

Department of Educational Leadership 2014-15 Assessment Report

The Educational Leadership and Administration degree program has two pathways: P-12 (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential) and Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership [HEAL] (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration). The Department of Educational Leadership is working on finalizing a proposal for HEAL to be a specific option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State through the Department of Educational Leadership. For the 2015-16 academic year, our two pathways have a combined 183 students (152 P-12 and 31 HEAL). Our instructional delivery is through a cohort delivery model (eight cohorts); the six P-12 cohorts all operate off the Fresno State campus in partnership districts across the Central Valley. The two HEAL cohorts operate on campus.

Due to the adoption of new standards by the CTC and proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option, the Educational Leadership and Administration program is undergoing transition, therefore, as approved by Dr. Nef through communications with Associate Interim Dean, Dr. Sarah Lam, the Department of Educational Leadership's 2014-15 Assessment Report will not respond to the traditional six assessment questions, but instead provide a status report of the work and assessment activity to-date and in progress.

Status of the re-development of our SOAP

The Department of Educational Leadership SOAP is currently under construction to reflect the transition to new program standards and finalization of a proposal for HEAL to be an option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State.

P-12 Educational Leadership and Administration degree and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential pathway

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) adopted in December 2013 new Administrator Content Expectations and Performance Expectations that establish the knowledge and skills that new administrators should know and be able to do at the beginning of their administrative career. Given the important need to ensure that new administrators are prepared to help schools improve student learning and achievement and due to the significant program-level changes embodied in the new standards, the Commission is requiring all preliminary Administrative Services Credential (ASC) program sponsors, of which Fresno State is a program sponsor through the Department of Educational Leadership, to transition to the new standards by September 1, 2015, however, we had the opportunity to pilot a few of the changes in Spring 2015.

As a department, we created a course, curricula, and assessment design/redesign team that prepared our program Transition Plan (plan to plan), which was due to the CTC on September 1, 2014. Our team, known as the Academic Task Force, met almost every other week throughout the 2014-15 academic year for the purpose of designing/redesigning our curriculum, courses, delivery approaches, field experiences, and assessment with an emphasis on performance assessment. We piloted a few changes with two new Spring 2015 cohorts and full transition to

the new standards and assessment begins with our three new cohorts in fall 2015. Our CTC required Program Assessment document is due to the CTC one year from full-implementation (September 1, 2016).

To-date new competency tasks/measures (content knowledge and performance assessments) have been developed in alignment with most of our new candidate/student learning outcomes, which we will begin to use this academic year (2015-16). As stated above, we did pilot a few of these measures in spring 2015 and conducted faculty feedback sessions regarding the piloted measures and student results. Some revisions were made to our competency tasks/measures based on this data, and the revised measures will be used in fall 2015.

The following are a few student of the student learning outcomes that were assessed through our pilot during the 2014-15 academic year, the competency task measures, indicators and standards of success, results, discovery from results and adjustments made based on results:

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
<p>Graduates/candidates will (a) develop techniques in identifying, collecting, analyzing, and evaluating various types of data that engage and support school staff in analyzing instructional effectiveness and (b) use a 6-step data-driven decision-making process to inform instructional improvement and programmatic decisions.</p> <p>Graduates will develop knowledge and skill in the use of effective training processes and protocols to build teacher capacity in assessment literacy.</p>	<p>Written Paper – Unit Development (rubric)</p> <p>Presentation w/peer feedback and self-assessment (rubric)</p> <p>Video clip demonstration with explanation (rubric)</p> <p>Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality</p> <p>Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each criterion on scoring rubrics</p>
<p>Results: 42 of 46 students met indicators on first submission. One team of four (4) students was required to revise written presentation materials to evidence deeper concept knowledge of the importance of clear communication in the delivery of new information. Revisions included (a) more thorough discussion of baseline assessment data used to determine intervention and (b) visual summary of the 6-step data-driven process and PDSA cycle used to arrive at the solution and plan for continuous improvement.</p> <p><i>Note: Graduates/Candidates must score Competent or Quality for each criterion given a Competency Task in a program course; therefore, graduates/candidates must redo and resubmit any task not meeting the indicator of Competent or Quality.</i></p>	

Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings:

Based on data from faculty feedback sessions and graduate work products, we discovered that graduates found it difficult to explain the process from the perspective of a school leader. Graduates delivered information as if they were the learner, rather than the facilitator of others' learning. As a result of these findings, faculty will increase focus on developing graduate (a) concept knowledge of adult learning theories/principles and the role leaders play in system change, and (b) skills and approaches in facilitating adult learning and communicating purpose and processes used in teacher-led data-driven decision making.

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
<p>Graduates/Candidates will conduct a data mining process and examine, analyze, and evaluate a school's information and analysis system (types of data collected, purpose of data collected, data form, frequency of collection, data collectors [who], consumers [users], and processes used to collect, analyze and communicate data).</p> <p>Graduates will use information gained from the data mining process to identify improvement areas for focus and inform next step high leverage actions.</p>	<p>Synthesized Table (Matrix) (scoring guide/rubric)</p> <p>Written Analysis and Evaluation (scoring guide/rubric)</p> <p>Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality</p> <p>Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each criterion on scoring rubrics</p>
<p>Results: 40 of 46 graduates met indicators on first submission. Two groups of three graduates (total of six graduates) had to revise a portion of the task and resubmit. Areas graduates did not meet competency on first submission were: (a) written analysis and evaluation from a leadership viewpoint/perspective – graduates' analysis and evaluation was from a classroom teacher viewpoint/perspective and (b) identification of high leverage school improvement actions based on the data and information gained from data mining process and specific leadership actions (actions were derived from the data collected and made sense – matched and aligned).</p> <p>Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings:</p> <p>Graduates struggled with (a) considering the entire system (system perspective) over that of just their individual classrooms, and (b) taking on a high level, balcony view of a site leader. As a result of these findings, faculty will add a grounding exercise/activity that requires graduates to first map the system of the school, and examine the source of the data streams and how changes would affect the systems in place at the school.</p>	

According to the CTC, the 2013 Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards introduce a program based upon content and performance expectations, referred to as the CE and CAPE respectively. The CEs define the content that must be addressed in the Preliminary program and the CAPEs define the knowledge and skills that must be practiced and assessed during the program. The following is a program matrix and key indicating where in the program's coursework and fieldwork each expectation/learning outcome will be addressed. Fall 2015 begins the first full year of implementation and modifications will be made based on the Program Assessment Report to the CTC in September 2016. This information will be used for the re-development of our SOAP.

Key to the following matrix:

Categories:	
Category for Content Expectations:	
CE VI=	Content Expectation Visionary Leadership
CE IL =	Content Expectation Instructional Leadership
CE SIL =	Content Expectation School Improvement Leadership
CE PLGL=	Content Expectation Professional Learning and Growth Leadership
CE OSL =	Content Expectation Organizational and Systems Leadership
CE CL=	Content Expectation Community Leadership
C =	Competent (entry-level)
C* =	Competent (entry-level) and (*portion of expectation)
C ulm =	Competent (entry-level) and ulm (expectation assessed along the continuum, but a culminating assessment of competency occurs)
CAPEs:	
A-C =	Assessed as Competent (entry-level) <i>Note: Where expectation is Practiced will be determined during planning and development of performance assessments</i>
A-C* =	Assessed as Competent (entry-level) and (*portion of expectation)

Table One: The Content Expectations

Course Titles →	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
Content Expectation ↓											
CE VL-1				C							
CE VL-2				C							
CE VL-3				C							
CE VL-4				C							
CE VL-5				C							
CE VL-6				C							
CE VL-7				C							
CE VL-8				C							
CE VL-9						C					
CE VL-10				C							
CE VL-11							C				
CE VL-12							C				
CE VL-13				C							
CE VL-14							C ulm				
CE VL-15			C								
CE VL-16				C							
CE VL-17					C						
CE VL-18				C			C ulm				
CE VL-19							C ulm				
CE VL-20							C ulm				
CE IL-1							C				
CE IL-2							C				
CE IL-3		C				C					
CE IL-4	C						C ulm				
CE IL-5		C									
CE IL-6		C									
CE IL-7		C									
CE IL-8					C						
CE IL-9		C									
CE IL-10		C									
CE IL-11		C									
CE IL-12		C									
CE IL-13						C					
CE IL-14		C									
CE IL-15					C						
CE IL-16					C						

