

Biennial Report to the CCTC
California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A. Part I
Contextual Information

Education Administration

California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs. Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Education Administration Program prepares candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. All candidates are expected to complete a Master's Degree in Education (unless they already have a degree), which is integrated into the credential program. The coursework required for the credential consists of 18 units of coursework and six units of administrative fieldwork. The additional requirements for the Master's Degree consist of three units of research (ERA 220) and four units of the Master's Degree Project/Thesis (EAD 298/299).

All coursework and fieldwork experiences are based on standards required by the CCTC. These CCTC standards are based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs), which in turn have been adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which are recognized nationally.

Candidates are expected to apply theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and leadership skills in leading schools and school district. The mission of the Education Administration Program, "*Our mission is to prepare credible and relevant leaders in education*", guides all program activities in the preparation of high quality educational leaders with a thorough knowledge and understanding of the issues currently facing our schools.

Candidates take coursework in a cohort in a predetermined sequence of courses with an emphasis on Instructional Leadership. Presently, there are eight cohorts in the program, but this will increase by one to three cohorts over the next year. Two local school districts, Fresno Unified and Clovis Unified, have recently entered into partnerships with the Education Administration Program to provide on-site preparation programs for future administrators in these two districts. The renowned Chancellor's Fellows program, with support from the Chancellor's Office, will begin its 7th cohort of candidates selected exclusively by local school superintendents. Other partnerships are being explored.

The major challenge facing the Education Administration Program is to continue providing a coherent program offering to all candidates in light of rapid program expansion and growth and the integration of many new part-time faculty members. Fourteen new part-time faculty members have joined the program in the past two years.

Education Administration Program Candidate Information		
Site/Cohort	Number of Candidates¹	Number of Completers/Graduates Spring 2008
Fresno	24	22
COS Visalia	23	21
Fresno Unified	31	31
Clovis Unified	30	30
Chancellor's Fellows 5	25	23 (Fall 2009 expected)
Total	133	127

¹Only those candidates are counted who were to graduate in Spring 2008. Total enrollment is 203 candidates.

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document

Rubric for Master's Degree Project/Thesis	Spring 2006
Graduate Writing Requirement condensed into one course	Fall 2007
Revised dispositions survey	Fall 2008
Revision of Leadership Portfolio	Fall 2008

Section A. Part II
Candidate Assessment/Performance and
Program Effectiveness Information
Education Administration

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?

The Education Administration Program utilizes a variety of means to assess student progress and program effectiveness. A **Leadership Portfolio** was developed to assess overall mastery of the CPSEL standards throughout the program. Students are to choose graded assignments from each course to be reviewed by a faculty member each semester and a final assessment of the portfolio is to take place in the final semester of the program. This final assessment is to take place between the university supervisor and the superintendent or designated representative in a meeting near the end of the program.

All candidates must pass a **Graduate Writing Requirement** by responding to a prompt generated by the instructor. Previously, during the first semester, only the mechanics section of the rubric was used. During the second semester, the mechanics, style and format, and content and organization sections were used to assess the candidate's writing competency. Since the past year, all sections of the rubric are used in the first semester. Candidates are assessed by the course instructor and are advised of passing or of needing improvement in writing competency. A student is not passed until she/he demonstrates mastery of writing competency.

Candidate and supervisor pre- and post-**fieldwork assessments** have been gathered regularly since 2003 to determine perceived growth in each area of the CPSELs. The candidate and the site supervisor use the pre- and post-assessments for discussion of candidate progress and areas of growth. The university fieldwork supervisor ensures that all requirements are adequately fulfilled, including a variety of required assignments. Please see Table 1 below.

A pre- and post-assessment of **candidate dispositions** was utilized previously to assess the difference in candidate dispositions during the Leadership course. Candidates rated themselves in a variety of areas using an established instrument. Statistical analysis related the variables of the instrument to the six dispositions established by the Kremen School of Education (Reflection, Critical Thinking, Professional Ethics, Valuing Diversity, Collaboration, and Life-long Learning). A revised dispositions survey has been developed that is now used by our doctoral program candidates. Beginning in the fall of 2008, Education Administration Program candidates will rate themselves and will give the instrument to six colleagues and their supervisor to complete and return to our office. All results will be tabulated and shared with each candidate. Please see Table 3 for results of the previous dispositions assessment.

A **rubric** for the culminating activity, the **Master's Degree Project** or Thesis was developed by program faculty and is given to students. Faculty members developed the rubric to provide students with clear expectations of the culminating activity and to utilize in assessing this activity. The rubric is over 14 pages long and provided electronically to all candidates.

Faculty members serving as Master’s Degree project advisors blind reviewed four projects individually to determine the degree to which faculty members were in agreement regarding each candidate’s project. Please see Table 2 for results of this review.

