SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Educational Doctorate	Department: Educational Leadership
Degree or Certificate Level: Ed.D.	College/School: School of Education
Date (Month/Year): November, 2020	Primary Assessment Contact: Jody Wood
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Outcome 3 (Students will apply evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in the broader context).

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Comprehensive examinations and student passage rates were the artifacts and data used as well as the questions themselves. These comprehensive examinations are completed in the final semester of coursework and designed to align to all coursework in the Educational Leadership in the Ed.D. as outlined in the roadmap. This artifact consists of 6 case study questions divided into three appropriate leadership areas and students must answer one question from each of the three areas. The case studies are integrated so students apply evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in the broader context.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Student passage rates were reviewed and the questions themselves were examined using the current rubric by the entire faculty following comprehensive exams from both fall 2019 and spring 2020. The questions were focused on individual courses and did not contain inter-course content focused on the broader context These questions were scored by the faculty member for the specific course and if there was a questions of passage a second faculty scored the question as well. The faculty discussed how administrators conduct school administration and determined the current process did not align to current school processes nor did they demonstrate enough interdisciplinary theories nor evidence-based practices.

The attached rubric quality indicators/criteria
Content depth/breadth
Content accuracy
Evidence and examples of evidence-based practices
Clear writing style
Organization of content showcasing ideas and connectedness to research

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

93% passed in the fall of 2019 (3/45 failed), 80% passed in the spring 2020 (1/5 failed). The failures were due to lack of content accuracy and depth and breadth of content. This was in direct relation to the student outcome of students will apply evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in the broader context. Specifically, the evidence-based knowledge in Ethics in the fall session (philosophers and Ethical principles) and in Law (legal knowledge and application) and research (application of research practices) in the spring were the issues. Modality had no effect on the achievement.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Students reported it was too much about specific information not closely related to evidence-based practice. Two students who did not pass struggled to identify the theories and evidence-based practices to the specific area of Ethics. We know 80 to 90% of students are doing well, based upon the current instruction, but we still have a small % of our students who have not been able to perform well in this mode. Specifically, these students had not studied evidence-based practices related to these areas. Since the expectation was a depth and breadth of content knowledge with evidence-based practices (criteria from the rubric), it became apparent the comprehensive exams needed to be revised to be more accessible to all students. Specifically, one student in the fall who failed was a second language person and one student who failed in the spring was a minority, the faculty began to consider the need to make the comprehensive exams focused more on practice and less on producing memorized content information.

The faculty considered possible remedies to include examining and changing the structure of comps, identify students we think will struggle with language and provide additional supports leading up to the comps. The determination was first to reconstruct the comprehensive exams which was done over the summer and to add case studies as finals for classes to help prepare students for responding to this type of work to help prepare them for comps.

Strengths:
Here are the contents where students proved to be successful: questions passed Human Resources, District Administration, School and Community Relations, Curriculum, Finance, Law, Professional Development and Teacher Evaluation, Politics, and Facilities. Students apply evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in the broader context through Problem based learning projects in most of these classes thus students do apply evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in real world contexts. The pedagogy in classes is strong with interactive lectures, real world applications of knowledge learned, and interactive discussions of issues experiences and problem solving together.

Remedies:
The faculty determined the comprehensive exams needed to use a case study approach which would use integrated coursework areas and theories along with incorporation of more evidence- based practices. The case study questions were written, a rubric prepared and then reviewed during collaboration of all faculty to ensure agreement. Once these components were agreed upon by the entire faculty, it was determined a pilot study should be conducted to allow faculty to practice scoring and calibrate to ensure accurate scoring across faculty. A pilot/practice using one question was conducted followed by joint faculty scoring of answers using the rubric, adjustments were then made to both the process and the rubric.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

At the conclusion of the spring comps, the faculty convened to look at the exams in their entirety to discuss the success rate, the learning gaps specific by course content, and the possible remedies for improving students applying evidence-based knowledge of educational leadership to address problems in the broader context.

Program faculty identified how they might use these findings to improve teaching and learning in the courses taught and it was suggested the best modality to ensure evidence-based practices and administration theories were incorporated in an interdisciplinary mode would be to utilize case studies that cover multiple areas of content.

This approach has demonstrated it represents a better way of evaluating student knowledge. This approach provides a more in-depth analysis of various administration theories as applied in school administration. Further, it has been determined by faculty of various courses to implement case study analysis (similar to the comprehensive exams) as finals in courses to help prepare students in how to analyze and answer case studies appropriately.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan
- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

Program faculty identified how they might use these findings to improve teaching and learning in the courses taught and it was suggested the best modality to ensure evidence-based practices and administration theories were incorporated in an interdisciplinary mode would be to utilize case studies that cover multiple areas of content.

Additionally, the program faculty has determined to move the fall comprehensive finals to July/August to better accommodate student needs. This was discussed during faculty meeting and approved unanimously. Because this method has proven to be a positive change, new questions are being composed to utilize for spring exams, as stated in Section 5 the rubric has been updated.

This year program faculty have worked to revise the assessment plans based on results from previous assessment cycles. Specifically, we revised our student learning outcomes, created a four-year assessment cycle plan for collecting student artifacts and agreed upon a schedule "assessment talks" during each monthly faculty meeting.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes**
   A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

   We have added a class (Admin of Special Education) and redesigned the arrangement of delivery of coursework/roadmap. These changes were determined as a need based on student feedback.

   B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

   They have been assessed through student feedback at exit interviews. These are ways we continue to asses – grades, exit interviews which are indirect measures and this feedback provides ways we can improve the program.

   C. What were the findings of the assessment?

   Students provided positive feedback on all changes (courses, roadmap)

   D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to ask for feedback from students concerning how we can proceed in our cycle of continuous improvement. Additionally, we will continue to utilize results of student scores and create a curriculum map to ensure questions are aligned to all coursework.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

Top Two categories are screening – if the question does not score a three in each of the top two areas – it would not pass

CATEGORY	4 – Exceeds Expectations	3 – Meets Expectations	2 - Approaching Expectations	1 - Below Expectations	Score
Content Depth & Breadth Indicated	The answer contains an extensive depth and breadth of knowledge of the subject which is distributed throughout in a meaningful manner and expands the question's meaning.	The answer contains both depth and breadth of knowledge of the subject with appropriate application and answers the question.	The answer demonstrates a minimum or surface level application of the knowledge base and/or does not answer portions of the question.	The answer does not represent an understanding of the knowledge base and does not address the question.	
Content Accuracy	All supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.	Almost all supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.	Few supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.	Most supportive facts and statistics were inaccurately reported.	Sub total ____ / 8

The total for the two areas above must be 6 and both must be at least 3 in order to continue

Completeness: Evidence and Examples	All of the evidence and examples are specific, relevant and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence is connected and supports the author's answering of the question.	Most of the evidence and examples are specific, relevant and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the author's answering of the question.	Some of the pieces of evidence and examples are relevant and have an explanation that shows how that piece of evidence supports the author's position.	Most evidence and examples are NOT relevant AND/OR are not explained.	
Clear Writing Style	Descriptions and supporting detail are provided in an order that makes it easy and interesting to follow the author's train of thought.	Descriptions and supporting details are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it reasonably easy to follow the author's train of thought.	Several of the support details or descriptions are not in an expected order; distracting the reader and making the essay seem somewhat confusing.	Many of the support details or descriptions are not clear; distracting the reader and making the essay seem very confusing.	
Design & Organization	The organization is sequential with a variety of thoughtful paragraphs which flow, clearly showcasing ideas and their connectedness to each other and the writing answers the entire question clearly.	The organization is logical with transitions that show how ideas are connected, but there is repetition of the some transitions. The writing is designed and does adequately answer the question.	The organization only partially answers the question with some transitions that work well, but some connections between ideas are fuzzy.	There does not appear to be any logical organization and the writing does not answer the question. The transitions between ideas are unclear OR nonexistent.	
Grammar & Spelling	Author makes no errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	Author makes 1-2 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	Author makes 3-4 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	Author makes more than 4 errors in grammar or spelling that distracts the reader from the content.	

