

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: EDLR PhD K-12 **Contact Name(s) and Email(s):** Terry McDaniel (Director) terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</p> <p>knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought and EDLR 850(Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 9 (25%) Meets Expectations; 27 (75%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes</p>

				was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment. Also see Part 2
<p>1.2 Critical Reflection ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in in EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education) and EDLR 850(Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework. After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 708 and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 708 and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 7 (19%) Meets Expectations; 29 (71%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Leadership for Learning in Educational Administration (EDLR 683); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern</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</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 683, EDLR 708, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u></p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed</p>

<p>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>Education); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 683, EDLR 708, and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>Exceeds Expectations; 11(31%) Meets Expectations; 25 (69%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>1.4 Exercise Leadership ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline. and Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Practiced as a Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657);Reinforced in EDLR 683 (Leadership for Learning) and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657 and EDLR 683.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 10 (28%) Meets Expectations; 26 (72%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced</p>

	<p>the performance in EDLR 657 and EDLR 683.</p>			<p>throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims regarding application of research.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Inquiry of Higher Education in Educational Administration (EDLR 761); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought) and EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); Reinforced in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency as well as in EDLR 899 (Dissertation); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, and EDLR 899.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, and EDLR 859, A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 12 (33%) Meets Expectations; 23 (64%) Developing; 1 (3%) Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study, with only one student at the developing stage.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The</p>

				assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment. Also see Part 2
<p>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames 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 environments.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Foundations of Modern Education in Educational Administration (EDLR 708); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational thought); Reinforced in EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 708, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 10 (28%) Meets Expectations; 26s (72%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research ability to critically read and review various forms</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency); Reinforced in EDLR 899 (Dissertation) and</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and EDLR 859. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p>

<p>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. and Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 859 and EDLR 899.</p>	<p>Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 12 (33%) Meets Expectations; 24 (67%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>2.4 An Understanding of Research 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</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Statistical Methods in Educational Psychology (EPSY 612);Practiced as a concept in EPSY 712 (inferential Statistics or EPSY 710 (Qualitative Research); Reinforced in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendentcy) and EDLR 899 (Dissertation) and Completion of Preliminary Examinations 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>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, and EDLR 859. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 12 (33%) Meets Expectations; 24 (67%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core</p>

<p>profession.</p>	<p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, EDLR 859, and EDLR 899.</p>	<p>accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>		<p>curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>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, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 657 (Human Relations in Educational Administration), EDLR 683 (Leadership for Learning), EDLR 708 (Foundations of Modern Education), EDLR 761 (Inquiry of Higher Education), and EPSY 612 (Statistical Methods); Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought), EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory), EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency, EPSY 712 (Inferential Statistics or EPSY 710 Qualitative Research, and EDLR 899 (Dissertation); and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 708, EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, EPSY 612, and EPSY 712 or EPSY 710. A few students have completed work in EDLR 899.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 13 (36%) Meets Expectations; 23 (64%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The</p>

	written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 708, EDLR 761, EDLR 806, EDLR 850, EDLR 859, EPSY 612, EPSY 712 or EPSY 710, and EDLR 899.			assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment. Also see Part 2
<p>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Development and Construction of Student Conceptual Model of Human Relations in Educational Administration (EDLR 657); Practiced as a concept in EDLR 683; Leadership for Learning; Reinforced in EDLR 806 (Seminar in Educational Thought) and EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); and</p> <p>Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in EDLR 657, EDLR 683, EDLR 806, and EDLR 850.</p> <p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 12 (33%) Meets Expectations; 24 (67%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p> <p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters’ level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
<p>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs ability to plan and evaluate policies and</p>	<p>Practiced as a concept in EDLR 850 (Advanced Leadership Theory); Reinforced in EDLR 859 (Seminar in Superintendency);</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</p>	<p>36 Students completed preliminary examinations and coursework in in EDLR 850 and EDLR 859.</p>	<p>Scores indicate that our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study.</p>

