

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: MA Educational Leadership

Department: Educational Leadership

Degree or Certificate Level: Masters

College/School: School of Education

Date (Month/Year): December, 2020

Primary Assessment Contact: Jody Wood, Ed.D.

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2019-2020

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?

Outcomes 1 and 2

### 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.

Artifacts of student learning used to determine student attainment of outcomes included completed rubrics for the final examination/School Improvement Plan project from Principalship I, EDL 5630, compared to the completed rubrics from the capstone assessment, the Performance Assessment for Aspiring Building Administrators, completed to evaluate student's final assignment for EDL 5913, Principal Internship, and required by Missouri for principal certification. Principalship I is a hybrid/blended course; the Internship is a field-based course.

### 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.

Rubrics are attached.

Student work from EDL 5630, Principalship I, was evaluated by the instructors. Student work in EDL 5913, Principal Internship, were scored by two scorers on the educational leadership faculty and any score discrepancies were resolved. These completed rubrics were then compared to determine the level of preparation students received in Principalship I in order to be successful on the program capstone assessment, and in order to fully demonstrate Outcomes 1 and 2.

### 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)?

As a result of this review, faculty determined that students are demonstrating mastery of Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will assess data, relevant literature, administration practices, and educational theories to analyze issues

related to building level administration practices, and Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will apply knowledge about evidence based leadership, communication, financial, legal, curriculum/instruction/assessment, and management practices to work in building level educational administration areas. Achievement did not differ by teaching modality. Faculty did determine that students were better prepared to achieve these learning outcomes, based on the spring 2020 class data reviewed, than was the case in prior years, due to alignment of the curriculum in Principalship I with the capstone Performance Assessment. Faculty made additional adjustments to Principalship I content in order to tune this alignment.

Rubric scores from the Performance Assessment for Aspiring Building Administrators were scored both analytically and holistically. Data for each step of the assessment are reported below as well as overall scores. Individual Steps in the assessment are aligned with the State of Missouri Leadership Standards.

The data below demonstrate an improvement for students in the second cohort that had experienced the full curricular alignment of Principalship I.

	Step I	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Total
All	3.29	3.54	3.39	3.21	13.43
Cohort 1	3.2	3.45	3.35	3.1	13.1
Cohort 2	3.5	3.75	3.5	3.5	14.25

## 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

Students are prepared to analyze data in order to identify and address problems of practice in school leadership. Further work can be done to integrate the requirements of the Performance Assessment in other courses. The faculty is now engaged in a curriculum mapping activity, during which we will consider changing/updating the learning objectives in School Law, School finance, Curriculum, and Professional Development/Teacher Evaluation to emphasize the requirements of the capstone assessment and Learning Outcome #2.

## 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?

Faculty discussed these results during collaborative meetings on September 12, 2020, on Moving Forward Day September 23, 2020, and during monthly faculty meetings.

**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.

Changes have been implemented in course content in Principalship I. Changes were implemented in scoring procedures and in student supervision for EDL 5913, Internship. Changes in course content are being further evaluated for School Law, Finance, Curriculum, and PD/PE

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?

As a result of evaluating student data as identified in the assessment plan, the program faculty replaced written comprehensive examinations with the Performance Assessment for Aspiring Building Administrators.

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

This change was assessed per the evaluation of rubrics discussed above, and the comparison/alignment of course-based rubrics with the quality expectations delineated in the rubric for the capstone assessment.

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

A comparison of student scores on the Performance Assessment for Aspiring Building Administrator from 2019 to 2020 demonstrates improvement in student achievement of Learning Outcomes.

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

Faculty will complete the curriculum mapping project during the 20-21 school year, further aligning learning objectives and course content.

