K-12 Surveys and Meeting Discussions                      -Student Evaluations                      -Program Director will be responsible for initiating the discussions and meetings</p>	<p>The intent would be to address student performance outcomes. The discussion and data should inform as to if the needs of the students are first being taught in a manner that the student can comprehend and develop at a higher level thinking skill and if the instructional methods are addressing the professional standards.</p>	<p>It is hoped that the outcomes will be demonstrating successful instructional practices by faculty and that the curriculum and instruction are meeting the expectations of the standards. If assignments are not doing so, then proper adjustments can be made.</p>	<p>These are new goals.</p>
<p>Faculty will seek the assistance of instructional designers for review of online courses and consultation regarding best practices in student online engagement and success.</p>	<p>Faculty/Program Director will seek the assistance of instructional designers for review of online courses and consultation regarding best practices in student online engagement and success.</p>	<p>The intent would be to address student performance outcomes. The discussion and data should inform as to if the needs of the students are first being taught in a manner that the student can comprehend and develop at a higher level thinking skill and if the instructional methods are addressing the professional standards.</p>	<p>It is hoped that the outcomes will be demonstrating successful instructional practices by faculty and that the curriculum and instruction are meeting the expectations of the standards. If assignments are not doing so, then proper adjustments can be made.</p>	<p>This is a new goal.</p>
<p>Program Director will work with all Educational Leadership Faculty and Adjuncts who teach in the</p>	<p>Program Director will meet with each Educational Leadership Faculty and Adjuncts to create a data</p>	<p>Assessment based on the proficiency standards (ELCC Standards for the program) should reflect all standards</p>	<p>We should see consistency from assessments indicating all students are receiving the same content so the</p>	<p>This is a new goal.</p>

M.Ed. program to create a Curriculum Map that will include consistent syllabi and a resource data base with assignments and activities aligned with collaborated syllabi.	base with consistent syllabi. In addition, a data base will be created with assignments and activities aligned to collaborated syllabi.	are being covered properly and successfully	standards are consistently addressed bin a course regardless of the instructor.	
---	---	---	---	--

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

**Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement**

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?**

As all goals are new this year, the discoveries will be made during the year and reported next year. It is hoped that the results are consistent and improved student performance and completion. Retention has not been an issue in this program. The goal is always to assure all students are ready to take positions of leadership in the schools and possess both the theoretical knowledge and practical skills to assure their schools are successful and they as leaders are providing the leadership to assure success. The goal include developing a true professional who can demonstrate the skills and characteristics needed for students and staff.

*Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.*

## **EDLR Department-Wide Self-Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

### **All Programs**

### **Academic Year 16-17**

*We believed that it was important to study the rubric provided on the Office of Assessment website that would be used to evaluate our Assessment Processes. As the college as well as the department focuses on CAEP assessment and the Graduate Council has required the program self-study, using the Learning Outcomes will assist in the other assessment procedures. This has been helpful in preparation of the other reports. We have included our narrative below, if it would be of interest to review:*

**Department-wide Status of Outcomes (Source – Student Learning Summary Form Rubric):** The learning outcomes of the Department of Educational Leadership represented by this program’s assessment report are specific (focused), measurable (four levels of proficiency, with an expectation of a certain percentage of summative achievement of those outcomes, which is 80%), student-centered (the focus on student performance outcomes is necessary for success in their professional careers), and span multiple learning domains (professional knowledge, skills, dispositions, ethical challenges, and communication proficiencies, among others). The outcomes integrate with the Graduate Learning Goals, as have been noted for each outcome presented. They also reflect the most important results of program completion as established by our accreditation agency and other professional organizations, as well as with information from professional literature and research in our field. The program employs a variety of delivery formats, the learning outcomes are consistent across face-to-face, online, and hybrid course delivery systems. The outcomes are reviewed annually and have been thoughtfully revised, where necessary (K-12 M.Ed. and Ed.S. degree programs) by the faculty, with input from stakeholders, including accreditation organizations and field professionals. The curriculum maps identify where/to what extent each outcome is addressed, and the department continues to study further placement of learning outcomes in courses so as to provide students the opportunities to master learning outcomes needed for successful completion of our degree program.

**Department-wide Status of Measures and Performance Goals (Source – Student Learning Summary Form Rubric):** Multiple measures are provided, and because of accreditation agency mandates for the K-12 programs, a vast majority of what we currently assess is direct. Indirect measures will again be implemented over the next academic year. The detailed information will hopefully indicate that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. The measures provided factor-in to the course grades, as they are assignment grades for the most part, and in a summative sense, course grades are calibrated to the final assessments of learning outcomes. Meeting or exceeding standards constitutes “A” work in classes, as that is where expectations are set and clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. For the programs in which certification or licensure exams are required to practice in the field, these were included as a measure at the end of the outcomes list. Program and course measures include high impact practices, as practicing educational leaders demand no less. The overall variety of measures used across programs and departments allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course, yet for the annual submission for review, each assessment is separately housed within a single course, with the exception of preliminary/comprehensive examinations for the Ph.D. program. Measures assess more than one outcome, because the number of outcomes for each program is quite lengthy (some by accreditation agency demand) and demands that outcomes are compressed under a finite number of measures, mirroring the occupational demands of working educational leaders (they must accomplish myriad outcomes with a finite number of actions each day in leadership). To do otherwise would require 10 to 30 assignments per class, which would be unreasonable to expect of graduate students.

**Department-wide Status of Expectations for Performance and Results (Source – Student Learning Summary Form Rubric):** A summary of what has been the content of program-wide discussions regarding expectations for performance and assessment results is provided. Hopefully, the data collection, analysis, and interpretation provided demonstrate the validity of the results. Included are thoughts, commentary, and reflections on student performance and whether or not it is continuously improving as students matriculate through our programs.

**Department-wide Status of Expectations for Performance and Results (Source – Student Learning Summary Form Rubric):** Also provided is a summary of what has been the content of program-wide discussions regarding expectations for performance and assessment results. Details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation are provided to demonstrate the validity of the results. This includes thoughts, commentary, and reflections on student performance and whether or not it is continuously improving as students matriculate through our programs.

**Department-wide Status of Assessment Engagement and Improvement (Source – Student Learning Summary Form Rubric):** All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. Faculty reflect on students’ achievement of performance standards in program meetings, and faculty who directly teach courses in which assessment activities are used collaboratively make plans to adjust activities, performance goals, and outcomes when needed. Annually, faculty reflect on the history and impact of

previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. Stakeholders are currently involved to the degree that they serve as adjuncts in the program, and our department could expand its use of field stakeholders directly in assessment activities and development of our systems. It is believed that continuous improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment, as students report that our programs have the rigor, relevance, and relationships that truly allow them to make a positive difference in their professional careers. Outcomes and results are currently not available to stakeholders on/from the program website, yet we can confirm that assessment is integrated powerfully with teaching and learning, as this is what we do as teachers of educational leaders.

Dear Terry,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

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

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: EDLR PhD K-12	
<b>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.00/3.00)	
<b>Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue):</b> Developing (1.00/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clear learning outcomes paired with the appropriate CGPS outcomes.</li><li>• Specific measures applied at specific times during the curriculum with clear expectations for student performance.</li><li>• Good discussion of making meaning of the findings.</li><li>• Congrats to your faculty and students for such strong performance!</li><li>• <b>Good description of strategies and assignment of responsibilities.</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It seems some of the most updated data is missing from the table in Part 1a. You don't need to resubmit this to me, but it may be helpful for you to update now before moving on so you'll have it to compare to other annual reports.</li><li>• Particularly for the areas where students do not perform to expectations consider adding assessment at other points of the curriculum. Having comprehensive exams and projects as the sole points of assessment is often informative but can mask some of the finer points of detail that assessing at multiple points can uncover.</li><li>• In Part 2b it may be helpful to include information about how assessment of student learning directly shaped your decisions regarding curricular changes. This would improve the transparency of the way you use the findings.</li><li>• <b>Since these are new goals, it would be helpful to have context for why they were selected (ex: student learning deficits, retention concerns for distance students, etc.). What is listed as goals sound like specific strategies for the larger goals (potentially) related to learning, retention, and persistence to graduation.</b></li></ul>



- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For your third goal clarify what is meant by “assessment based on proficiency standards.” Is this one specific assessment or one type of evaluation (ex: rubric) that can be used across courses?</li></ul> |
|--|---|

*Assessment Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success Scoring Rubric is included on the last page for reference only.  
Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.*

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided. (in terms of what is missing from the table)</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

**Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)**

**Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>0 Undeveloped</b>	<b>1 Developing</b>	<b>2 Mature</b>	<b>3 Exemplary</b>
<b>Goals/ Objectives</b>	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
<b>Action Steps</b>	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
<b>Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective</b>	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
<b>Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement</b>	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>