Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program Name: _Ed.S. in School Administration_ **Contact Name and Email** _Terry McDaniel, Program Director, and Ryan Donlan, Assessment Coordinator

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome*** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
ELCC Standard Element 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **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**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	*Predictions and Reflections on Data:* 1.1 – The standard asks four questions in one, so there is great difficulty in looking at all four. In fact, in the older version of Standard 1, these competencies were spread among four or five Standard Elements, yet they are now compressed. This gets confusing to predict in that we must ask ourselves, "Where do you draw the line?" What if a person can do three of four (everything but stewarding, for example). We try to see that through our Internship program, our students master them through a number of projects, and we try to take responsibility for reinforcing all of them, but these are a big bite to swallow.	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

(including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.				
			1.1 Score of 4: 7 (47%) Score of 3: 6 (40%) Score of 2: 2 (13%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) ***Interpretations and Further Thoughts*** 87% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. *Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building.* *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a*	

			1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.	
ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **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.**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	***Predictions and Reflections on Data:*** 1.2 – We were thinking that candidates would struggle more here than anywhere else. The key is for them to "assess" organizational effectiveness, and this really asks them to widen their pan. As a building administrator, part of their responsibility is to look at data, but asking them to look at data for an entire school district may be tough. They can judge whether the overall district is using their building's data, as they have that perspective, yet again, widening the pan is an admitted challenge for them. 1.2 Score of 4: 8 (53%) Score of 3: 6 (40%) Score of 2: 1 (7%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) ***Interpretations and Further Thoughts*** 93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. *Across all of these Standard*	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

			Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building. *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.*	
ELCC Standard Element 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	***Predictions and Reflections on Data:*** 1.3 – This one is almost a given, as it focuses on continual and sustainable school district improvement. Although candidates have been tied to their schools, and although they are	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available

			interns at this point, they are learning through their coursework and internship what continual and sustainable school improvement is all about. Plus, their in-house professional development focuses on this as well. This one, we feel would have more 3's than 4's, as again as before, widening the pan, even with this professional focus, is a challenge in terms of transcending one's own organizational level (elementary, middle, high).	at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.
Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: **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.**			1.3 Score of 4: 6 (40%) Score of 3: 9 (60%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) ***Interpretations and Further Thoughts*** 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. *Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved*	

			in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building. *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.*	
ELCC Standard Element 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.** **Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	***Predictions and Reflections on Data:*** 1.4 –Again this is an easier one for them to transition from as a building principal. They have done this over and over each year, because they have been asked to look at what they have done and adjust. The transition to looking at district-level progress is what they are doing anyway. Our coursework, EDLR 751 does a really good job of helping with that. 1.4 Score of 4: 9 (60%) Score of 3: 6 (40%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

			higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.	
			Interpretations and Further Thoughts	
			Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building.	
			Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.	

| Standard Element 2.1: Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:

Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.

Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.

Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.

Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession. | Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship. | 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. | *Predictions and Reflections on Data:*

We're talking about sustaining a district culture, and that's the job of a building principal. Principals don't have any choice; if you don't do this, you're out of a job. Thus, we forecasted good scores, as principals come in to our program with solid competencies here. Principals are always looking at their school's achievement, then tying it into the culture and developing the personnel. EDLR 751 puts it all together. The excellent rating there is one of the highest.

2.1
Score of 4: 13 (87%)
Score of 3: 2 (13%)
Score of 2: 0 (0%)
Score of 1: 0 (0%)

Interpretations and Further Thoughts

100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.

Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active | Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting. |

			participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building. *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.*	
ELCC Standard Element 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.** **Students achieve mastery of the skills**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	***Predictions and Reflections on Data:*** 2.2 – This one, however, is a little different than 2.1. The district is a leap from the building here. Being a building principal helps, but the one catch that comes with this one, is that you have to learn to be comfortable outside your structure. If you're an elementary person, you have to think in terms of a secondary curriculum, which gets a little tougher. It is a key element for us to be teaching, because that is the big transition between the principalship and the superintendency. You can't look	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

| **(including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.** | | | at just part of the picture. The superstars are able to do this, because they know that we are talking about a k-12 curriculum that really needs to flow together. Heavy emphasis in having them look at the whole curricular program is our goal in this area.