Table 1: Fieldwork Pre- and Post Comparisons (2006 and 2008)

	Student Assessment			Supervisor Assessment		
	Pre-X	Post-X	Difference	Pre-X	Post-X	Difference
Standard 1: Shared Vision of Learning						
2006	3.08	3.25	0.17	3.25	4.18	0.94
2008	2.96	3.79	0.83	3.31	4.16	0.85
Difference	-0.12	0.54	0.66	0.06	-0.02	-0.09
Standard 2: Culture of Teaching and Learning						
2006	3.05	3.97	0.92	3.38	4.24	0.86
2008	3.19	4.27	1.08	3.57	4.31	0.74
Difference	0.14	0.30	0.16	0.19	0.07	-0.12
Standard 3: Management of the School in the Service of Teaching and Learning						
2006	2.84	3.91	1.07	3.10	3.99	0.89
2008	2.64	3.55	0.91	2.98	3.87	0.89
Difference	-0.20	-0.36	-0.16	-0.12	-0.12	0.00
Standard 4: Working With Diverse Families and Communities						
2006	2.93	3.81	0.88	3.22	4.04	0.82
2008	2.99	3.73	0.74	3.36	3.99	0.63
Difference	0.06	-0.08	-0.14	0.14	-0.05	-0.19
Standard 5: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity						
2006	3.18	4.02	0.85	3.34	4.23	0.89
2008	3.46	4.15	0.69	3.83	4.41	0.58
Difference	0.28	0.13	-0.16	0.49	0.18	-0.31
Standard 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding						
2006	2.67	3.56	0.88	3.03	3.85	0.82
2008	2.69	3.49	0.80	3.18	3.86	0.68
Difference	0.02	-0.07	-0.08	0.15	0.01	-0.14

Table 2: Results of Blind Review of Projects by Project Advisors

Project #	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Reviewer D	Mean	Range	Difference	SD
1	3.3	4	3.85	2.8	3.49	2.8 - 4	1.2	0.55
2	3.1	2.37			2.74	2.4 - 3.1	0.6	0.52
3	2.7	2.1			2.40	2.1 - 2.7	0.6	0.42
4	2.6	3.2	2.04		2.61	2.0 - 3.2	1.2	0.58
Overall avg. =					2.91		0.90	
SD =					0.59			

Table 3: Mean Differences of KSOEHD Dispositions of Education Administration Students (One-tailed t-test).

Disposition	Question Number	Mean Difference	SD	t-value	p-value
Reflection	Part A, Q8	.739	1.054	3.364	.001***
	Part A, Q13	.565	1.037	2.614	.008**
Critical Thinking	Part A, Q9	.435	.843	2.472	.011*
	Part A, Q15	.545	.739	3.464	.001***
	Part B, Q17	.391	.783	2.398	.013*
Professional Ethics	Part A, Q7	.870	.869	4.800	.000***
	Part B, Q12	.696	.635	5.254	.000***
	Part B, Q15	.783	.902	4.159	.000***
Valuing Diversity	Part A, Q4	.304	.765	1.908	.035*
	Part A, Q12	.739	1.176	3.014	.003**
	Part A, Q17	.391	.891	2.105	.023*
	Part B, Q2	.435	.590	3.536	.001***
Collaboration	Part A, Q2	.391	.941	1.994	.029*
	Part A, Q6	.609	1.118	2.612	.008**
	Part A, Q16	.696	.822	4.058	.000***
	Part B, Q6	.652	.714	4.38	.000***
Life-long Learning	Part B, Q1	.478	.730	3.140	.003**

*significant at .05, ** significant at .01, *** significant at .001

b. What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

Candidates in the final semester or recent graduates complete a post-program survey (**Education Administration Program Survey**) to obtain feedback on student perceptions of program effectiveness. In the past, this survey was handed out to students in the final course, completed and returned to the instructor. Recently, the survey is sent to graduates electronically within a semester of completing the program. Please see Table 4 for a summary of responses.

Superintendents who work closely with our program through our advisory committee are also surveyed periodically utilizing the **Education Administration Superintendents Survey**. Previously, this survey was given to superintendents during a meeting of the Superintendents' Advisory Committee, however, recently the survey is sent to these superintendents electronically. Please see Table 5 for a summary of responses.

Table 4: Results of Survey Data from Graduates (or students in final semester)

Question	Fresno Fa 07	Fresno Sp 08	COS Sp 07	COS Sp 08	CF5 Fa 07	FUSD Sp 07	FUSD Sp 08	Clovis Sp 08
5	4.1	3.9	4.6	3.8	5.0	4.9	3.8	4.3
6	4.1	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.9	3.1	3.7	3.7
7a	4.2	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.9
7b	4.0	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.5	4.4	3.9
7c	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	3.7
7d	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.4	4.0
7e	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.3
7f	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	3.9
7g	4.3	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0
8a	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.2
8b	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.1
8c	4.0	4.0	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.5	4.6	3.9
8d	4.0	3.7	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.8	4.6	4.0
8e	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.5	3.8
8f	4.0	4.0	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.2
8g	4.0	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.0
8h	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.4
N	24	18	14	9	9	28	7	11

Note: 1-5 scale

Key to questions:

5. The cohort experience is an essential element of the education administration program.
6. The sequence of courses in the program was appropriate in preparing me for a leadership position.