<p>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>and Completion of Preliminary Examinations at End of Coursework.</p> <p>After Preliminary examinations, students are rated on the Ph.D. Preliminary Exam Standards document (attached) by the Ph.D. faculty. The rating is based on the performance of both oral and written preliminary exams and the performance in EDLR 850 and EDLR 859.</p>	<p>Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.)in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs</p>	<p><u>Student Outcomes:</u> Exceeds Expectations; 13 (36%) Meets Expectations; 23 (64%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0</p>	<p>Completed mapping of the Ph.D. curriculum has allowed for a stronger development of the skills needed to meet expectations of the Ph.D. Standards and for students to often exceed the standards. Each standard was either introduced in a previous masters' level course or introduced in the Ph.D. core curriculum of courses. Each of the standards are practiced throughout the courses and reinforced for mastery in additional coursework. (See Ph.D. Curricular Map)</p> <p>At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.</p> <p>Also see Part 2</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

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

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

The 2018-2019 year was the last year of the Wednesday residency model cohort. In 2019-2020 this model is being replaced with the new Campus Residency cohort model.

Cohort sizes for:

	<u>Wednesday Residency Cohort</u>	<u>Regional Distance Education Cohort</u>
2018-2019	12	26
2017-2018	12	24
2016-2017	12	29

	<u>Enrollment Totals</u>	<u>Graduation Totals</u>
2018-2019	129	25
2017-2018	135	23
2016-2017	152	24

Each year two new cohorts begin, the campus program tends to have smaller enrollment because of the need to attend more courses on days with K-12 schools are in session. Most of the students in both programs are working K-12 school administrators who are trying to balance their professional position with the Ph.D. program. The Wednesday program required attendance on campus for 32 Wednesdays to complete four courses each Wednesday. The day was from 7:30am to 6:45pm. The regional program (Acronym: REDS) is basically a distance education program that requires only one face-to-face Saturday meetings each month (total of four per semester) and four summer days, with the rest of the program on-line. The Wednesday program has a course timeline of 15 months, two semesters and one summer, while the regional program is for five consecutive terms with two courses each term (Fall, Spring, Summer, Fall Spring).

This year the Wednesday program was revised to the Campus Residency Educational Doctorate (CREDS) program. The change was initiated because of the decreasing enrollments in the Wednesday Residency program. With the continued increase in responsibilities of K-12 school leaders, district leaders were sending a message that they could no longer allow possible Ph.D. students to be away from their district responsibilities for 32 Wednesdays in a single school year. Those students who were attending were finding it more and more difficult to keep up with the academic load of four courses each semester. After considering multiple models, the CREDS program was initiated.

This program begins in the summer term with two courses that are hybrid in nature. The students attend four days of intensive on-campus classes, for the two courses. Assignments for the courses are scheduled through the rest of the summer term. In the each, the fall and spring semester, students enroll in three courses. During each semester students will attend face-to-face sessions on campus three 3-day sessions of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Other assignments will be submitted on-line throughout the semesters. The following summer students will once again attend a four day intensive session on campus for the final two courses of the 30 hour Ph.D. core of courses. We will be evaluating the process throughout the year through spontaneous conversations with students and through a final assessment.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

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

meaning. It has been suggested that we consider beginning the regional cohort with the intensive four day summer session as a better orientation to the program. this will be considered for the 2020-2021 cohort.

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

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

The assessment continues to indicate that our students are successful K-12 educational leaders at the building and district level who are making academic gains and building a strong practitioner/scholarship knowledge base as indicated by the outcomes assessed. They experience the pressures to attain a high level of student performance accountability and through the program are exposed to knowledge and research that requires them to seek practical solutions to the problems and challenge they face. Though the development of higher-order thinking skills. The Ph.D. program challenges their practices, especially those based on only experiences and the values and beliefs developed through the culture of their experiences. This challenge comes through the theory and research of educational leadership and the foundations of education. The true learning happens at the edge of discomfort, with a healthy level of positive anxiety, and the assessment of their performance bears out that they rise to our expectations for research and scholarship, under the performance standards we have established. The result is leaders who lead based on scientifically based research and not based solely on cultural norms and experiences.