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

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR STEP I

Performance Descriptors	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Well Below Expectations
Score	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
<p><b>Step I Domain: Visionary Leader</b></p> <p>Knows the importance of a vision and how it relates to the core values and culture of the school community</p> <p>Understands how multiple sources of data are connected to a mission, vision, and core values</p> <p>Responses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Identification of key instructional problem, supported by evidence and rationale for selection (data artifact);</li> <li>*Consequences if key problem is not addressed (two sources of evidence artifact);</li> <li>*Description of school climate and culture, including demographic information regarding students, faculty, and community (faculty overview artifact).</li> </ul> <p><b>Competencies 1, 3</b></p>	<p>The candidate provides an exemplary narrative and artifacts to describe a problem and thoroughly uses appropriate data to support his/her notion that it is a problem; the candidate provides strong evidence of goals and outcomes to address the problem, which, in turn, is thoroughly linked to the core values, mission, and vision of the building and the candidate's understanding of how to use data to support the need for change.</p>	<p>The candidate provides acceptable narrative and artifacts of a problem and effectively explains the use of data to support this claim; the candidate provides adequate evidence of goals and outcomes to address the problem, which, in turn, is clearly linked to the core values, mission, vision, and data of the building.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a weak narrative and artifacts of a problem and makes some attempt to explain the use of data to support this claim; the candidate provides some evidence of goals and outcomes to address the problem, which, in turn, is loosely connected to the core values, mission, vision, and data of the building.</p>	<p>The candidate provides little or no narrative and artifacts of a problem and provides an incomplete explanation of the use of data to support this claim; the candidate provides confusing evidence of goals and outcomes to address the problem, which, in turn, is not convincingly linked to the core values, mission, vision, and data of the building.</p>
SCORE	4	3	2	1

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR STEP II

Performance Descriptors	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Well Below Expectations
Score	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
<p><b>Step II: Relational Leader and Innovative Leader</b></p> <p>Understands the importance of building effective relationships with staff</p> <p>Recognizes knowledge, skills, and best practices that support continuous professional growth</p> <p>Responses include:</p> <p>*Description of a school improvement plan developed to address key instructional problem;</p> <p>*Building relationships and continuous improvement</p> <p>(a)Explanation of best practices and activities used with staff (sample journal article or other reputable source)</p> <p>(b)Explanation of how plan was implemented</p> <p>*Communication with staff to ensure implementation of the plan was successful (sample communication artifact);</p> <p>*Description of professional development activities provided for staff</p> <p>(a)Description of how new knowledge/professional development activities provided to staff (sample agenda of Professional Learning Activity notice to staff artifact AND sample professional reading linked to Professional Learning Activity artifact)</p> <p>(b)Explanation of those involved in organizing and</p>	<p>The candidate provides an exemplary narrative and artifacts of actions and communications strategies and thoroughly explains the professional development activities; the candidate provides strong evidence of research to determine the appropriateness of the professional learning activities chosen, which, in turn, is thoroughly linked to the development of a school improvement plan and best practices to meet the needs of the staff and to build strong relationships.</p>	<p>The candidate provides acceptable narrative and artifacts of actions and communications strategies and effectively explains the professional development activities; the candidate provides adequate evidence of research to determine the appropriateness of the professional learning activities chosen, which, in turn, is clearly linked to the development of a school improvement plan and best practices to meet the needs of the staff and to build strong relationships.</p>	<p>The candidate provides weak narrative and artifacts of actions and communications strategies and attempts to explain the professional development activities; the candidate provides sketchy evidence of research to determine the appropriateness of the professional learning activities chosen, which, in turn, is loosely linked to the development of a school improvement plan and best practices to meet the needs of staff and to build strong relationships.</p>	<p>The candidate provides little or no narrative and artifacts of actions and communications strategies and provides an incomplete explanation of the professional development activities; the candidate provides unclear evidence of research to determine the appropriateness of professional learning activities chosen, which, in turn, is not convincingly linked to the development of a school improvement plan and best practices to meet the needs of staff and to build strong relationships.</p>

<p>how these people were chosen or volunteered;</p> <p>*Description of the benefit of the Professional Learning Activity for staff (sample survey and one participant's response artifact).</p> <p><b>Competencies 20, 26</b></p>				
<p><b>SCORE</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR STEP III

Performance Descriptors	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Well Below Expectations
Score	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
<p><b>Step III Domain: Managerial Leader</b></p> <p>Understands how routines, procedures, and schedules support the school environment</p> <p>Understands the necessity of establishing and communicating clear expectations, guidelines, and procedures</p> <p>Responses include:</p> <p>*Description of the schedule of events to address key instructional problem (timeline artifact);</p> <p>*Development of goals aligned to the building school improvement plan (goal artifact);</p> <p>*Description of key participants and contribution to the solution of the problem (participant list artifact);</p> <p>*Description of how participants were motivated to support the school improvement effort (communication request for participation artifact);</p> <p>*Description of self-preparation for effective leadership required to complete the school improvement challenge;</p> <p>**Description of the formative and summative assessments to determine if outcomes were met (evaluation artifact).</p> <p><b>Competencies 11, 13</b></p>	<p>The candidate provides exemplary narrative and artifacts of a schedule to address the problem and thoroughly explains the goals, people, and steps used to support this claim; the candidate provides strong evidence of leadership strategies to address the problem, which, in turn, is thoroughly linked to assessments to determine the extent of success and the extent to which the routines, procedures, schedules, and communications support the school environment.</p>	<p>The candidate provides acceptable narrative and artifacts of a schedule to address the problem and effectively explains the goals, people, and steps used to support this claim; the candidate provides adequate evidence of leadership strategies to address the problem, which, in turn, is clearly linked to assessments to determine the extent of success and the extent to which the routines, procedures, schedules, and communication support the school environment.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a weak narrative and artifacts of a schedule to address the problem and attempts to explain the goals, people, and steps used to support this claim; the candidate provides some evidence of leadership strategies to address the problem, which, in turn, is loosely linked to assessments to determine the extent of success and the extent to which the routines, procedures, schedules, and communications support the school environment.</p>	<p>The candidate provides little or no narrative and artifacts of a schedule to address the problem and provides a confusing explanation of how goals, people, and steps are used to support this claim; the candidate provides unclear evidence of leadership strategies to address the problem, which, in turn, is not convincingly linked to assessments to determine the extent of success and the extent to which the routines, procedures, schedules, and communications support the school environment.</p>
<b>SCORE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR STEP IV

Performance Descriptors	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Well Below Expectations
Score	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
<p><b>Step IV Domain: Innovative Leader</b></p> <p>Understands the importance of reflection and a commitment to ongoing learning</p> <p>Recognizes that beliefs based on new knowledge and understandings are used as a catalyst for change</p> <p>Responses include:</p> <p>*Development of a self-reflection regarding successes and failures of experience, leadership growth, what would be done differently in subsequent plans, and reasons for improved leadership as a result of the action research;</p> <p>*Description of the legal implications relative to staff participants and student outcomes, especially the impact of all student groups, including socio-economic, diversity, special education, ethnicity, ELL/ESOL, etc. (legal source artifact).</p> <p><b>Competencies 28, 31</b></p>	<p>The candidate provides exemplary narrative and artifact of reflective thought that describes lessons learned from the experience and thoroughly explains changes that would be made in the future; the candidate provides strong evidence of knowledge and understanding of legal, socio-economic, diverse culture, special needs, and other implications, which, in turn, is thoroughly linked to commitment to on-going learning.</p>	<p>The candidate provides acceptable narrative and artifact of reflective thought that describes lessons learned from the experience and effectively explains changes that would be made in the future; the candidate provides adequate evidence of knowledge and understanding of legal, socio-economic, diverse culture, special needs, and other implications, which, in turn, is clearly linked to commitment to on-going learning.</p>	<p>The candidate provides weak narrative and artifact of reflective thought that describes lessons learned from the experience and attempts to explain changes that would be made in the future; the candidate provides sketchy evidence of knowledge and understanding of legal, socio-economic, diverse culture, special needs, and other implications, which, in turn, is loosely linked to commitment to on-going learning.</p>	<p>The candidate provides little or no narrative or artifact of reflective thought that describes lessons learned from the experience and an incomplete explanation of changes that would be made in the future; the candidate provides unclear evidence of knowledge and understanding of legal, socio-economic, diverse culture, special needs, and other implications, which, in turn, is not convincingly linked to commitment to on-going learning.</p>
<b>SCORE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>



CANDIDATE NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ SEMESTER: \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:**

**Step I Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step II Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step III Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step IV Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Step I Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step II Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step III Score:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Step IV Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total All Steps:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total All Steps:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Average Score** \_\_\_\_\_

**Points Possible 16**

**Points required to pass: Ten (10)**

**This Candidate:**

**Pass    Fail**

**COMMENT(s)**