7. The Education Administration Program has helped me to:
 - a) Develop a clear personal vision
 - b) develop a clear school/site vision
 - c) be able to clearly articulate my vision effectively
 - d) use data to inform instruction
 - e) align curriculum to standards
 - f) use effective supervision strategies
 - g) be an instructional leader
8. The Education Administration Program has:
 - a) provided opportunities for me to regularly reflect upon my learning
 - b) provided opportunities for me to regularly reflect upon my practice
 - c) provided opportunities for me to analyze interpersonal issues in education settings
 - d) fostered my understanding of the importance of reflecting on ethical decision making
 - e) helped me to recognize more fully the importance of valuing cultural, linguistic, cognitive, and physiological diversity
 - f) provided opportunities to learn the skills of collaboration:
 - g) provided opportunities to practice the skills of collaboration:
 - h) demonstrated the value of continuous professional growth and life-long learning

Table 5: Results of Survey Data from School Superintendents

School administrators graduating from the CSU Fresno Education Administration Program...	Mean 2006*	Mean 2008	S.D. 2008	Difference 2008-2006
• have a clear vision and express it articulately	4.36	3.94	1.06	-0.42
• establish a standards-based learning environment	4.36	4.14	0.86	-0.22
• use data to guide and inform instruction	4.36	4.00	0.96	-0.36
• align curriculum to standards	4.36	4.29	0.73	-0.07
• use effective instructional supervision strategies	4.55	4.00	0.78	-0.55
• are instructional leaders at their worksites	4.55	4.21	1.12	-0.34
Overall mean	4.42	4.08		

*S.D. was not calculated for 2006

Section A. Part III.
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data
Education Administration

The **Leadership Portfolio** has been implemented to varying degrees with comments expressed about the time involved in developing and assessing the portfolio. The portfolio has been redesigned to encompass a programmatic assessment as opposed to individual student progress. Faculty will collect a sample of assignments from their courses and drop them into an electronic portfolio designed specifically for programmatic review. This new portfolio design is being implemented for Fall 2008.

Analysis of Pre- and Post-**fieldwork** means (Table 1) shows approximately the same amount of change over time. However, as a result of open-ended responses to the graduate program survey along with additional anecdotal comments, it was apparent that fieldwork is not entirely consistent among the various full and part-time faculty fieldwork supervisors. As a result, a focus group discussion will take place in Fall 2008 with a number of current and past students to gain an understanding of how the fieldwork component can be revised to be more meaningful for all students. With the addition of 10 new faculty supervisors in the past 24 months, this is seen as a strong need for our program.

The analysis of **candidate dispositions** (Table 3) demonstrates significant change over time. However, further analysis was undertaken and the faculty have revised the disposition survey to directly include the KSOEHD dispositions. Further, the survey was redesigned to include a 360° assessment; candidates now select six peers, colleagues, and supervisors to use the same assessment instrument. Results of the 360° survey will be compared to the individual's results with a focus on differences and areas of further growth opportunities.

Analysis of the blind review utilizing the **rubric for the Master's Degree Project/Thesis** (Table 2) indicates little agreement among project supervisors of the quality of projects. However, open-ended comments from the graduate program survey indicate that the rubric has been generally well received. However, other student comments indicate that further development of the rubric as well as increased cohesiveness of faculty understanding and use of the rubric is necessary.

Analysis of survey data from the **Education Administration Program Survey** (graduate program survey) (Table 4) indicates that program satisfaction varies to some degree by cohort. The special cohorts (Fresno Unified, Clovis Unified, and Chancellor's Fellows) received higher ratings than the regular cohorts in Fresno and COS Visalia. The data and open-ended comments indicate that some students in the Fresno regular cohort may perceive that they may have received preparation of equal quality as the special cohorts.

Analysis of survey data from the **Education Administration Superintendents Survey** (Table 5), both in the quantitative data and in the open-ended responses indicates a relatively high degree of satisfaction with the exception of two superintendents who did not participate in earlier administration of the survey.

Section A. Part IV.
Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
Education Administration

Specific Objective	Strategies/Tasks	Person(s) Responsible	Date
Modify the Leadership Portfolio	Meet with candidates and faculty regarding their expectations of the portfolio Develop alternative assessment(s) to gauge progress of candidates through the program and to serve as a final assessment	Ginny Boris, Linda Hauser	By December 2008
Improve the integration of fieldwork and coursework and overall program cohesiveness	Regular meetings between fieldwork supervisors and course instructors. The last half of our program meetings will now be devoted to assessment issues and tasks assigned to be completed during and after the monthly meeting.	Program coordinator	By Spring 2009
Utilize candidate dispositions as data for professional growth and programmatic improvement	Once initial results of the recently adapted survey are calculated by program faculty, they will be given to each candidate and a plan of action will be developed as part of coursework and fieldwork to enhance areas of need.	Linda Hauser, Sharon Brown-Welty	By December 2008
Improve the rubric for the Master's Degree Project/Thesis	All project supervisors will meet with students and as a team to improve the clarity of the expectations.	Ron Unruh	By Spring 2009
Improve communication with the Superintendents' Advisory Committee	Superintendents will be informed on a regular basis of candidate and program needs through presentation of quantitative and qualitative data. Superintendents will take a more active role in ongoing discussions of the program and its outcomes.	Program coordinator	By Spring 2009