

Program-Level Assessment Plan



Program: Doctorate of Education Educational Leadership	Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master's program, doctoral program): Doctoral Program
Department: Educational Leadership	College/School: School of Education
Date (Month/Year): August 2021	Primary Assessment Contact: Sally Beth Lyon, Program Director

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	
			Artifacts of Student Learning (What)	Evaluation Process (How)
	<p>What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program?</p> <p>Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</p>	<p>In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level at which student development is expected in each course (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.).</p>	<p>1. What artifacts of student learning will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome?</p> <p>2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected?</p>	<p>1. What process will be used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom?</p> <p>2. What tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process?</p> <p>Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.</p>
1	<p>SLU outcome: Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field(s) of study.</p> <p>Ed.D. Outcome: Graduates will apply discipline-based literature to educational administration practices.</p>	<p>EDL-5914 Internship: Superintendent (D, R, A) EDL-6110 School District Administration (I) EDL-6190 School Community Relations/Politics (I, D, A) EDL-6200 Ethics of Educational Leadership (R, A) EDL-6300 Advanced School Law (I, D, A) EDL-6390 Gateway Leadership Institute (R) EDL-6400 Human Resources Administration (I, D, A) EDL-6470 Planning School Facilities (I, D, A) EDL-6690 School Business</p>	<p>1. Comprehensive Exam. Students respond to case study scenarios that require accurate application of relevant literature and scholarship to complex problems of practice, drawing upon content from all courses in the program.</p> <p>2. Artifact is collected in EDL 6950, Special Studies for Exams.</p>	<p>A rubric (to be reviewed annually - see attached) will be used to blind score student responses to each case study scenario. The rubric is aligned to these Assessment Plan Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>Two faculty readers evaluate each response and identify strengths and weaknesses regarding the application of discipline-based literature to the case study questions. Findings are reported and discussed with the entire program faculty to determine program improvements.</p> <p>Data on quality of questions is reviewed to ensure rigor and if it appears the</p>

		Administration (I, D, A) EDL-6450 Managing the District Level Curriculum (C & I) (I, D, A) EDL-6730 Personnel Evaluation and Development (C & I II) (I, D, A) EDL-6960 Project Guidance (R, A) EDSP-6110 Special Education Administration (I, D, A) EDR-6971 Research: Topics in Educational Adm. (I)		questions need more rigor, they will be rewritten.
2	<p>SLU Outcome: Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.</p> <p>Ed.D outcome: 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.</p>	EDL-6450 Managing the District Level Curriculum (I,D,A) EDL-6400 Human Resources Administration(I,D, A) EDL-6470 Planning School Facilities (I,D,A) EDL 6110 School District Administration (I, D)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final projects in these three courses require students to apply their knowledge of evidence-based practices to actual school district practices in the relevant course area (curriculum, human resources, and facilities). These case studies or audits of district practice compared to best practices in educational administration are the artifacts to be analyzed regarding this outcome. 2. Artifacts are collected in EDL 6450 (Fall), EDL 6400 (Fall), EDL 6110 (Fall) ,EDL 6470 (Spring). 	<p>Audits will be scored using a rubric (to be rewritten and reviewed/approved by faculty) and comparison of scores across classes will occur to review quality of application of practices, theories, and research methodology. Faculty will identify strengths and weaknesses regarding the application of evidence-based practices in educational administration. Findings are reported and discussed with the entire program faculty to determine program improvements.</p> <p>Strengths and weaknesses will be reviewed by faculty to determine if changes are needed in course content or pedagogy.</p>
3	<p>SLU Outcomes: Apply knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts.</p> <p>Articulate arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general</p>	EDL 5914 Superintendent Internship (D, R, A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Superintendent Internship Final Report. Students write a final report that demonstrates application of evidence-based practices through reflection and analysis. 2. Artifact collected in EDL 5914 Superintendent Internship. 	University Supervisors of student internships will analyze strengths and weaknesses demonstrated in students' internship final reports, regarding their application of evidence-based practices. Course content throughout the program (e.g. in EDL 6110 School District Administration, EDL 6300 School Law, EDL 6690 School Business Administration, EDL 6190 School Community

