***STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM***

***SUMMARY FORM AY 2016-17***

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA annually by July 1. For departments undergoing the IBHE review program, this worksheet should be submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the learning assessment portion of the statewide review.

M.S. – Educational Leadership

**Degree and**

**Program Name:**

# Submitted By:

Dr. Cliff D Karnes, Chair

**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed?  | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. A depth of content knowledge including effective technology skills and ethical behaviors. | The M.S. program has 3 content assessments (#1, #2, and #5) and 3 performance assessments (#3, #4, and #7) as outlined below. Detailed assessment descriptions, scoring guides, and data tables are housed on the department website. | Meet or exceed on scoring guide provided | * Program Assessments:

 99% Meets or Exceeds Content* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting

2016-2017 Graduates 84 | * Chair, graduate coordinator, faculty members
* The department has created a secure website to house all student data.
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting the objective and placing data tables on department website.
* At the end of every semester, data on all assessments are reviewed by all faculty members as part of the end-of-the-semester assessment review for Unit (CEPS Grad) Assessment
 |
| 2. Critical thinking and problem solving skills | The M.S. program has 3 content assessments (#1, #2, and #5) and 3 performance assessments as outlined previously (#3, #4, #7). Detailed assessment descriptions, scoring guides, and data tables are housed on the department website. | Meet or exceed on scoring guide provided | * 100% Meets or Exceeds
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting
 | * Chair, graduate coordinator, faculty members
* The department has created a secure website to house all student data.
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting the objective and placing data tables on department website.
* At the end of every semester, data on all assessments are reviewed.
 |
| 3. Effective oral and written communication skills | Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 all have significant writing expectations which are assessed as outlined on the assessment description and scoring guides. Assessment #4, project #6, requires a formal presentation which requires a PowerPoint presentation. As part of course grades in Assessment #6, EDL 5410, the student presents a legal issue presentation. | Meet or exceed on scoring guide provided | * 100% Meets or Exceeds
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting
 | * Chair, graduate coordinator, faculty members
* The department has created a secure website to house all student data.
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting the objective and placing data tables on department website. At the end of every semester, data on all assessments are reviewed.
 |
| 4. Evidence of advanced scholarship through research and/or creative activity. | Assessment #2, Leadership Plan requires an extensive review of literature covering the research on effective Leadership. Assessment #4, Practicum, requires an action research project which requires a 3-year trend analysis of school state testing data, a gap analysis, a review of literature on best practices to eliminate the gaps identified, and the development of an action plan to correct deficiencies. As part of Assessment #6, EDL 5410, Course Grades, studies do a legal review on a selected topic for presentation to the class.  | Meet or exceed on scoring guide provided | * 100% Meets or Exceeds
* Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting
 | * Chair, graduate coordinator, faculty members
* The department has created a secure website to house all student data.

Faculty members are responsible for providing intervention techniques for students not meeting the objective and placing data tables on department website. At the end of every semester, data on all assessments are reviewed. |

**M. S. Program Assessments**

| **Name of Assessment[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Type or** **Form of Assessment[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **When the Assessment****Is Administered[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|
| 1 | **[Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment]**  | **Licensure Exam** | **End of the Program** |
| 2 | **[Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership]** | **Leadership Plan** | **EDL 5630—The Principalship** |
| 3 | **[Assessment of ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction]** | **Need Assessments** | **EDL 5600-School Culture Audit****EDL 5700-Teacher Observations****EDL 5420-Mission/Vision Audit****EDL 5420-Public Relations Audit** |
| 4 | **[Assessment of internship/clinical practice]** | **Practicum Evaluation** | **EDL 5891,EDL 5892, EDL 5893-Practicum in Educational Administration** |
| 5 | **[Assessment of ability to support student learning and development]** | **Graduate Survey** | **End of Program** |
| 6 | **[Content-based assessment – application of content]** | **Course Grades** | **EDL 5700-Supervision of Instruction****EDL 5410—School Law** |
| 7 | **Assessment of abilities in organizational management and community relations]** | **Simulations** | **EDL 5410-Handbook Review****EDL 5410-Legislative Action Letters** |

| **ELCC STANDARD**  | **APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II** |
| --- | --- |
| Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. |
| 1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6  |
| 1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. |
| 2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program. | Assessment # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| 2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning. | Assessment # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| 2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans. | Assessment # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. |
| 3.1 Manage the Organization. | Assessment # 1,4, 5, 6,7 |
| 3.2 Manage the Operations. | Assessment # 1,4, 5, 6,7 |
| 3.3 Manage the Resources. | Assessment # 1,4, 5, 6,7 |
| Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. |
| 4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| 4.3 Mobilize Community Resources. | Assessment # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner |
| 5.1 Acts with Integrity. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| 5.2 Acts Fairly. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| 5.3 Acts Ethically. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. |
| 6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| 6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| 6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context. | Assessment # 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 |
| Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. |
| 7.3 Candidates apply skills and knowledge articulated in the first six ELCC standards as well as state and local standards for educational leaders. Experiences are designed to accommodate candidates’ individual needs. | Assessment #4 |

**PART TWO**

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

**Program Assessment Accomplishments**

Assessments and advisory council member communications, and student survey data were used in the development of a new Principal Preparation Program. The Program of Study was approved by the State Board of Education in July of 2012. This program provided the opportunity for students to receive the Teacher Leader Endorsement with completion of the MSED. Students also have the opportunity to take 9 more hours to receive the Principalship Endorsement throught the ISBE. The EDL Faculty also completed the training and certification to be principal evaluators, a mandate by the Illinois State Board of Education. The knowledge and skills acquired in this program include identification of levels of principal performance and the principal’s impact on teacher evaluation and supervision. Since the new programs inception, the EDL Department has continued to reflect and build on the required components and improve on the items as educational leadership changes and evolves.

Comments from the Casa Director in 2011 stated that clear, measurable goals from College of Graduate Studies were incorporated into the Education Leadership Department’s Course Objectives. Additionally, learning expectations were “in place along with the scoring guide.” Further the “Response” mentioned “program successes” as follows: “mature levels of assessment work;” “useful information was in place for improvement;” “data were used for changes;“ and that the “faculty were active in state organizations.” The Department has corrected the 2011 faulty data assessment link. This was accomplished through the passing and promotion of the new PEP program.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

**History, Changes and Improvements, and Next Steps**

Over the past several years, the EIU Educational Leadership Department has overhauled its assessment program as part of the NCATE review process. Extensive time was spent (departmental retreats, faculty meeting, bringing in consultants, working with educational leadership faculty in other institutions) to revise our assessment system. The last NCATE full Accreditation was in 2011. Along with this, ELCC standards updates from the latest (ISLLC) Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium will be incorporated in future reports.

We are currently working to update our assessments based on the new ELLC Standards from the Revised 2011 ISLLC Standards. The EIU EDL Department’s next generation of assessments will follow these standards and will represent significant faculty study and discussions on the topic.

With the approval of the *Educational Leadership Policy Standards Board: ISLLC 2011* (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium), the NPBEA (National Policy Board for Educational Administration) approved an ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) this helped align the overall MSED Program. Two groups, a Technical Advisory Committee and a Steering Committee, facilitated comprehensive research, revisions, and field review of the proposed changes prior to submitting them to NPBEA and NCATE. EIU EDL Faculty have continued to review 2011 ELLC Standards and conduct continued crosswalk with the current course assessments. After continual review, modifications may be made and reported and improvements made.

Further the EDL Faculty Members have engaged in intense discussions regarding how to most effectively improve our program. These efforts were precipitated by our department’s traditional and ongoing improvement efforts, the data collected from departmental assessments, and information gathered from external initiatives that address principal preparation programs nationally and in Illinois. All of our department members work closely with the Illinois Principal Association, Illinois Association of School Administrators and two have served on the Superintendent Redesign Program throughout the state. We also have faculty involved in other continuous improvement processes for programs and organizations, including Charlotte Danielson Improvement Modules, Leadership Inventories, and Baldrige Excellence in Education pursuit. As a result of our collective efforts and the various data we have considered, the department has made significant improvements to our program, and has plans to address additional issues in the immediate future.

The Department has embraced the idea of Richard DuFour’s Professional Learning Community. We hold ongoing discussions and examine data to determine:

1. *What is it we want all candidates to learn?* This has been guided by the ELCC Standards, feedback from our advisory committee, changes in state and federal laws and requirements, and best practices in the field.
2. *How will we know if they have learned it?* Our seven assessments provide feedback to faculty members about what our students have learned. As part of our discussions, the faculty has collaborated to develop six assessments that are course embedded and provide evidence of candidate competency in the ELCC standards. Some of these were existing assessments that had already been aligned with the standards, other were created and/or revised to strengthen the program’s alignment with the standards. One of the biggest challenges was creating rubrics and clarifying and defining expectations for our candidates. The entire process has resulted in many of our faculty using the same type of format for all course assessments.
3. *What do we do when they don’t learn?* Intervention and remediation is provided as needed. For example, students not passing the state certification exam are contacted and provided additional support.
4. *What do we do when they do know it?* Many of the program assessments as well as course assessments allow students to go above and beyond the minimum. Faculty members often identify exceptional students for research and creative projects beyond the classroom experience.

Faculty members have added another question, How do we want students to learn? There is 100% agreement that there has to be an application piece to all we teach. Feedback from our alumni and our advisory board indicate that this is a very valuable aspect of our program.

As mentioned above and after much effort on the part of the EDL Faculty, The EDL Advisory Group, the College of Education, and others, the Principal Preparation Program was written during the 2011 and 2012 school term and was approved in July of 2012. In this new program, EIU provided the opportunity for students to receive the Teacher Leader Endorsement with completion of the MSED. Students may further their educational experience by taking 9 more hours that will lead them upon state assessment completion to receive the Principalship Endorsement through ISBE. As the revised courses are delivered assessments will be continuously reviewed and refined to meet the goals, objectives and the targets that were mandated by the State Board of Education. Many of these courses are currently evolving into more technological savvy courses. These courses are being delivered in the hybrid models. This is to meet the diverse learners that we currently have in our Department.

We are also are engaged in significant strategic planning using the Baldrige Framework of Continuous Improvement. Category 7-Results uses the departments’ performance data in all the key areas of student learning, customer focus, workforce, leadership and governance, budgetary, financial and marketing results to show areas of strength, as well as areas that provide opportunities for improvement. Specifically, our student assessment results from various aforementioned assessments are vital as we analyze our successes and plan our future growth strategies. As part of the Strategic Planning, materials from Tom Friedman, John Maxwell, Diane Ravitch, Jon Gordon, Daniel Pink and others were reviewed and considered.

**Specific Assessment Information**

**1. Content Knowledge**

In the area of content knowledge, three assessments are used – the state PEP certification exam (Assessment #1), course grades for EDL 5700-Supervision of Instruction and EDL 5410-School Law (Assessment #2), and the Leadership Plan (Assessment #6). The department has found the state certification data to be somewhat frustrating. Although the data indicates that our students are doing extremely well on this test, the feedback we receive does not break the results down by question or by standard. Faculty members have been involved on committees at the state level to review and make recommendations for changing this test.

The department decided to utilize course grades for two courses because the content of these courses is very specific and directly align with the specific standards. Data indicates that students are successfully mastering the content knowledge in each of these areas. The Leadership Plan was a new assessment integrated into EDL 5630—The Principalship. This class is taken towards the end of the program before practicum (internship). For this assessment candidates have to demonstrate knowledge of five standards in terms of what effective principals do and how to implement. Candidates, through course evaluations, have indicated that they find this assessment very valuable in preparing for the state certification exam and preparation for the practicum. The number of students who completed the MS program for 2016-2017 are also added to this report.

School Law is a course we use the final grade for NCATE assessment purposes. The graded activities for this course include a Legal Issue Report and Presentation, Case Briefs, Advocacy Letters, Handbook Analysis, and a comprehensive Final Exam. These assignments require students to research, review, analyze, synthesize, and apply various political, ethical, legal, economic and pedagogical considerations in various school contexts. (5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3). The data we have collected suggested that ethical issues related to 5.3 needed additional coverage in our program, so a new project has been created and implemented that requires students to apply ethical and legal principles to a school-based scenario. This is a substitute for the Handbook Analysis project. This exercise has focused students more closely on the issues and appears to be effective.

Graduate survey feedback has also impacted content in three courses. Results indicated that M.S. graduates did not feel prepared in the area of school finance. In response the department has now incorporated into EDL 5600-Introduction to Organization and Administration and EDL 5630-The Principalship, modules to address this area. EDL 5600 provides an introduction to school finance, and EDL 5630 addresses developing building budgets. The finance activity included in the Practicum has also been expanded to provide more hands-on budget development and monitoring experiences. In EDL 5420—School/Community Relations, an additional module focused on mobilizing community resources has been added. Additional modules have been added to EDL 5410 and EDL 5600 to introduce students to IDEA 2007 and the requirements. This is the result of student feedback. In addition, the Approved Principal Preparation Program includes additional course work to address Special Education, Reading, and Psychology,

**2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions**

Data clearly indicates that one of the strengths of our program is the practical application of professional knowledge and skill. The majority of the courses include field experiences that require candidates to take the content knowledge and apply it in real settings. The practicum experience has been significantly revised to ensure that students are experiencing more hands-on activities that require the utilization of the knowledge and skills acquired during coursework, and assessment results indicate that our students are meeting the standards. On the other hand, department members are currently engaged in conversations with how to make the practicum even more meaningful. Our program currently requires a full year practicum. We are also exploring how to require more time-intensive experiences such as one- or two-week fulltime experiences.

In terms of changes pedagogically, we believe that providing students with greater immersion into the effective use of various technologies is something each course should strive to accomplish. Feedback from our site supervisors for practicum and our advisory board have both supported this belief. Hands-on experiences working with data, analyzing data, and making quality scientifically research-based decisions based on this data are critical skills that have been added to all classes. Thus, the incorporation and revamping of course deliveries to include hybrid courses is an ongoing evolution within our department.

**Conclusion**

The development, implementation, and review of the data of the seven assessments continue to be an extremely enriching experience for our faculty. The data indicates that our program completers are highly competent in each of the ELCC standards, are “creators of effective education environments,” and meet the graduate four learning goals. Conversations continue in regards to improving the assessments and the program. One of these conversations revolves around the collection of the data. Technology and appropriate programs continue to be a challenge as we manage our data and analyze our results. The Faculty continues to seek the most effective and efficient means to manage our data.
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