Total Points: _____

24 – 22 – passing with distinction (must have 4 in content depth/breadth, accuracy, and evidence)
21 – 14 – passing (must have at least a 3 depth/breadth and accuracy or it automatically does not pass)
13 – 0 - fail

EDL MASTERS

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	P/F
1043	18		P
Grader >>	Lyon	Lyon	

EDL MASTERS CATHOLIC

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (2)	P/F
1028	20				
1042	18				
Grader >>	James	Tichy	James	Tichy	

EDL PhD

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	P/F
1008		19	16			16	20				
Grader >>	Everson	Lea	Wood	Lyon	Everson	James	Wood	Lea	Shindel	Lyon	

EDL PhD

Student ID #	Day 1 (1)	Day 1 (2)	Day 1 (3)	Day 1 (4)	Day 1 (5)	Day 2 (1)	Day 2 (2)	Day 2 (3)	Day 2 (4)	Day 2 (5)	P/F
1021							18				
Grader >>	Everson	Murdick	Murdick	Murdick	Shindel	Shindel	James	Wood	Lea	Everson	

EDL PhD

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	P/F
1051		16		19		16	19				
Grader >>	Everson	Lea	Wood	Lyon (SCR)	Shindel	James	Wood	Lea	Shindel	Lyon	

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	AM (6)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	PM (6)	P/F
1004	18	20		23					18	4			
1013	16	18					16			17			
1015	17	22					18						
1018	22	19					19						
1022	21			19			21		17				
1036		12							16				
1038	17	10							12				F
1052	21	18							16				
Grader >>	James	Lyon (Ethics	Tichy	Rebore	Buckley	James	James	Tichy	Lyon (SCR)	Lea	James	Quinn	

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	AM (6)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	PM (6)	P/F
1003	16	17								14		24	
1005		24		20			16			14			
1006				18		21				14	18	24	P
1007	16	18								20		20	
1012	17	24		21			18				16		P
1014	18	24		22								21	
1017	18	22		23						14		21	P
1026		Not mine		18		16						20	
1031		19		22							18	21	
1032		22		21						21		24	
1034	16	24								18		21	
1035	15			20		16				14		19	P
1039	16			20		23	19				21	20	P
1046		24		24						18		24	
1048		24		21			19						
1050	18	24					18			22		21	P
Grader >>	James	Lyon (Ethics	Tichy	Rebore	Buckley	James	James	Tichy	yon Koberlei	Lea	James	Rebore	

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	AM (6)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	P/F
1001			17			18	12		21			
1011			17	17		19	14	19	21			P
1024		22	24			20	24	23				P
1027		16	17	22			11	19	17			P
1029		19		15		18		21	16			P
1037		14	16	16			18	18	15			P
1040		14		20		15	17	14				P
1041				20		18	12	17	16			
1002		18				19	16		16			
1009		22	22	21				14	22			P
1010		17		23			17		23			
1023		16	16						20			
1025			17	18		16	17		21			P
1044			17			18	16					
1049		17				16	17		16			
Grader >>	Vogelaar	Lea	Lyon (SCR)	Wood	Hodge	Rebore	Lyon (Ethics)	Lea	Wood	Everson	Wright	

This is the question the student answered

EDL MASTERS CATHOLIC

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	P/F
2007		19	P
2008	21		P
Grader >>	James	James	■

EDL PhD

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)	P/F
2009	22	17		22		23	17			19	P
Grader >>	James	Tichy	Everson	Colignon	Shindel	James	Tichy	Everson	Koberlein	Grawitch	■

EDL EdD Houston

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	AM (6)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)
2003	22	17			22		21				20
2004	22	17	22				20			14	
Grader >>	James	Lyon	Tichy	Rebore	Buckley	James	James	Tichy	Lyon	Lea	James

EDL EdD

Student ID #	AM (1)	AM (2)	AM (3)	AM (4)	AM (5)	AM (6)	PM(1)	PM(2)	PM (3)	PM (4)	PM (5)
2005		22			16	20	15	21	15		
2006			F		15	14		15	14	F	
Grader >>	Lyon	Rebore	Everson	James	Wood	Lea	Lyon	Lea	Wood	Hodge	Wright

PM (6)	P/F
15	P
18	P
Quinn	

P/F
P
F