	<p>audience, in both oral and written forms.</p> <p>Ed.D. Outcome Graduates will articulate arguments or explanations about evidence-based practice in leadership, communication, legal, financial curriculum/instruction/assessment/ and management in educational leadership.</p>			<p>Relations/Politics) will be realigned to address identified weaknesses.</p> <p>At this time students are assessed on a pass/fail basis. During the 2022-2023 school year faculty plan to develop a rubric aligned to Assessment Plan outcomes to facilitate analysis of student strengths and weaknesses and ensure consistency across evaluators.</p>
4	<p>SLU Outcome Evidence of scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.</p> <p>Ed.D outcome: Graduates will propose and conduct research related to educational leadership practices emphasizing professional integrity in the field.</p>	EDL 6960 Project Guidance (A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Team Projects and Individual Analysis Reports. Students produce a project report describing the results of their culminating doctoral project, in which they applied evidence-based practice to a team-identified problem, conducted appropriate data collection, and produced recommendations. Students write an Individual Analysis Report reflecting upon this project and their leadership development through the program. 2. Artifact is collected in EDL 6960 Project Guidance. 3. Student feedback for program improvement is collected during student oral examinations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final team projects are reviewed by the student's adviser and committee to determine strengths and weaknesses in graduates' ability to propose and conduct research related to educational leadership practices. 2. A rubric will be created in 2021-2022 and will be used to evaluate team projects and individual analysis reports. 3. Student feedback is catalogued in writing during individual student oral examinations and disseminated to all faculty, discussed collaboratively, and used to inform program improvement.

Use of Assessment Data

1. How and when will analyzed data be used by program faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment practices?

Faculty analyze data as described in this plan during monthly faculty meetings throughout the assessment year. Improvement decisions are summarized by

faculty collectively during a faculty meeting in May/June of each year. Individual faculty members adjust course syllabi, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies accordingly for the subsequent school year during the summer and implement changes in the subsequent year.

2. How and when will the program faculty evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?

As described in this Assessment Plan, faculty review prior years’ improvement changes annually in order to monitor and adjust. Specifically, program faculty discuss assessment-informed changes made in previous years throughout the year at program faculty meetings to determine if they have closed the loop regarding strengths and weaknesses.

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will program faculty assess each of the program’s student learning outcomes? (Please note: It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)

	Student Learning Outcome	Artifact	Closing the Loop
2019 - 2020	SLO 1	Comprehensive Exams	
2020 - 2021	SLO 2	Case studies/Audits	SLO 1 (Comprehensive Exams)
2021 - 2022	SLO 4	Team Projects and Individual Analysis Reports (IAR)	SLO 2 (Case studies/Audits)
2022 - 2023 (Projected)	SLO 3	Superintendent Internship Final Reports	SLO 4 (Team Projects/IAR)
2023 - 2024 (Projected)	SLO 1	Comprehensive Exams	SLO 3 (Internship Final Reports)

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

Faculty developed the Ed.D. Assessment Plan collaboratively throughout the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. Faculty directly involved with the Ed.D. Program worked with the School of Education’s Assessment Coordinator to align the plan with the University’s Assessment Student Learning Outcomes. The plan was updated for clarity in August 2021.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

