

## Masters in Administration

Faculty Responsible for Writing Report: Doug Ebersold

Date: 5/6/2015

### Program Demographics:

William Woods University						
Assessment Data						
<b>Program: MED Admin.</b>						
		Academic Year				
		10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
<b>Declared Majors</b>	Incoming Students	-	-	22??	60??	24??
	Total	438	405	372	393	305
	Graduate Enrollment	1,426	1,301	1,206	1,125	1,025
<b>Number of Cohorts</b>		61	65	55	55	42
<b>Graduated Majors (9/1-8/30)</b>		404	246	255	299	NA
		Cohort Year				
<b>Graduation Rate:<sup>1</sup></b>		07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
<b>Graduate College</b>		90.7%	94.2%	94.5%	88.1%	NA
<b>Program</b>		96.9%	95.5%	97.4%	94.0%	NA
<sup>1</sup> = % of students completing program within 3 years						

## **Program Objectives**

Objective 1: Education leaders have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.

Objective 2: Education leaders have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program that applies best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans.

Objective 3: Education leaders have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Objective 4: Education leaders have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Objective 5: Education leaders have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by acting with integrity and in an ethical manner.

Objective 6: Education leaders remain current on best practices in education administration and school-related areas as evidenced by establishing a plan for his/her professional development each year.

## Assessment Matrix

	EDU500: Current Issues	EDU520: Research Design	EDU525: Foundations of Educational Administration	EDU535/536: Elem/Sec Administration	EDU545/546: Elem/Sec Curriculum	EDU557: Field Experience I	EDU570: Supervision	EDU580: Educational Technology	EDU590: Appraisal of Student Learning	EDU 597 FE II, Portfolio, School Improvement	EDU 585 School Law
Objective 1			Barrier Research Paper								NCLB Research Project
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible for data			90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.								90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.
Objective 2					Curr. Eval. Paper		MO Educator Eval. Tool				
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible for data					90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.		90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.				
Objective 3				Scheduling & Staffing Critique							Missouri Safe Schools Act
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible for data				90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.							90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.
Objective 4				Community Relations Plan	Analysis of Demographics FE Activity						
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible				90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on	90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the						

for data				the paper.	paper.						
Objective 5							Release of Tenured Teacher				Landmark Supreme Ct on Desegregation
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible for data							90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.				90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.
Objective 6			Administrat or Interview Reflection				Growth & Improvement Plan				
Benchmark/ term  Faculty responsible for data			90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.				90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper.				

## Assessment Results

	Analysis of Assessment Year: 2014-15	Action Taken	Analysis of Assessment year 2014-15	Action Taken
Objective 1	EDU 525: Barrier Research Paper 2014-15: 86 students. 100% of students met benchmark	None as benchmark was met.	EDU585: NCLB Research Project 2014-15: 97 students. 100% of student met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.
Objective 2	EDU545/546: Curriculum Evaluation 2014-15: 100 students. 99% of students met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.	EDU570: MO Educator Evaluation Tool 2014-15: 75 students. 100% of students met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.
Objective 3	EDU535/536: Scheduling and Staffing Critique 2014-15: 50 students. 100% of student met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.	EDU585: Safe Schools Act 2014-15: 97 students. 100% of students met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.
Objective 4	EDU535/536: Community Relations Plan 2014-15: 50 students. 100% of student met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.	EDU545/546: Analysis of Demographics 2014-15: 55 students. 100% of student met benchmark.	None as benchmark was met.
Objective 5	EDU 570: Release of Tenured Teacher 2014-15: 86 students. 100% of students met benchmark	None as benchmark was met.	EDU 585: Landmark Supreme Court Case 2014-15: 97 students. 100% of students met benchmark	None as benchmark was met.
Objective 6	EDU 570: Growth and Improvement Plan 2014-15: 75 students. 99% of students met benchmark	None as benchmark was met.	EDU 525: Administrator Interview 2014-15: 68 students. 100% of students met benchmark	None as benchmark was met.

### Analysis of the Assessment Process:

All data was collected through TK20 from course assessments during the last calendar year. Each assessment matches one or more standards. Assessments were selected that best meet the standard definition. Faculty are involved in course and assessment development along with scoring guide development to help with the consistency of expectations for grading.

### Assessment Evaluation:

Assessment Component	Assessment Reflects Best Practices	Assessment Meets the Expectations of the University	Assessment Needs Development	Assessment is Inadequate
Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes are aligned to national standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measurable program learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are clearly articulated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes have been identified and are somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes are not clear or measurable

			measurable	
<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures are used to assess a student-learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Rubrics or guides used are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> All measurements are clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific measures are clearly identified <input type="checkbox"/> Measures relate to program learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures can provide useful information about student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some measurements are described, but need further description.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures do not connect to learning outcomes (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures are not clear. <input type="checkbox"/> No assessment measures are established.
<b>Assessment Results</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> All learning outcomes are assessed annually; or a rotation schedule is provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Data are collected and analyzed to evaluate prior actions to improve student learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for performance and gaps in student learning are clearly identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> A majority of learning outcomes assessed annually. <input type="checkbox"/> Data collected and aggregated are linked to specific learning outcome(s). <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for student performance and gaps in student learning are recognized.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data collected and aggregated for at least one learning outcome (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Data collection is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for student performance and gaps in student learning are not identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are not routinely assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Routine data is not collected. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program is too new to have collected assessment data.
<b>Faculty Analysis and Conclusions</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions about student learning are made and changes outlined to improve student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific conclusions about student learning are made with discussion on improvement, but no detailed plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific conclusions about student learning are noted with no plan for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions about student learning are not identified. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes.
<b>Actions to Improve Learning and Assessment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A comprehensive understanding of the program's assessment plan and suggestions for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated adjustments in curriculum as a result of assessment data. <input type="checkbox"/> Actions are innovative in	<input type="checkbox"/> Description of the action to improve learning or assessment is specific and relates directly to faculty conclusions about areas for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of action includes a timetable for implementation and identifies who is responsible for action	<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustments to the assessment plan are proposed but not clearly connected to data <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal discussion of the effectiveness of the assessment plan; minimal discussion of changes, if	<input type="checkbox"/> No actions are taken to improve student learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Actions discussed are not connected to data results or analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes.

	approach in attempt to improve student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Actions are realistic, with a good probability of improving learning or assessment.	needed.	
--	--	--	---------	--

Additional Comments:

Program objectives are determined by the state of Missouri and used as part of each of the master's programs from what I understand. Thank you that each objective has 2 different identified artifacts. They need to more detailed in the definition, but we will work on it.

Need to identify any missing data and explain the numbers of students as the range is pretty large. What is the strategy for data management for the program? What external assessments are used for students in this program? Isn't there is a test they must take for the state of Missouri??

The program needs to link the assessment in the assignments to the larger picture of student learning and the program objectives. Also, assignments and tasks that the program is asking students should constantly be under revision to make it as relative and accurate as possible at meeting the needs of students. The program shows 100% success with coursework, but what strategies are used to make sure we are getting 10%, and does this score correlate with the state of Missouri numbers on the exams that they take?