

**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:** Ed.S. in School Administration **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Brad Balch Brad.Balch@indstate.edu

**Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</b></p>
<p><b>1. ELCC Standard Element 1.1:</b> Candidates can develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision <b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:</b> Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies. Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments. Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession. <b>Justification of Standards:</b> The ELCC Standards are the accreditation standards for licensing in terms of program accreditation. These are</p>	<p>Participation Journal Assignment in EDLR 759 – Seminar in the Superintendency Internship Journaling and completion of Indiana District Administrative Standards Assignment in EDLR 790/792, Superintendent/Central Office Internship. Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor – <a href="#">add survey hyperlink here</a>)</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 each of the three (3) rubrics in order for achievement of this outcome. In each of the journaling assignments the student is required to identify projects that develop, articulate, or implement a shared vision. Feedback is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor).</p>	<p>Score of 4: 29/33 Score of 3: 2/33 Score of 2: 2/33 Score of 1: 0/33</p> <p>94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>In 2017-18, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 94%.</p> <p>In 2016-17, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 100%.</p>	<p>Developing, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a shared district vision has been an integral part of this three-course experience. The emphasis was successful and will remain a program priority. While no changes were made because the performance expectations were met, migration from ELCC to NELP Standards will be a change imperative this year.</p>

<p>established for all university educational leadership programs. Additionally, for Indiana, this program must meet the Indiana Professional Standards for District-Level Leadership to allow students to develop the skills necessary to be licensed as a superintendent in Indiana. The above listed ELCC standard is cross-referenced with the appropriate Indiana Standard. It is noteworthy that the program will migrate from ELCC Standards this academic year to National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards.</p>				
<p><b>2.ELCC Standard Element 2.2:</b> Candidates can create and evaluate a comprehensive rigorous curricular and instructional district program. <b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:</b> Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession. Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession. <b>Justification of Standards:</b></p>	<p>Curriculum Vitae and Placement Filer Assignment in EDLR 759 Seminar in the Superintendency Internship Journaling and completion of Indiana District Administrative Standards Assignment in EDLR 790/792, Superintendent/Central Office Internship. Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the site supervisor – attached)</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. In the Curriculum Vitae and Placement File Assignment the student needs to demonstrate (through the inclusion of knowledge and skills listed on the vitae) the talents necessary to create and evaluate an</p>	<p>Score of 4: 25/33 Score of 3: 8/33 Score of 2: 0/33 Score of 1: 0/33</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>In 2017-18, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 94%.</p>	<p>Students have continued to demonstrate effectiveness in creating and evaluating the curriculum and the instructional program. This again has been a strong part of the program. Emphasis has been to keep an accurate focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, knowing that professionally, strong instructional leadership remains a district leadership imperative.</p>

<p>The ELCC Standards are the accreditation standards for licensing in terms of program accreditation. These are established for all university educational leadership programs. Additionally, for Indiana, this program must meet the Indiana Professional Standards for District-Level Leadership to allow students to develop the skills necessary to be licensed as a superintendent in Indiana. The above listed ELCC standard is cross-referenced with the appropriate Indiana Standard.</p>		<p>instructional program. In the journaling assignments for EDLR 790/792 the student must demonstrate the ability to use the knowledge and skills to create and evaluate an instructional program that provides a personalized learning environment. Feedback to determine if the student did effectively create and evaluate a rigorous instructional program is provided to the student through the Summative Assignment in EDLR 790/792 Superintendent/Central Office Internship Rubric Assignment (Completed by the intern, mentor, and university supervisor).</p>	<p>In 2016-17, candidates scoring 3 or higher was 100%.</p>	
<p>3. Indiana Superintendent Licensure Composite Scores</p>	<p>Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would pass this exam, which is a requirement for national recognition through our accreditation agency.</p>	<p>Currently, 8/9 (86%) candidates passed the Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam in the Academic year 2018-2019.</p> <p>In 2017-18 100% (6/6) students passed the licensure examination.</p> <p>In 2016-17 100% (8/8) students passed the licensure examination.</p>	<p>Domain scores across each section remain strong, indicating we are teaching the Indiana standards for district leadership as well as the ELCC standards for accreditation.</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

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.