Table One: The Content Expectations

Course Titles →	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
Content Expectation ↓											
CE IL-17							C				
CE IL-18		C									
CE IL-19					C						
CE IL-20		C									
CE IL-21					C						
CE IL-22		C									
CE IL-23		C									
CE IL-24		C									
CE IL-25							C ulm				
CE IL-26							C ulm				
CE IL-27							C ulm				
CE IL-28					C						
CE IL-29				C							
CE IL-30						C					
CE IL-31						C					
CE IL-32						C					
CE SIL-1				C							
CE SIL-2							C ulm				
CE SIL-3						C					
CE SIL-4							C ulm				
CE SIL -5					C						
CE SIL-6				C							
CE SIL-7				C							
CE SIL-8				C			C				
CE SIL-9				C							
CE PLGL-1					C						
CE PLGL-2				C							
CE PLGL-3							C				
CE PLGL-4							C				
CE PLGL-5					C						
CE PLGL-6					C						
CE PLGL-7					C						
CE PLGL-8							C				
CE PLGL-9				C			C				
CE PLGL-10							C				
CE PLGL-11					C		C				
CE OSL-1			C								

Table One: The Content Expectations

Course Titles →	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
Content Expectation ↓											
CE OSL-2					C						
CE OSL-3	C					C					
CE OSL-4							C ulm				
CE OSL-5							C ulm				
CE OSL-6			C								
CE OSL-7							C				
CE OSL-8					C						
CE OSL-9							C ulm				
CE OSL-10							C ulm				
CE OSL-11							C ulm				
CE OSL-12							C ulm				
CE OSL-13					C						
CE OSL-14					C						
CE OSL-15							C				
CE OSL-16					C						
CE OSL-17							C				
CE OSL-18							C				
CE OSL-19							C				
CE OSL-20							C				
CE OSL-21							C				
CE OSL-22							C ulm				
CE OSL-23							C ulm				
CE OSL-24							C				
CE OSL-25					C						
CE OSL-26					C						
CE OSL-27			C								
CE CL-1	C										
CE CL-2	C										
CE CL-3				C							
CE CL-4						C					
CE CL-5	C*		C*	C*							
CE CL-6	C*			C*							
CE CL-7							C				
CE CL-8			C								
CE CL-9	C*	C*		C*	C*	C*	C*				
CE CL-10	C*	C*		C*		C*	C*				

Table Two: The Performance Expectations

Course Titles →	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 274	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 269			
Performance Expectation ↓										
CAPE 1					A-C					
CAPE 2					A-C					
CAPE 3				A-C						
CAPE 4	A-C									
CAPE 5		A-C								
CAPE 6		A-C								
CAPE 7				A-C						
CAPE 8						A-C				
CAPE 9					A-C					
CAPE 10					A-C					
CAPE 11					A-C					
CAPE 12					A-C					
CAPE 13							A-C			
CAPE 14						A-C				
CAPE 15						A-C	A-C			
CAPE 16							A-C			
CAPE 17						A-C				
CAPE 18			A-C							
CAPE 19			A-C							
CAPE 20	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*			

Careers in higher education reflect the dynamism of colleges and universities subject to constant change. This change brings forth new opportunities in an increased demand for access to higher education, demographic change, as well as innovative pedagogies and technologies. In light of the nature of work in higher education, professionals working in the numerous positions of a college or university's organizational structure are expected to have a broad range of competencies. To meet this demand the Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership (HEAL) degree pathway prepares professionals through graduate education.

