

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: MED in School Administration **Contact Name(s) and Email(s):** Bobbie Jo Monahan bmonahan@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>ELCC Standard Element 2.1</p> <p>Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:</p> <p>Demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p> <p>Engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Justification of Standards:</p>	<p>Final Examination-<i>Essay Assignment Reflection of Reframing the Path to School Leadership</i></p> <p>Students will read <i>Reframing the Path to School Leadership</i> by Bolman and Deal, (2019). Students will reflect on their own personal and professional experiences and write an essay describing a leader from each of the four frames discussed in the text. Students should describe the leader, but can give them a different name. The essay should be 5-6 pages (APA format, title page optional).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Final Internship Evaluation, field based assessment completed by the site placement supervisor</p>	<p>100% of students would be at meets or exceeds level.</p>	<p><u>Spring 2019</u> 2 students-4.00 Exceeds 10 students-3.00 Meets</p> <p><u>Summer 2019</u> 18 students-3.00 Meets</p> <p>AND</p> <p><u>Spring 2019</u> 19 students-4.00 Exceeds 13 students-3.00 Meets 1 student-2.00 Developing</p>	<p>As the program director, I have consistently continued to develop, articulate, and discuss the importance of the school culture and the leader's role in collaborating and earning stakeholder trust to enhance the learning and teaching environment by collaborating with all faculty who teach in the program.</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 Building-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>ELCC Standard Element 5.1</p> <p>Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:</p> <p>Engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>LONG TERM ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT</p> <p>During the internship, in addition to the daily activities, interns undertake one major action research project that will help a school wide issue at the host school of their internship.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Final Internship Evaluation, field based assessment completed by the site placement supervisor</p>	<p>100% of students would be at meets or exceeds level.</p>	<p><u>Spring 2019</u> 5 students-4.00 Exceeds 23 students-3.00 Meets 7 students-2.00-Developing</p> <p>AND</p> <p><u>Spring 2019</u> 23 students-4.00 Exceeds 9 students-3.00 Meets</p>	<p>Advocating and sustaining a developing culture and instructional program conducive to student learning have been strong points in the program. However, having seven students score in the Developing indicates a need to discuss improvements needed.</p> <p>There are several possible suggestions for this data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Intern Students may not have completed research by due date-ongoing research. -Intern Student Leader Mentor may have hindered the findings and conclusion of the research. -Determine the measurement of “mastery of the skills” as a

<p>Achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p> <p>Justification of Standards:</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 Building-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>K-12 Department focus discussion to research possible solutions.</p>
<p>ELCC Standard Element 6.3</p> <p>Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:</p> <p>Demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Final Exam</p> <p>“The final exam will be comprehensive in nature and will cover the all of the units studied. The student will be responsible for any material discussed in the videos, chapters assigned in the text, discussions, and APA units of study. The final exam may include matching, true/false, or multiple choice questions as well as short answer, essay, or vignette questions.”</p>	<p>100% of students would be at meets or exceeds level.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2018</u> 19 students-4.00 Exceeds 6 students-3.00 Meets</p> <p><u>Summer 2019</u> 13 students-4.00 Exceeds</p>	<p>As the program director, I have consistently continued to develop, articulate, and discuss the importance of the school culture and the leader’s role in collaborating and earning stakeholder trust to enhance the learning and teaching environment to adapt school-based strategies. I will continue to collaborate with all faculty who teach in the program.</p>

<p>Engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Justification of Standards:</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 Building-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>				
---	--	--	--	--

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	2) Year-to-Year Retention	3) 5-Year Graduation Rate
53	71.43%	

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 building-level leadership professional standards. These standards and the curriculum focus on essential student needs to develop specific skills in collaborating, accountability, and professional development in curriculum, instruction, and assessment, as well as emphasizing the essentials of professionalism, ethics, interpersonal skills, problem solving, critical thinking, and assessing emerging trends. 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.

Qualitatively, the responses from students in all courses and the Principal Internship Experience have been overwhelming positive (Blue Course Ratings). The advisement and mentoring throughout the program continues to be strong (consistent numbers in the program annually, Spring 2017-57 students, Fall 2017-50 students, Spring 2018-52 students, Fall 2018-53 students, Spring 2019-56 students).

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 heightened expectations for GPA (i.e., from 2.5 to 3.0). 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.

University data is showing 71.43% Year-to-Year Retention, which could be problematic for the MED Administration and Supervision program at face value. The program is currently year-round open enrollment. The culminating experience is at the end of the program-The Internship. At this time, the students in the program become a cohort of interns for both fall and spring consecutive semesters. Several students may have summer courses to complete the program after the internship experience. In addition, several students in the program have a master's degree and are seeking certification only, so they may not need as many courses as those seeking the Master of Education.

Blue Reports does not identify the Non-Degree students who are part of the internship cohort as separate, therefore, it is difficult to identify those students who are either on the Non-Degree track or have courses to complete the program after the internship.

One way to improve the tracking of the program completers and retention rate, would be to track all students internally and identify those who complete and when, and those who are Non-Degree seeking certification only.

[Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities](#)

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

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 building level vision. Additionally, candidates evidence the knowledge and understanding to create and evaluate a comprehensive instructional program and build leadership teams for collaboration. Both strengths support two building leadership imperatives for success – a team approach and instructional leadership. In terms of findings-based plans and actions, the Indiana State University test mean of 233.3, while above expectations, is below the statewide mean of 243.2. 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 superintendent's conference, in which about 200 district leaders attend. Elements of this report will also be shared.

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.

Dear Bobbie Jo,

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: M.Ed. School Administration	Overall Rating: Mature (2.69/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable. They are aligned to both Graduate Student Learning Outcomes and ELCC Standards. This is one the best examples I've seen of this.• Assessment methods and courses are clearly noted. A diverse array of student performances are captured for each outcome from different points of view, allowing for a variety of insights into student learning.• Clear information provided about expected and actual student outcomes. Good information provided about evaluative tools for outcome 2.1.• Fantastic insights into why 7 students scored below expectations on outcome 5.1.• Good discussion of student success and recruitment initiatives. Really interesting note about the influence of non-degree-seeking students on your data. It's a great idea to internally differentiate so you can compare those groups.• Clear information provided about how findings are shared publicly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider noting if these outcomes were assessed in response to prior findings/interventions or as part of a regular assessment cycle. Not doing so does not diminish the quality of the report in any way – it just may help provide a historical record for faculty reading/using the report in the future.• For outcome 6.3 it is noted that a comprehensive final exam was used as the measure of student learning. If the exam addresses more than just outcome 6.3, make sure that only the student scores on questions aligned to this outcome are reported in the findings so they reflect what you intend to learn.• A little more information about how the assignments for outcome 5.1 were evaluated would help make this process clearer (e.g., was a rubric used similar to that used in 2.1?).• It would be great to see more action planning based on your insights into why 7 students scored below expectations on outcome 5.1. I think you're on to something regarding the challenge of doing research and working with mentors possibly influencing the scores. Is it possible to use a rubric to assess just the portion of the project related to the outcome rather than the research methods in order to get a picture of learning, even in ongoing projects?

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. (some)</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. <i>(some)</i></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. <i>(some)</i></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 type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped