

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: **EdS EDUCATION LEADERSHIP**

Department: **Education Leadership**

Degree or Certificate Level: **Ed.S.**

College/School: **School of Education**

Date (Month/Year): **August 2021**

Primary Assessment Contact: **Sally Beth Lyon, Program Director**

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020 - 2021

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

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

**SLU Outcome:**

Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.

**EdD Student Learning Outcome #2:**

Graduates will apply evidence-based practices in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration.

### 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? 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.

The Educational Leadership EdS program is nested within the EdD degree program. Students in both programs take the same sequence of courses. In this assessment cycle, none of the students in EDL 6110 were pursuing their EdS degree; they were all earning EdD degrees. Accordingly, there is no separate, distinct data for evaluation. The learnings: the strengths, weaknesses, and programmatic improvements gleaned from the analysis of EdD data (and reported in the EdD Assessment Report 2021 as well as here) will also be implemented in the EdS program.

The artifacts directly measuring student learning of *applying evidence-based practices in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration* are:

**Case Study Final Exams**

- a) Assessed by instructor (Lyon) of record using rubric (see attached)
  - i) Collected in EDL 6110 (Lyon) (Fall 2020)
  - ii) n = 15 (all EdD students)

This course is usually taught in-person on Frost Campus or Kansas City. In the Fall of 2020 this course was taught in face-to-face and then was moved to fully online due to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

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

Case study analyses/final exams were scored using a rubric aligned to the rubric used for written comprehensive exams, and aligned to program learning outcomes (see attached). The rubric was intentionally designed to align to the EDL Assessment Plan and SLO 2.

The artifact used to measure student performance on SLO2 were the scores on the first two rows of the rubric (“Problem/theoretical challenges defined”).

The instructor of EDL 6110 discussed results of the assessment, including strengths and weaknesses in relation to SLO #2. Program faculty discussed synthesis of strengths and weaknesses regarding the application of evidence-based practices in educational administration to determine program improvements based on alignment/lack of alignment in August 2021. These collaborative conversations and analysis of strengths and weaknesses informed the onboarding of new faculty assigned to teach this course in the Fall of 2021.

**4. Data/Results**

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? 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)?

EDL 6110 Analysis of Data - Final Exam Fall 2020

N=15

Element	C Range	B range	A Range
Analysis of the problem or the theoretical issues or foundational problems of practice in school district administration.		2 (13.3%)	13 (86.6%)
Application of leadership theory learned in the course.		3 (20%)	12 (80%)

**5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

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

Strengths: This is one of students’ first courses in the EdD/EdS sequence, so the outcome is being introduced and developed. Students were required to apply evidence-based best practices to a case scenario involving the need for district strategic planning and change leadership. Students demonstrated an initial acceptable understanding of the application of evidence-based practices in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration.

Weaknesses: As many as 20% of students require additional instruction and coaching in the application of evidence-based practices, supported with appropriate references to the literature, to the practice of educational administration.

## 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?

The EDL faculty met in June 2021 to review the EDL assessment plan and this year's data cycle. Strengths and weaknesses in the data were discussed and documented. The relationship of this artifact to written comprehensive examinations, data from which were analyzed in the prior year's assessment cycle, was noted. Faculty agreed to continue to use final examinations and projects in content courses to scaffold student analysis and application of evidence-based practices to the problems of practice in running a school district. Pedagogical approaches to this outcome were discussed.

Faculty responsible for teaching EDL 6110 met in August 2021 to review these results and plan specific adjustments to the course in the Fall 2021 semester.

### B. How specifically have you decided to use these 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
- Artifacts of student learning
- 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 these findings.

The content of EDL 6110 School District Administration is being updated to include additional focus on school district strategic planning, leadership for collective efficacy, and change leadership.

The rubrics used to score and provide feedback to students are being revised in additional courses: EDL 6190 School/Community Relations/Politics, EDL 6470 School Facilities, and EDL 6200 Ethics of Educational Leadership.

The EDL faculty met again in August 2021 to review pedagogical approaches and agreed that as a culminating activity for each content course, faculty will highlight , with students, the central theoretical constructs/big ideas learned in the course, that students are responsible for applying to problems of practice in the course final and, eventually, in their written comprehensive exams.

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?

2019 fall finals from EDR 6971 Research Topics and EDL 6110 School District Administration were utilized for review to determine how to align them to SLO #1. These finals were updated to be used for fall 2020 in the format of case studies (and these newly designed case study final exams are the topic of this 2020-2021 Assessment Report for SLO #2) . The analysis was conducted by professors and discussed with faculty.

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

Faculty share artifacts of student work (e.g. final examinations) to discuss strengths and weaknesses in students' ability to apply discipline-based literature and educational theory to problems of practice. Student responses to comprehensive examinations the following year are being analyzed for strengths and weaknesses.

**C.** What were the findings of the assessment?

Students have improved their demonstrated ability to apply discipline based literature to educational practice. Faculty also observed a relative weakness in students' ability to apply evidence-based practices to the specific plan to address the problems identified, which led to faculty analysis of SLO #2 in the 2020-2021 cycle.

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

Student responses to comprehensive examinations will be analyzed annually to ensure continued improvement.

**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
<b>Content Depth &amp; Breadth Indicated</b>	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.	
<b>Content Accuracy</b>	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 <hr/> / 8

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

<b>Completeness: Evidence and Examples</b>	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.	
<b>Clear Writing Style</b>	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.	
<b>Design &amp; Organization</b>	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.	
<b>Grammar &amp; Spelling</b>	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

## Use of discipline-based literature on finals

	4	3	2	1
<b>Use of discipline-based literature</b>	Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various aspects of discipline-based literature relevant to the focus of the coursework.	Presents in-depth information from relevant disciplined-based literature representing various points of view/approaches.	Presents information from relevant disciplined-based literature representing limited points of view/approaches.	Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.
<b>Analysis</b>	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.
<b>Conclusions</b>	States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the disciplined-based literature findings.	States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the disciplined-based literature findings.	States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the disciplined-based literature findings.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported conclusion from disciplined-based literature findings.
<b>Limitations and Implications</b>	Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications.	Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications.	Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications.	Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported.