The 2014-2015 academic year marked the first full year for HEAL, welcoming 14 new students while conferring degrees to 14 graduating students. Transforming HEAL to a learning-centered graduate culture meant gathering multiple forms of meaningful and credible evidence of the ways in which students achieved program outcomes.

1. Write about national trends and issues in higher education and student affairs and the impact to their local communities (Written Communication).
2. Develop a research design incorporating basic research methodologies used in the study and practice of higher education and student affairs (Assessment and Research)

Develop a research design incorporating basic research methodologies used in educational research [P-12] (Assessment and Research)

Outcome 1

Data for Outcome 1 (Written Communication) came from a direct assessment in EAD 261 during Fall 2014. This involved asking new students to demonstrate their competence by writing a response paper addressing current issues in higher education as a means of meeting the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR). Results showed 86% (n=12) of HEAL students achieved this outcome and met the GWR. The other students (n=2) that did not meet the GWR did not make satisfactory academic progress and did not continue in spring 2015.

Faculty will continue assessing this outcome as it meets an important university requirement and in partnership with P-12 Educational Leadership faculty. Currently, department faculty are collaborating to develop explicit statements of what P-12 and higher education leaders should learn while verifying that the department's two curricular pathways are structured to foster this learning. This collaborative process has led the department to renew its commitment to collect empirical data that evidence student learning and to use this data to improve student learning through continuous program improvement. Additionally, assessment of this program outcome supports student learning and program improvement related to Outcome 2.

Outcome 2

Data for Outcome 2 (Assessment and Research) came from a direct assessment in EAD 298/299 during spring 2015 (HEAL) and fall 2014/spring 2015 (P-12). Graduate students demonstrated their competence by writing a culminating project or thesis incorporating appropriate research methodologies towards the completion of a master's degree.

Results for HEAL pathway showed that 100% (n=14) satisfactorily achieved this outcome. Results for P-12 pathway showed that 100% (n=49) satisfactorily achieved this outcome.

HEAL Program Outcomes 2015-16

Graduates will be able to:

1. Write about how the history, philosophy, and values of higher education connect to their professional practice. (Professional Foundations)
2. Explain the importance of engaging in critical reflection to identify internalized prejudices and biases. (Diversity and Inclusion)
3. Articulate the vision and mission of a functional area, division, and institution. (Organizational and Human Resources)
4. Identify and write about their personal strengths and challenges as a leader (Leadership)

Semester	Course	Program Outcomes			
		1	2	3	4
Fall 1	EAD 261	I	I		I
	EAD 278T (SA)	I	R	I	I
Spring 2	EAD 262	R		R	R
	ERE 220		R		R
	EAD 273	R			R
Fall 3	EAD 278T (Div)		E		
	EAD 266			R	
	EAD 280T		R		R
Spring 4	EAD 269	E		R	R
	EAD 298/299			E	E

Curriculum Map: I= introduced, R= reinforced, E= Emphasized

2015-16 Department/Across Pathways (P-12 and HEAL) Student Learning Outcome

Graduates will be able to write about national trends and issues in P-12 education/higher education and the impact on their local communities.

Graduates (P-12 and HEAL) in the Department of Educational Leadership are expected to apply effective written communication competencies to develop and implement an organizational vision, engage multiple stakeholders, and lead adult and student learning. Achieving this outcome meets the graduate writing requirement.

Department faculty (P-12 and HEAL) have acknowledged that our current more holistic (pass/fail) rubric for the GWR is inadequate in providing the types of data that will help inform and drive next step decisions: (a) specific graduate/candidate competencies and support and (b) program cohort areas of focus. An analytic rubric is needed as well as an information system that documents follow-up graduate support and cohort graduate/candidate information. The information gained from an analytic rubric will not only provide the individual candidate/graduate with important information in areas for growth and improvement, but will provide cohort specific information as well. This work is not only important, but also extremely powerful in bringing together two distinct pathways (P-12 and Higher Education) as one P-16 system; a system with one very specific set of expectations/learning outcomes in the core competency area of written communication. Department faculty have been awarded a 2015 -16 Assessment Grant administered by OIE titled: Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders.