**PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS**

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**Goals and Objectives:**

The specific goals and objectives of the Educational Leadership programs are instilled through the following principles:

1. Effective leaders develop and articulate reasonable personal and school goals;
2. Effective leaders are instructional leaders and are knowledgeable about analyzing data, identifying, securing, and organizing appropriate resources for school reform (human, technological, etc.);
3. Effective leaders create nurturing and caring educational environments;
4. Effective leaders are knowledgeable about safe practices regarding ethical, legal, social, and political issues;
5. Effective leaders skillfully communicate with internal and external publics;
6. Effective leaders emphasize the importance of literacy, and
7. Effective leaders skillfully practice leadership theories in real world settings.

**M.Ed. Educational Leadership (Principal Licensure)**

**Mission: The Educational Leadership program will prepare leaders to be confident, caring, and reflective decision makers. This hybrid program will equip candidates to become change agents for positively impacting their students’ lives socially, emotionally, physically, and academically. This program is designed for seasoned educators with a strong background in best practice teaching and building positive learning environments, and who are advocates for all students (K-12).**

1. **Within the institution’s mission to provide academic programs to promote student learning (WCU 1) and to provide an environment that supports student learning (WCU 2), the M.Ed. Educational Leadership has six singular, specific, and measureable SLOs.**
   1. **Scoring Guide for Case Scenario One –** As measured by the Case Scenario Scoring Guide, students will identify communication principles, use of implementation strategies, organization of the implementation program, and program rationales when reviewing an effective instructional program. The mean score will be a 3.0 or higher on a four-point Likert scale.
      1. Principles of communication and group processes (building consensus, motivating, and team building);
      2. Implementation and/or change strategies;
      3. Response to the question asked;
      4. Organized steps or actions; and
      5. Logical and reasonable rationales for answers.

Table 1. Case Scenario

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Communication | 3.52 | 3.96 | 3.68 |
| Implementation/Change | 3.58 | 3.90 | 3.90 |
| Response to question | 3.65 | 3.99 | 3.96 |
| Organized steps | 3.60 | 3.99 | 3.92 |
| Logical rationales | 3.63 | 3.99 | 3.98 |
| N= | 48 | 70 | 50 |

* 1. **Principal Leadership Project** – As measured by the PLP rubric, students will analyze leadership types using four dimensions of leadership styles. The mean score will be 3.0 or higher on a four-point Likert Scale.
     1. Dimension 1: Understanding self and others;
     2. Dimension 2: Understanding of complexity of organizational life;
     3. Dimension 3: Building bridges through relationships; and
     4. Dimension 4: Engaging in leadership best practices.

Table 2. Principal Leadership Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Dimension 1 | 3.96 | 3.86 | 3.88 |
| Dimension 2 | 3.88 | 3.84 | 3.82 |
| Dimension 3 | 3.88 | 3.81 | 3.88 |
| Dimension 4 | 3.92 | 3.84 | 3.91 |
| N= | 25 | 37 | 34 |

* 1. **Efforts to Raise Test Scores –** Students will analyze national models of effective learning interventions to raise student test scores. The mean will be 3.0 or higher on each indicator. The analysis will have seven indicators:
     1. The model’s efforts described;
     2. The model’s justification for those strategies implementations;
     3. The model’s application of the interventions;
     4. Models, theories, and conceptual frameworks;
     5. Data analyzed;
     6. Description of data collection and management; and
     7. Reflection.

Table 3. Efforts to Raise Test Scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Efforts | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.92 |
| Justification | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.77 |
| Application | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Theories | 4.00 | 3.91 | 3.92 |
| Data | 4.00 | 3.73 | 3.69 |
| Data Collection | 3.83 | 3.91 | 3.92 |
| Reflection | 3.50 | 3.91 | 3.69 |
| N= | 6 | 11 | 13 |

* 1. **Human Resources Management–** Students will analyze strategies in recruitment, retention practices, diversity, and employment incentives from model districts. The mean will be 3.0 or higher on each indicator. The analysis will have three indicators:
     1. Summaries of recruitment, hiring, retention practices, diversity, recruitment incentives;
     2. Evaluations of recruitment, hiring, retention practices, diversity, recruitment incentives;
     3. Recommendations for improvement of Personnel Management Policy.

Table 4. Human Resources Management

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Summaries | 3.82 | 3.80 | 3.93 |
| Evaluations | 3.75 | 3.80 | 3.81 |
| Recommendations | 3.67 | 3.90 | 3.69 |
| N= | 28 | 10 | 27 |

* 1. **Court Case Analysis–** Students will analyze and comprehend the impact of current court case law by presenting the fact summary, the summary of the judges’ decision, rationalization of the decision based on the judges’ discussion, and personal reflection. The mean will be 3.0 or higher on each indicator. The analysis will have five indicators:
     1. Correct Case Citation and References;
     2. Facts of Case – pro and con;
     3. Decision(s) rendered;
     4. Rationale/Implications for the district, school, and classroom;
     5. Personal Reflection.

Table 5. Court Case Analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Case Citation | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.79 |
| Facts of the Case | 4.00 | 3.93 | 3.90 |
| Decision | 4.00 | 3.79 | 3.93 |
| Rationale/Implications | 4.00 | 3.86 | 3.90 |
| Reflection | 4.00 | 3.54 | 3.83 |
| N= | 5 | 14 | 29 |

* 1. **Logic Model Project –** Students will analyze and comprehend the impact of an highly effective program model through the use of a logic model rubric. The mean will be 3.0 or higher on each indicator. The analysis will have ten indicators:
     1. Statement of the model’s rationale;
     2. Inputs into the model program;
     3. Description of the model’s process;
     4. Description and analysis of the model’s outcomes;
     5. Outline the participants’ relationships;
     6. Evaluate the presentation effectiveness;
     7. Evaluate the contributions made;
     8. Evaluate the timeliness of the model;
     9. Summarize the model’s performance;
     10. Describe the cooperative elements.

Table 6. Logic Model Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Statement of Rationale | 3.79 | 3.07 | 4.00 |
| Inputs | 4.00 | 3.13 | 4.00 |
| Process | 3.96 | 2.93 | 4.00 |
| Outcomes | 4.00 | 3.07 | 4.00 |
| Relationships | 3.95 | 3.21 | 4.00 |
| Presentation | 4.00 | 3.08 | 4.00 |
| Contribution | 4.00 | 3.14 | 4.00 |
| Timeliness | 3.68 | 3.14 | 4.00 |
| Performance | 4.00 | 3.15 | 4.00 |
| Cooperation | 4.00 | 3.13 | 4.00 |
| N = | 24 | 15 | 1 |

1. **What students learned as documented by learning measurements.**

The M.Ed. Elementary Education program is a teaching degree designed to advance the instructional best practices of kindergarten through 6th grade educators. As demonstrated by the SLOs, educators learn to design and implement integrated teaching units based on current curriculum design research findings, current integration of technology into classroom plans, building a diverse and inclusive learning environment with value-added instructional activities to encourage each child’s best efforts, and the growth of intelligence through increased knowledge and skills training.

**3) Documented evidence of what students learned and did not learn based on SLOs.**

**What students learned?**

M.Ed. Elementary Education students reported high scores when analyzing program components, especially in faculty expertise (4.7), best practices (4.6), research skills (4.7), technology (4.6), and scholarly writing (4.7). Two components were reflections on their advanced abilities in research skills and scholarly writing. These are important indicators that the graduate program is providing needed experiences in these two areas and increasing students’ confidence in their abilities to conduct research. The other SLOs are focused on designing powerful learning experiences, creating lively, high impact, brain-based class environments founded on brain-based research, and implementing value-added assessments to diagnose learning achievements. There are strong indicators that this was happening across all five SLOs.

**What students did not learn based on SLOs?**

Differentiated instruction continues to be the learning block for many of the students. The inclusive classroom model employs concepts foreign to students who have been previously trained in whole group instruction, teaching to the middle of the group’s abilities, and meeting the needs of exceptional learners.

**4) Evidence of continuing appropriate programmatic SLOs.**

Four of the five SLOs are being continued without revision because they offer a strong diagnostic analysis of student growth in instructional practices and design. The Comprehensive Examination is under review determining if more diagnostic program information could be produced through the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) which is content and application. The Comprehensive Examination only provides evidence of content knowledge.

1. **Evidence of programmatic revision or improvement for weak results on SLOs.**

The Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) is designed to analyze educators’ professional growth throughout the M.Ed. program. The analysis includes the teaching abilities to differentiate instruction, integration of content, demonstrating the educator’s impact on students’ learning in their classrooms. The Assessing Student Learning was first implemented in 2016-2017. Four other key assessments will be added to complete the TPA summative assessment package. The Instructional Unit will be replaced with the TPA assessments.