- b. 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.
- 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: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

- 1) Cohort Sizes:30
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention: 63.16%
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

**What worked well in supporting student success this year?** The results of the representative assessments indicate the curriculum, instruction, and overall teaching/learning environment is supporting student success by addressing the expectations of both the ELCC standards and the Indiana district-level leadership professional standards. These standards and the curriculum focus on essential student needs to develop specific skills in budgeting, facilities, and professional development in curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as emphasizing the essentials of professionalism, ethics, interpersonal skills, problem solving, and critical thinking. The survey data from site supervisors at the end of the capstone experience for the program strongly suggests that our students know and understand these essentials. The College has developed a new strategic plan, which clearly focuses on student success. The program assessment of student learning outcomes clearly supports the College's emphasis on student success.

**What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?** A recruitment plan should be developed and implemented that evidences our commitment to diversifying the educational leadership ranks in Indiana. Although program enrollments remain healthy, it is largely due to self-selection and predominately white in terms of race. Program selectivity criteria should be addressed with the elimination of the GRE and heightened expectations for GPA (i.e., from 2.5 to 3.0). Additionally, two course changes should be made to eliminate two 600-level courses that have typically included in programs of study, but not recognized in the Graduate Catalog. Finally, a crosswalk will need to occur as the program migrates from ELCC to NELP Standards. This migration will entail changing all rubrics and course syllabi in which the Standards are addressed.

### Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

N/A

### Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)
- 2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)
- 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year
- 4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

From last year's assessments, candidates evidence the knowledge and understanding to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision. Additionally, candidates evidence the knowledge and understanding to create and evaluate a comprehensive rigorous curricular and instructional district program. Both strengths support two district leadership imperatives for success – strategic planning and instructional leadership. As noted in the preceding table, three years of data were shared across the three assessments and in each case, the expected outcome was exceeded as per site supervisor feedback. In terms of findings-based plans and actions, the statewide test mean of 86%, while above expectations, is below the statewide mean of 94%. No specific domain is of concern, however, the Pearson tutorial available to students for preparation is only of medium difficulty. Another test-prep resource is available and will be used this year. Multiple choice questions are much more difficult than the Pearson product and it is expected we will more closely approximate the statewide average next year. Other changes are at the program and admissions levels and driven by standards changes and accreditation expectations as articulated in Part 1. In terms of sharing information with stakeholders, this report will be shared with all K-12 leadership faculty once submitted and discussed at a faculty meeting before the end of the fall semester. Updates for this program are also shared annually at the statewide superintendents conference, in which about 200 district leaders attend. Elements of this report will also be shared.

Dear Brad,

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)

<b>Program: Ed.S. School Administration</b>	<b>Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable and are clearly aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes &amp; ELCC accreditation standards. This is one of the best examples I've seen.</li><li>• Assessment methods and courses are clearly noted. The assignments seem to allow for significant, meaningful displays of student learning.</li><li>• Great decision to include the licensure exam scores as an indirect measure of overall learning and student success.</li><li>• Clear information about expected and actual student outcomes. Good information provided rubrics used to evaluate performance. Excellent breakdown of scores, and great inclusion of prior years' performance relative to the goal to reflect on findings over time.</li><li>• Good discussion of what was learned from findings, performance relative to statewide mean, and actions to be taken to promote improvement. Good insights on efforts already underway to diversify the cohort.</li><li>• Clear information provided about how findings are shared with multiple stakeholders.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider adding a note of whether these outcomes were assessed to address prior year's findings/interventions, or if this is part of a normal assessment cycle. Not noting this does not detract from the quality of the report in any way, but may be helpful as a historical record for faculty in the department looking back.</li></ul>

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.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>