2.2
Score of 4: 10 (66%)
Score of 3: 4 (27%)
Score of 2: 1 (7%)
Score of 1: 0 (0%)

Interpretations and Further Thoughts

93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.

Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. | |

			So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building. *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.*	
ELCC Standard Element 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.** **Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.** **Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	*Predictions and Reflections on Data:* 2.3 – Almost a mirror of 2.2, when we think about it. About the only difference here, is that school leaders can oftentimes do it on paper, but the sometimes struggle with the leadership capacity to take what looks good on paper and lead people. Sometimes, as our program is leadership, the importance of what we have to do in the Ed.S. program is to ensure school leader can advance the organizations instructional capacity with people and personnel, as well as on paper. Our EDLR 751 coursework is key to this: Can you hire the right people, put them in the right place, and have them lead others in terms of culture and instructional program? That is what we ask of ourselves, and of our candidates. 2.3 Score of 4: 8 (53%)	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

Score of 3: 6 (40%)
Score of 2: 1 (7%)
Score of 1: 0 (0%)

Interpretations and Further Thoughts

93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.

Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building.

Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists),

			and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.	
ELCC Standard Element 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district. **Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:** **Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.** **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.**	Central Office Portfolio Project/Assignment in EDLR 790-792 – Superintendent/Central Office Internship.	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.	***Predictions and Reflections on Data:*** 2.4 – This one is difficult to gauge, without knowing where the candidates' local circumstances lie. The trick with technology is this: It really depends on the district's focus on technology. We're seeing a lot more where some schools are developing their technology in progressive and robust ways, and some are not. Some districts have the vision that technology is something that is of its own nature, and only use it to replace textbooks. We do a good job in talking about technology's use as a tool, yet we have a ways further to go in ensuring that people can make the adjustment to technology as a seamless part of their instruction and their lives. One example – iPads versus Chromebooks are infused in everything a school does, yet in another, they cite One-on-one use of technology, but students can't take them home. 2.4 Score of 4: 7 (47%) Score of 3: 7 (47%) Score of 2: 1 (6%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) ***Interpretations and Further Thoughts*** 94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established	Terry McDaniel was responsible for collecting the data after analysis of performance on assessment task; Ryan Donlan tabulated the data, and Ryan Donlan and Terry McDaniel analyzed the data, sharing with program faculty intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings and finalized our interpretation on May 17, 2016 at a program meeting.

			for achievement of this outcome. *Across all of these Standard Elements, including this one, we found that most of these students, by the time they are ready for their internship, to score at least meeting expectations or exceeding. They have been through the training, specific to content areas (EdS) and if we look back to Standards 1 and 2, these individuals have been building level administrators, so they have been active participants within their programs. In most all cases, if you are a building administrator, you are going to be very involved in vision, mission, planning, and data to determine whether the school is meeting its goals. These school leaders are going to be very involved in that they are the ones who have the ultimate responsibilities for their students. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality the leads on those in each building.* *Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 were be those individuals who are coming through the program who have not been building level administrators (psychologists, teachers, or reading specialists), and we will need to find ways to make additional contextual connections for them during their coursework and internship.*	
Indiana Superintendent Licensure Composite Scores	Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam	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.	Currently, 12.14 (86%) candidates passed the Indiana Superintendent Licensure Exam in the period from June 1, 2015 to May 24, 2016.	The office staff of Judy Sheese was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Terry McDaniel, Bobbie Jo Monahan, and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results.

				They are the subject of ongoing review in Program Meetings, as these results are provided, on time, on a weekly basis to the Bayh College of Education.
Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).				

* See https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf.

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

Notes
   a.   Use your outcomes library as a reference.
   b.   Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
   c.   Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
   d.   Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
   e.   This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Narrative in the following section, in answer to the questions above, is gleaned from department review of assessment results, which include informal, indirect feedback from candidates in our program and stakeholders in the field, as well as faculty program meeting reflections and conversations:

(1) <u>Discoveries assessment have allowed us to make about student learning</u>: We have learned through assessment, and we continue to learn and understand that our students come to our program with a strong knowledge base regarding vision, mission, culture, data, etc. But we realize that time and time again, the level of understanding varies greatly depending upon their past professional experiences and the emphasis placed on these Standard Elements by their districts. Some share that they are fulfilled because we have provided them a lot of knowledge that they had not received in the past. The thing that amazes us about our program, is that these professionals come to the Ed.S. program because they WANT to learn. To have a 1 or 2 on our rubric is very rare, because we simply do not have people who are investing at lower levels in this degree; they wish to be district-level leaders at the time of enrollment. Even superstars know that this degree will provide them the knowledge and skills to be a central office administrator or superintendent, and they are wanting to know more. Assessment bears-this-out.

<u>Discoveries assessment have allowed us to make about curriculum</u>: Assessment has shown us that there is a great emphasis on the development of human resources in our program. We are discovering more and more the importance of understanding the complexities in working with people. The administration of school personnel goes much deeper than the basics of salaries, benefits, etc. – to personalities, to fitting in to the culture, to ownership of what they are expected to do and transparency in their actions. There has been a change in recent years in terms of knowing and understanding the difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership, and understanding exactly what each means. Assessment has made us look at curriculum in those areas very carefully. We have seen an increased importance and greater emphasis in three other courses we offer – finances, budgeting, and facilities. Those are incredibly important for persons wanting to be central office administrators and superintendents. So many schools are looking at losing students, and we must focus more on public relations and marketing skills in our candidates-- to bring in students to their schools in order to increase enrollment and financial solvency. Another discovery has occurred in the school facilities and planning course; it has greatly changed because now the names of the game, more than ever, are referendums. All of the intricacies of going through a referendum -- marketing, public relations legal issues, and resource procurement -- are critical for superintendents and school districts to survive and thrive. This changes annually because each year the legislation changes. Informal indirect assessment has also shown us what we need to add to our courses: Built-in to all of our classes must be the legal element, to ensure that students understand the legal issues that pertain to their districts that did not necessarily pertain to them as a building principal: i.e. special dealings with referendums, negotiations, collective bargaining, budgeting, etc. It is becoming more and more incumbent on us to have more resources available to candidates through our program and for us to stress to them to build those relationships to get answers to the problems we have. One can't be an expert in all areas, because the subject matter is too large.

<u>Discoveries assessment have allowed us to make about departmental processes</u>: Our departmental processes must continue to be refined and to grow in terms of the time spent together with leaders in the field. For our Ed.S. program specifically, we are discovering that as professors and instructors of educational leadership, we are not in daily contact with school corporations. Some of the skills and abilities have to be supplemented by people in the field. The need to bring in speakers and the need to have adjuncts in critical areas such as budget, are of paramount importance. We have to continue to develop our curriculum so that we are most current with what is happening in schools. We also have realized that our program cannot concentrate alone on the state of Indiana. We have to be more a nationwide and worldwide program, with principals across the United States and in Saudi Arabia.

<u>Discoveries regarding the Assessment Plan itself</u>: We are finding it very difficult to manage two sets of Standards (one mandated by Indiana and another mandated by our Specialized Program Association (SPA) National Recognition Group), and then to select one over the other for purposes of internal reporting, as the concepts embedded within the standard elements do not crosswalk well. We are particularly grateful of the opportunity for a once-per-year snapshot, rather than the quarterly reporting under the former system, as we work to make sense of what we are to do, and how we are to do it. What we very much like about our assessment processes are the monthly opportunities to have discussions regarding how we are doing

in program meetings, and having these conversations in quarterly department meetings as well. We find that ISU assessment office has always been supportive of us, as we wish to learn, grow, and improve through assessment.

(2) Changes and Improvements – We would like to make an improvement in our program by strengthening specifically the teaching of "curricular leadership," because the curriculum classes offered in our program are offered by another department, and we would like these taught by educational leaders in our program. We would also like to see a change of requirements in our program from the focus on advanced child psychology, to more the focus on adult psychology. Feedback from our candidates reveals that we do not have this enough of this course content in our Ed.S.

(3) Assessment Plan, Next Year: In the coming year, our Assessment Plan will focus on realigning itself with a new outcomes library to align with SPA expectations, as we have realigned the Standard Elements (divided by knowledge standard elements and skills standard elements) among courses, and we do not know whether we are going to keep the current rotation of two Standards (with corresponding Standard Elements). This will be the subject of summer 2016 discussions, and we are excited to embrace the challenge. Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).

Ed.S.
MASTER RUBRIC
ELCC District-Level Leadership Rubric
Department of Educational Leadership
Indiana State University

	Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
ELCC Standard Element 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ collaborative district visioning; ♦ theories relevant to building, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a district vision; ♦ methods for involving district stakeholders in the visioning process. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ design and support a collaborative process for developing and implementing a district vision; ♦ articulating a district vision of learning characterized by a respect for students and their families and community partnerships; ♦ develop a comprehensive plan for communicating the district vision to appropriate district constituencies; ♦ formulate plans to steward district vision statements.
ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates understand and	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the purposes and processes for

can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.	collecting, analyzing, and using appropriate district data to drive decision making that effects student learning; ♦ designing and using assessment data for learning; ♦ organizational effectiveness and learning strategies; ♦ tactical and strategic program planning; ♦ implementation and evaluation of district improvement processes; ♦ variables that affect student achievement.
Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; ♦ create district-based strategic, tactical, and strategic goals; ♦ collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals; ♦ evaluate district improvement processes.
ELCC Standard Element 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ continual and sustained district improvement models and processes; ♦ strategic district management of human capital and its effect on continual and sustainable improvement; ♦ district change processes for continual and sustainable improvement. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to:
Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	♦ identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity to support continual and sustainable district improvement; ♦ identify strategies for developing district leadership capacity; ♦ create a district plan to implement transformational change; ♦ design a comprehensive, district-level

	professional development program.
ELCC Standard Element 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ effective strategies for monitoring the implementation and revision of plans to achieve district improvement goals and program evaluation models. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ develop a district plan to monitor program development and implementation of district goals; ♦ construct evaluation processes to assess the effectiveness of district plans and programs; ♦ interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement of district vision and goals for educators in the district community and other stakeholders.
ELCC Standard Element 2.1: Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration,	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ theories on human development behavior, personalized learning environment, and motivation; ♦ district culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ lead district change and collaboration that focuses on improvements to district practices, student outcomes, curriculum, and instruction; ♦ incorporate cultural competence in

trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; ♦ use learning management systems to support personalized learning across the district; ♦ develop comprehensive programs that meet the unique learning needs and interests of diverse student populations and school personnel across the district; ♦ promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among school board members, school administrators, faculty, parents, students, and the district community.
ELCC Standard Element 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program. **Scores:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ curriculum development and instructional delivery theories; ♦ measures of teacher performance; ♦ multiple methods of program evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of evidence. ♦ district technology and information systems to support and monitor student learning. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ align curriculum and instruction with district assessments; ♦ collaborate with faculty across the district to plan, implement, and evaluate a coordinated, aligned, and articulated curriculum; ♦ use evidence-centered research in making curricular and instructional decisions; ♦ provide district resources to support quality curriculum and instruction; ♦ design district evaluation systems, make

Knowledge: **Skills:**	district plans based on multiple measures of teacher performance and student outcomes, and provide feedback based on evidence.
ELCC Standard Element 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ high-quality professional development for school staff and leaders; ♦ instructional leadership practices; ♦ leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation; ♦ district systems that promote effective and efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ collaboratively develop plans to improve the district's effect on teaching and learning; ♦ design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction within the district; ♦ facilitate school leadership through development of district activities that focus on teaching and student learning; ♦ design district-level professional growth plans to increase the capacity of school staff and leaders that reflect national professional development standards; ♦ use a variety of district approaches to improve school staff performance; ♦ develop district systems for effective and efficient management of policies, procedures, and practices.
ELCC Standard Element 2.4: Candidates	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ technology and its uses for instruction

understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	within the district; ♦ infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of district instructional technology. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ use technologies to enrich district curriculum and instruction; ♦ monitor instructional practices across the district and provide assistance to school administrators; ♦ use district technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate district data results for accountability reporting.
ELCC Standard Element 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ district management of organizational, operational, and legal resources; ♦ district management of marketing and public relations functions. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ analyze district processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the district; ♦ develop district operational policies and procedures; ♦ develop plans to implement and manage long-range goals for the district; ♦ develop plans to create and sustain strategic alignment throughout the district.