Research Report : Curriculum Audit Report

Student Names: _____ yhgyh

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Amount of Information	All topics are addressed and all questions answered with at least 3 sentences about each.	All topics are addressed and most questions answered with at least 2 sentences about each.	All topics are addressed, and most questions answered with 1 sentence about each.	One or more topics were not addressed.
Quality of Information	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several supporting details and/or examples.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It provides 1-2 supporting details and/or examples.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. No details and/or examples are given.	Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic.
Sources	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format. (taken from if copied from Internet)	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. (taken from if copied from Internet)	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format. (taken from if copied from Internet)	Some sources are not accurately documented.
Theory of Change	A specific and relevant theory of change is included and directly aligned to data	A relevant theory of change is included and aligns to the problem found in the data	A theory of change was included but did not align clearly to the data	No theory of change was included.
Logic Model	A clear and logical logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	A clear logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	A limited logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	No logic model was included.
Appendix	Attachments are recorded and organized in an extremely neat and orderly fashion.	Attachments are recorded legibly and are somewhat organized.	Attachments are recorded.	Attachments are recorded only with peer/teacher assistance and reminders.
Paragraph Construction	All paragraphs include introductory sentence, explanations or details, and concluding sentence.	Most paragraphs include introductory sentence, explanations or details, and concluding sentence.	Paragraphs included related information but were typically not constructed well.	Paragraphing structure was not clear and sentences were not typically related within the paragraphs.
Graphs & Illustrations	Diagrams and illustrations are neat, accurate and add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are accurate and add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are neat and accurate and sometimes add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are not accurate OR do not add to the reader's understanding of the topic.
Introduction	Introduction contained explicit demographic data and information relevant to the school.	Introduction contained necessary demographic data and information relevant to the school.	Introduction contained basic information and demographic data for the report.	Introduction contained only minimal demographic data.
Standards	Each of the 5 standards was addressed explicitly with documentation to back up the findings.	Each of the 5 standards was addressed with documentation to back up the findings.	Each of the 5 standards was addressed and findings were outlined carefully.	Each of the 5 standards was noted with some findings in each area.
Recommendations	Each finding that indicated less than the standard was addressed in a direct format.	Almost findings that indicated less than the standard were addressed in a direct format.	Most findings were directly addressed.	Findings were addressed, but recommendations were vague and not specific as far as what should be changed.
Reflection	Self-reflection was very thorough and explicit as far as learnings and how this new knowledge will be helpful in future.	Self-reflection was thorough as far as learning but did not reflect how this knowledge can be applied in future positions.	Self-reflection was surface level knowledge and did not delve into what knowledge had been internalized for future use.	Self-reflection did not directly link learning to how this knowledge could be helpful in future positions.

Comments:

Curriculum Audit - Analyzing Information : Reflection rubric

Teacher Name: **Jo Wood**

Student Name: _____

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Describes learning	Student clearly describes all the main points of the learning and how these will impact his/her work in the future. (standards and areas audited)	The student explains all the main learnings, but lists only a few in terms of impact. (standards and areas audited)	The student only lists without description main learnings, but only discusses importance of a couple. S/he does not highlight specific areas.	The student lists only a few learnings without describing impact.
identifies recommendations and their importance	Student accurately locates at least 5 recommendations in the audit and gives a clear explanation of why these are important to the school's improvement.	Student accurately locates four recommendations in the audit and gives a reasonable explanation of why they are important to the school's improvement.	Student accurately locates 3 recommendations in the audit. Explanation is weak.	Student has difficulty locating recommendations from the audit.
Identifies how recommendations will be implemented and monitored	Student accurately describes detailed steps for implementation and monitoring as well as who will be responsible and how it will be evaluated.	Student describes steps for implementation and monitoring as well as who will be responsible and how it will be evaluated.	Student describes some steps for implementation and monitoring.	Steps for implementation and monitoring have been omitted.
Audit details	Student recalls several details from the audit that made an impression which resulted in new learning and explains that learning.	Student recalls some details from the audit that made an impression which resulted in new learning.	Student recalls only a couple of details from the audit that made an impression which resulted in learning.	Student cannot recall details from the audit with accuracy.
ISLLC Standards	Student is able to align specific learnings to specific ISLLC standards and how the learning has helped him/her grow in terms of the ISLLC standards.	Student is able to align how some learning to ISLLC standards and how it has helped him/her grow in terms of the ISLLC standards	Student is able to cite some learning aligned to ISLLC standards	Student is not able to align how this learning helps him/her grow in terms of the ISLLC standards
Growth	Student can describe his/her growth in terms of working as a team member and how this relates to the real world of education.	Student can describe his/her growth in terms of working as a team member	Student lists his/her role in terms of working as a team member	Student can not describe his/her growth in terms of working as a team member
Understanding of importance of audit	Student can clearly articulate the importance of the curriculum audit to the school district in which it was performed.	Student can articulate the importance of the curriculum audit to the school district in which it was performed	Student can state functions of the curriculum audit which was completed.	Student can not articulate the importance of the curriculum audit to the school district in which it was performed.