The outcomes indicate our students are nearly performing at 100% in terms of meeting expectations with many of the standards indicating over 25% exceeding expectations. AS noted these scores are the outcomes that are determined through a final assessment after they have completed all coursework and have taken the preliminary examinations for admission to candidacy to the Ph.D. We can and will not accept anything less than meets expectations for our Ph.D. program. This has created various direction for the department in terms of findings-based plans and actions to improve the student learning and success.

First, we need to continue to reach out to the K-12 field and find what skills we may need to address or what areas the program needs to focus. This will be done through the use of our advisory council of school superintendents. They will be asked for input in terms of what skills are needed for future Ph.D. students in K-12 leadership. The department will also be having recruitment dinners throughout the spring. At these dinners we will be again assessing from school personnel in terms of needs for the program.

Seung, we need to carefully study the program outcomes. As a department are we satisfied with just meeting expectations or should we be designing a program where we expect a higher number of outstanding students to exceed expectations. The Ph.D. program is to be the ultimate model of student success. Is just meeting expectations a high enough expectation? Critical reflection was the outcome lowest in exceeding expectations. While the program continues to produce strong leaders and quality dissertations, the number of students continuing to develop scholarly documents for peer-reviewed publications is relatively low. If we are truly developing a large number of student exceeding expectations, then the program should have graduates contributing a higher number of scholarly works. The K-12 educational administration faculty will continue to address how we can help students develop scholarly publications. This will be a continued focus of the assessment plan for the coming school year. Information will be shared at our continued attendance at the state-wide educational conferences such as the Indiana School Principals Conference, the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents Conference and others.

A very significant opportunity comes this year to attempt to add more diversity to our program in terms of student population. A large majority of white leaders dominate the field of educational administration, especially in district-level positions. The goal is to at least have education leadership positions be held by a percentage of minority leaders equal or greater than the percentage of minority population of the State of Indiana. Recruitment dinners are a part of the accreditation process of our MED and Ed.S. licensure programs for educational leaders. The desire is to attract minority candidates to these dinners and encourage their enrollment in the Ph.D. program. Efforts to recruit minority candidates will also take place at the leadership conferences by having tables and booths with faculty members present to encourage minority enrollment.

**PhD
Master Assessment Rubric**

Student's Name: _____

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

	Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), and Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge Score:	Displays knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.2 Critical Reflection Score:	Displays ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.3 Articulate a Philosophy Score:	Displays ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.4 Exercise Leadership Score:	Displays ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments Score:	Displays ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames Score:	Displays facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.3 Critically Read and Review Research Score:	Displays ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.4 An Understanding of Research	Displays understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.

Score:	
3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills	Displays communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.
Score:	
4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education	Displays theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.
Score:	
4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs	Displays ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.
Score:	

Dear Terry,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

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

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: PhD K-12 Administration	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable. They are clearly aligns to the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes.• Excellent notes on how curriculum mapping was used to strengthen to deepening of concepts throughout the curriculum.• Information about courses where concepts are learned and reinforced is clear.• Expectations of student performance are clearly stated, and actual performance is stated relative to expectations. Excellent breakout of scores by level to see not just how many are achieving expectations, but also exceeding them.• Great reflections on the appropriate level of achievement for doctoral students, as well as what informs that decision. Your faculty will be engaged in meaningful and challenging conversations about this topic.• Clear information about sharing findings.• Good information about recruitment, retention, and diversification efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If just one section of the Preliminary Exam relates to a specific outcome, make sure to only report the scores on that section. I'm guessing that you've done this since different scores are reported for different outcomes, but I can't tell from the description.• Consider whether you would add assessment data from earlier in the program (any of the assignments in the aligned classes described) to understand how student learning develops over time in the program. There's nothing wrong with the current method, but it could provide additional insights.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</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>Performance Goals & Measures</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>

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