ELCC Standard Element 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ methods and procedures for managing district resources, including the strategic management of human capital, district operations, and facilities; ♦ alignment of resources to district priorities and forecasting resource requirements for the district; ♦ technology and management systems. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ develop multi-year fiscal plans and annual budgets aligned to the district's priorities and goals; ♦ analyze a district's budget and financial status; ♦ develop facility and space utilization plans for the district; ♦ project long-term resource needs of a district; ♦ use technology to manage district operational systems.
Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	
ELCC Standard Element 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ district strategies supporting safe and secure learning environments including prevention, crisis management, and public relations; ♦ district strategies supporting student development of self-management, civic literacy, and positive leadership skills; ♦ district-based discipline management policies and plans. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ improve and implement district policies and procedures for safe and secure central office and school-work environments (including district office, school personnel, students, and visitors)

Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	that encompass crisis planning and management; ♦ evaluate and implement district-wide discipline management plan.
ELCC Standard Element 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the meaning of distributed leadership in a district environment and how to create and sustain it. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels within the district; ♦ model distributed leadership skills; ♦ involve district and school personnel in decision-making processes.
ELCC Standard Element 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning. .	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ supervision strategies that ensure that teachers across the district maximize time spent on high-quality instruction and student learning; ♦ management theories on effective district time, priorities, and schedules. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ develop district policies that protect instructional time and schedules; ♦ develop district calendars and schedules.

Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	
ELCC Standard Element 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district's educational environment. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ collaboration and communication techniques to improve the district's educational environment; ♦ information pertinent to the district's educational environment. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret information pertinent to the district environment; ♦ communicate information about the district environment to the community.
ELCC Standard Element 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ district cultural competence; ♦ diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within a district community. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ identify and use diverse community resources to improve district programs.

community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	
ELCC Standard Element 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the needs of students, parents, and caregivers; ♦ district organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers; ♦ district strategies for effective oral and written communication with families and caregivers; ♦ district collaboration methods for productive relationships with families and caregivers. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ conduct needs assessments of families and caregivers within the district; ♦ develop collaboration strategies for effective district relationships with families and caregivers; ♦ involve families and caregivers in district decision making about their students' education.
ELCC Standard Element 4.4:	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of:

Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive district relationships with community partners. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	♦ the needs of district community partners; ♦ district organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners; ♦ district strategies for effective oral and written communication with community partners; ♦ district collaboration methods for productive relationships with community partners. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ conduct needs assessment of district community partners; ♦ develop effective relationships with a variety of district community partners; ♦ involve community partners in the decision making processes within the district.
ELCC Standard Element 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student's academic and social success. **Scores:** **Knowledge:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ practices demonstrating principles of integrity and fairness; ♦ federal, state, and local legal and policy guidelines to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice within the district. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ act with integrity and fairness in supporting district policies and staff practices that ensure every student's academic and social success; ♦ create an infrastructure that helps to monitor and ensure equitable district practices.

Skills:	
ELCC Standard Element 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the basic principles of ethical behavior established by legal and professional organizations; ♦ the relationship between ethical behavior, district culture, and student achievement; ♦ the effect of ethical behavior on one's own leadership. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ formulate a district-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices; ♦ analyze district leadership decisions in terms of established ethical practices.
Scores: **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	
ELCC Standard Element 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ democratic values, equity, and diversity. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ develop, implement, and evaluate district policies and procedures that

diversity within the district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	support democratic values, equity, and diversity issues; ♦ develop appropriate communication skills to advocate of democracy, equity, and diversity.
ELCC Standard Element 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ moral and legal consequences of decision making in districts; ♦ strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ formulate sound district strategies to educational dilemmas; ♦ evaluate district strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues.
ELCC Standard Element 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the relationship between social justice, district culture, and student achievement; ♦ theories of efficacy. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ review and critique district policies,

student needs inform all aspects of schooling. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	programs, and practices to ensure that student needs inform all aspects of schooling, including social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty within the district; ♦ develop the resiliency to uphold core values and persist in the face of adversity.
ELCC Standard Element 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local, and federal authorities that affect districts; ♦ the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and lack of resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students, and learning. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ analyze how district law and policy is applied consistently, fairly, and ethically; ♦ advocate based on an analysis of the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages; ♦ serve as a respectful spokesperson for students and families served by the district.
ELCC Standard Element 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state,	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; ♦ ways that power and political skills can influence local, state, and federal decisions.

