

Education Specialist in Administration

Faculty Responsible for Writing Report: Doug Ebersold

Date: 5/18/2016

| Program: Education Specialist-Administration | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | Academic Year | | | | | | |
| | | 10/11 | 11/12 | 12/13 | 13/14 | 14/15 | 15/16 | Change |
| Declared Majors | Incoming Students ¹ | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 31 | 17 | |
| (As of fall census) | Total | 223 | 248 | 240 | 206 | 159 | 212 | -4.9% |
| | Graduate Enrollment | 1,426 | 1,301 | 1,206 | 1,125 | 1,025 | 1,171 | -17.9% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Cohorts | | 75 | 63 | 53 | 40 | 26 | 30 | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated Majors | | | | | | | | |
| (9/1-8/30) | | 134 | 92 | 163 | 114 | 90 | NA | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cohort Year | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate: ² | | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 12/13 | |
| Graduate College | | 90.7% | 94.2% | 94.5% | 88.1% | 89.5% | NA | |
| Program | | 71.4% | 94.1% | 92.9% | 87.5% | 89.4% | NA | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| ¹ = students new to the program in the fall semester | | | | | | | | |
| ² = % of students graduating or obtaining a certificate from program within 3 years, students earning more than one degree are excluded from the analysis | | | | | | | | |

Program Objectives

Objective 1: Superintendents have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Objective 2: Superintendents have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by promoting a positive culture and an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

Objective 3: Superintendents have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by leading personnel and managing the organizational structure and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Objective 4: Superintendents 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: Superintendents have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by acting with integrity, responsibility and in an ethical manner.

Objective 6: Superintendents have the knowledge and ability to ensure the success of all students by understanding, responding to and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Objective 7: Superintendents 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.

| | EDU600: Issues in Sup't. | EDU610: Stat. Procedures in Ed. Research | EDU620: School and Community Relations | EDU640: Human Resources in Education | EDU653: Facilities and Safety | EDU657: Field Experience I | EDU650: Finances | EDU673: Educational Reform and Urban Ed. Issues | EDU690: Diff. and Supplemental Programs | EDU 697 FE II, School Portfolio Development | EDU 680 Advanced School Law |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Objective 1 | | | | | Bond Issue Promotion | | | | | Philosophy of Ed. Admin. | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | Urban Reform Model | Cohort Study Group Major Report | | |
| 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 | | BOE Report | | | | | Local Tax Revenue | | | | |
| 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 | | | School District Comm. Plan | | | | State Formula Assignment | | | | |
| 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 5 | | | | Group Project | Interview of | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | Presentation | Superintendent | | | | | | |
| Benchmark/ term | | | | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | | | | | | |
| Faculty responsible for data | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 6 | | | | Summary of HR Legislation | | | | Presentation on Budget Process | | | |
| Benchmark/ term | | | | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | | | | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | | | |
| Faculty responsible for data | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 7: | | | | PD Induction Mentoring Analysis | | | | Final Project PD Plan | | | |
| Benchmark/ term | | | | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | | | | 90% of students will receive a minimum of 80% on the paper. | | | |
| Faculty responsible for data | | | | | | | | | | | |

Assessment Results

| Results of Assessment | Analysis of Assessment: 2014-2015 | Action Taken | Analysis of Assessment 2015-2016 | Action Taken |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| Objective 1 | <p>EDU 653: Bond Issue Promotion 2014-15: 86 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU697: Philosophy of Ed. Admin. 2014-15: 38 students. 100% of student met benchmark</p> | None as benchmark was met. | <p>EDU 653: Bond Issue Promotion 2015-16: 76 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU697: Philosophy of Ed. Admin. 2015-16: 56 students. 100% of student met benchmark.</p> | None as benchmark was met. |
| Objective 2 | <p>EDU673: Education Reform Model 2014-15: 3 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU690: Cohort Study Group Major Report 2014-15: 46 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> | <p>Limited data collected, needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>None as benchmark was met</p> | <p>EDU673: Education Reform Model 2015-16: 60 students. 100% of students met benchmark.</p> <p>EDU690: Cohort Study Group Major Report 2015-16: 39 students. 100% of students met benchmark.</p> | None as benchmark was met. |
| Objective 3 | <p>EDU610: BOE Report 2014-15: 108 students. 100% of student met benchmark</p> <p>EDU650: Local Tax Revenue 2014-15: 6 students. 100% of students met benchmark.</p> | None as benchmark was met. | <p>EDU610: BOE Report 2015-16: 53 students. 100% of student met benchmark</p> <p>EDU650: Local Tax Revenue 2015-16: 71 students. 100% of students met benchmark.</p> | None as benchmark was met. |
| Objective 4 | <p>EDU620: School District Communication Plan 2014-15: 66 students. 100% of student met benchmark</p> <p>EDU650: State Formula Assignment 2014-15: 0 students.</p> | <p>None as benchmark was met.</p> <p>Benchmark was not met lack of data</p> | <p>EDU620: School District Communication Plan 2015-16: 90 students. 100% of student met benchmark</p> <p>EDU650: State Formula Assignment 2015-16: 68 students. 100% of student met benchmark.</p> | None as benchmark was met. |
| Objective 5 | <p>EDU 640: Group Project Presentation 2014-15: 86 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU 653: Superintendent Interview 2014-15: 97 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> | None as benchmark was met. | <p>EDU 640: Group Project Presentation 2015-16: 78 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU 653: Superintendent Interview 2015-16: 71 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> | None as benchmark was met. |
| Objective 6 | <p>EDU 640: Summary of HR Legislation 2014-15: 75 students. 99% of students met benchmark</p> | None as benchmark was met. | <p>EDU 640: Summary of HR Legislation 2015-16: 83 students. 100% of students met benchmark</p> <p>EDU 650: Presentation of Budget Process</p> | None as benchmark was met. |

| | | | | |
|-------------|--|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | EDU 525: Presentation of Budget Process 2014-15: 68 students. 100% of students met benchmark | | 2015-16: 67 students. 98.5% of students met benchmark | |
| Objective 7 | EDU 640: PD Induction Mentoring Analysis 2014-15: 75 students. 99% of students met benchmark EDU 673: Final Project PD Plan 2014-15: 75 students. 99% of students met benchmark | None as benchmark was met. | EDU 640: PD Induction Mentoring Analysis 2015-16: 54 students. 100% of students met benchmark EDU 673: Final Project PD Plan 2015-16: 26 students. 100% of students met benchmark | None as benchmark was met. |

Analysis of the Assessment Process:

Attached is additional data from our DESE and CAEP accreditation reports. 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 Rubric Annual Assessment Report

| Assessment Component | Assessment Reflects Best Practices | Assessment Meets the Expectations of the University | Assessment Needs Development | Assessment is Inadequate | Comments: |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| Learning Outcomes | <input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes are aligned to national standards | <input 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 measurable | <input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes are not clear or measurable | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures are used | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific measures are clearly | <input type="checkbox"/> Some measurements | <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Measures | <p>to assess a student-learning outcomes.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Rubrics or guides used are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> All measurements are clearly described. | <p>identified</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Measures relate to program learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures can provide useful information about student learning. | <p>are described, but need further description.</p> | <p>do not connect to learning outcomes (objectives).</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures are not clear. <input type="checkbox"/> No assessment measures are established. | |
| Assessment Results | <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. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assessment Component | Assessment Reflects Best Practices | Assessment meets the expectations of the University | Assessment needs Development | Assessment is Inadequate | Comments: |
| Faculty Analysis and Conclusions | <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. | <p>No discussion on gaps in student learning due to almost all objectives being at 100%</p> |
| Actions to Improve Learning and Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> A comprehensive understanding of the program's assessment plan and suggestions for improvement. | <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the action to improve learning or assessment is specific and relates directly to faculty conclusions about areas for | <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustments to the assessment plan are proposed but not clearly connected to data | <input type="checkbox"/> No actions are taken to improve student learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Actions discussed are not connected to data | <p>With almost all classes meeting at 100% success it is hard to propose improvements.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated adjustments in curriculum as a result of assessment data. <input type="checkbox"/> Actions are innovative in approach in attempt to improve student learning. | improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of action includes a timetable for implementation and identifies who is responsible for action <input type="checkbox"/> Actions are realistic, with a good probability of improving learning or assessment. | <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal discussion of the effectiveness of the assessment plan; minimal discussion of changes, if needed. | results or analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes. | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

Additional Comments:

With the initial cycle of assessments happening, we need to add a few components to the report. We need to discuss the enrollment trends of the program and see if there are things that the program can do to assist in the recruitment of students. The graduate rates are high, and I don't think there is anything to say but to keep doing what you are doing on the graduation rates.

In the data section of the report, it would be helpful to know the percentage of students who did the assignment. Due to the variation data, it asks the question if the rotation of courses is the reason for the variation or the lack of participation of some cohorts? If there really were only 39 total students in EDU690 for 15-16 then that would provide more validity to the data. It might also help to have the average grade on the assignment. I know I am starting to ask for more data, but with the new system these are things we will be able to pull as the assignments are built into the system and then we will have a complete picture of what students are doing in these classes.

There was an improvement from last year on data as there were several classes that had almost no data uploaded into the system. Because almost all the assessment is at 100% success, we absolutely need to include the external testing to provide some legitimacy to the assessment we are doing. If students are not successful at the external assessment, then this is evidence that we need to make adjustments

Again, this will happen with the new system, but we also need to look at the rubrics being used and make sure they are appropriate to the objectives of the program. With the changes with accreditation I am sure these will change, but just something that we need to think about. We also need to look at including the outside data as part of the program assessment. It was forwarded to me, but it makes no sense to me as to what it means about our students/graduates in this program. I need you to add a section of the Assessment report to report on outside testing and show what it means for our students. It seems redundant, but... I think in the future we will be able to incorporate this automatically into the assessment report from LiveText.

For the Analysis of the Assessment Process we need a more detailed description of how the data was collected, the training of the faculty, the submission of data. Any changes that need to be made also go here in this section.