and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ advocate for district policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities for student success; ♦ communicate policies, laws/regulations, and procedures to appropriate district stakeholders.
ELCC Standard Element 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies. **Scores:** **Knowledge:** **Skills:**	**Content Knowledge** Candidate demonstrates knowledge of: ♦ future issues and trends that can affect districts (e.g., entrepreneurial approaches); ♦ contemporary and emerging district leadership strategies to address trends. **Professional Leadership Skills** Candidate demonstrates skills required to: ♦ identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the district; ♦ adapt district leadership strategies and practice to address emerging district issues.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: EdS in School Adminstration   Date: 7.18.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified.	☐ An Outcomes Library was provided. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. ☐ Some of the outcomes are student-centered. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☒ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. As you note, some need to be separated/simplified. ☐ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. ☒ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. What's in the portfolio? ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. But it's the same one…. ☐ Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☒ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☒ Measures assess some <u>high impact practices</u> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure

				provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. The rubric provided does not identify specific traits assessed. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected. ☐ Some data are being analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☒ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☒ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. 1 collects, 2 analyze. ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to

			established timelines.
☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	connect to the results or are too vague to implement. ☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☒ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☐ **Level 1 - Developing**	☒ **Level 2 – Mature** ☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

In next year's report, please include a link to important supporting documents rather than attaching them.

1. **Learning Outcomes**
    The eight outcomes assessed this year are clear and measurable, though as you note, some embed multiple competencies in one outcome, which can complicate their assessment. You might also consider shortening them so that they cut to the chase: "Candidates develop. . .a shared district vision." I appreciate your specific explanations as to HOW students will demonstrate knowledge and your direct links to the graduate learning goals, and I look forward to seeing your new outcomes library. By the way, I have no qualms about your using the licensure exam as an outcome (e.g., students will earn at least an 80% pass rate…) since the exam is a criterion-referenced, cumulative measure required for employment in the field. But you can use it as a measure for some other outcome if you prefer.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
    I would like to have more information about what's in the portfolio so that I can vouch for its validity and understand how the attached rubric is used to assess it. Since you're using it to assess all eight outcomes, this is particularly important. I note your argument that using a single measure is the only practical way to assess a large number of individual outcomes. But since this one rubric does not identify the traits that accord with each level of rating, it does not provide detailed information about what learners know/can do that would justify the score awarded. Clarifying your expectations on the rubric would help, but as it's already quite long, you may want to reduce its focus and incorporate some of the other assessment measures listed on your new curriculum map. About the map: Does it suggest all outcomes are fully covered? Why are none of them assessed in 753 or 754? Last, thank you for noting that you have plans to develop an indirect measure.

3. **Results**
    I am impressed by how well you understand the impact of learners' individual backgrounds on their ability to achieve the outcomes-- and they do achieve the standards you set for them, as these results and those on the licensure exam show. In this section, there is no need for you to repeat the same interpretations and further thoughts. If this commentary is pertinent to all eight outcomes, why not just include it once in Part Two?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
    While a single person collects the data and two analyze it, you indicate that the department as a whole is involved in reviewing results, and I was pleased to see that you do this several times a year, not just at the beginning or end of it. In the predictions section, you identify your expectations for performance based on your historical experience, but I did not see any specific comparison of this year's results to previous years'. Are they better? The same? If you've seen any fluctuations in student achievement, do you know why they occurred? Is there evidence that learning continuously improves? Also, while you provide a great deal of analysis and reflection about what your students and you have learned, little of it is specifically related to the assessment results you reported in Part One. Last, you note that you have discovered some opportunities for improvement (making additional contextual connections for those students who have not been building level supervisors; finding new ways to remain current with what's happening in the schools; taking over the teaching of the curricular leadership courses). I would like to hear more about the specifics of these plans as they relate to outcomes assessed this year, as well as any updates on the success of previously implemented changes. I look forward to learning more about your assessment program!