Submission Guidelines for Interim Assessment Reports (assessment results from AY 2013-14)

Guidelines:

1) *Submission deadline: September 26, 2014, early submissions are encouraged*
2) *Submit electronically to Yvonne Kirby (Director of OIRA) as an email attachment (ykirby@ccsu.edu)*
3) *Provide a SEPARATE REPORT for each academic program, **all certificate and degree programs are required to be assessed per NEASC***
4) *An Interim report consists of the Completed Overview report for the academic program and General Education Overview, if appropriate.*

Reminder: Assessment reporting is on a 5 year cycle, consisting of a full report in year one followed with interim reports for years 2, 3, 4, and 5. The assessment cycle is aligned with the Program Review Cycle such that the full assessment report is due the year prior to the year that the department will submit their program review report. Departments are not required to submit an assessment report for that program in the year that they prepare a program review report (see Program Review Policy and Assessment Calendar). For example, if your program is scheduled for program review in Spring 2017 or Fall 2017 then only a Summary assessment report will be due for that program in Fall 2017 (report covering AY 2016-17 activities); this is necessary to comply with BOR requirements. Departments that are accredited by an outside agency, and thus exempt from the Program Review Policy, should follow the guidelines for assessment reporting as described in this document and follow the Assessment Calendar.

Interim reports: complete ONLY the Overview for the program, complete with contribution to general education.
URL to Assessment website resources: http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=3454

Overview: **The following questions are required by the Connecticut State Colleges and University Board of Regents, NEASC and the CCSU Academic Assessment Committee. These questions must be completed annually for all academic programs (all degree and certificate programs) as well as all departments offering courses in general education. Submit a separate table for each program and for each general education learning outcome the department teaches.**

- You may use a bulleted list for each of the questions—full details should be included within the text of the full report when it is due, not in the Overview.
- **Interim reports**: the Overview should append clearly labeled data tables as appropriate - for both the academic program as well as general education.

Overview

Department: ___Educational Leadership_____

Report Preparer: __Dr. Penelope L. Lisi _____

Program Name and Level:__EdD in Educational Leadership _____

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) **URL**: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/eduLeadership/doctorofEd/learningOutcomes.asp
2) **LO Changes**: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	No changes to the Learning Outcomes
3) **Strengths**: What about your assessment process is working well?	The program tracks students by five progress points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. All five Learning Outcomes inform course development and implementation. Student capacity in the Learning Outcomes is assessed as part of the Leadership Portfolio assessment task which students complete and defend at the conclusion of major coursework. The Portfolio serves as a "qualifying" examination for the dissertation, and requires students to demonstrate learning achievements in both academic and applied leadership contexts. We continue to rely on an analytic rubric for assessing the Leadership Portfolio as our primary assessment point. The analytic rubric clearly reflects the program's stated Learning Outcomes. Satisfactory performance on the Leadership Portfolio is required before a candidate can move forward with work on the dissertation. A summary across cohorts and check-points is presented in Table 1, *Doctoral Cohort Progress across Indicators* as of September 1, 2014. The two earliest indicators of progress in the program are Core and Methods Course Completion, and Leadership Portfolio defense. The assessment process, using these two checkpoints alone, has been useful in helping faculty to identify areas needing some attention in the teaching and learning process. We use the data from the Leadership Portfolio process to analyze course delivery and content. For example, throughout the second year research sequence (713-714-715), students focus on both quantitative and qualitative methods. More often than not, one or the other of these areas sometimes gets shortchanged. Based on student feedback, as well as student demonstration of competencies in these areas in the Leadership Portfolio, we are moving in the direction of focusing each of the first two courses in the research sequence on either quantitative or qualitative methods. The third course will focus on developing capacity in mixed methods, as well as preparation of the Leadership

| | Portfolio and the Dissertation Proposal.

Our assessment system has also helped us identify a somewhat uneven demonstration among students of achievement in the Leadership Portfolio categories. This has lead program faculty and the director to provide additional supports through earlier introduction of the portfolio requirements (in the spring of the first academic year), workshops and numerous opportunities for individual feedback on drafts of the Portfolio in the 2014-2015 academic year. These additional supports are already proving to be effective in terms of quality of outcomes.

Also looking at the information in Table 1, the graduation rate maintained by the program since its inception in 2002 has stayed at 68% or higher. For the 2009 Cohort, three students are still actively engaged and 1 student is inactive, though still in the program. We anticipate a graduation rate higher than the current 71% for that cohort. And for the 2011 and 2013 Cohorts, there is a very high level of actively engaged students. All students, of course, have six years in which to complete the program, and with these two cohorts, we anticipate high graduation rates again.

Finally, the culture of the program is collaborative and virtually every required course is team taught. Faculty meet informally around instruction on a regular basis, and so we often devise solutions to problems of practice in advance of summative data. We collect formative data from courses, and make professional judgments based on observations. The use of analytic rubrics is the norm, and the presence of multiple faculty at key assessment events (portfolio defense, proposal defenses, dissertation defense) inevitably leads to discussions about improvements. It also helps promote reliability and consistency of our measurements. We also regularly ask students participating in these events to discuss instructional strengths and gaps related to their preparation, and they have responded with insight. At the end of each semester of coursework, the director conducts a lengthy "focus group" session with the students in that cohort to ascertain aspects of the program and courses that are working well, and those areas meriting attention. |
|---|---|
| 4) **Improvements**: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | While the program makes extensive use of analytic rubrics to assess student capacity in each course, and in the Leadership Portfolio, it appears that the students and the program would be well served with the use of a rubric for assessing progress in completion of the dissertation. We anticipate developing such an instrument and have been reading different scholarly publications about the practice.

One area that we continue to discuss and work to address is writing. We are looking very carefully at data in Table 1, which shows where people are in the process, and how many completers and non-completers we have. We also make use of data from course evaluations. We continue to make use of that data, and engage in |

| | collegial conversations to ascertain factors associated with success and lack of success in the program. These discussions have implications for admissions as well as curriculum, instruction, and assessment. We use the GRE Writing Test and a writing sample as a part of the admissions process. Given what appear to be some trends about program completers, we recognize that we need to pay greater attention to indicators of writing skill in the application process. Our challenges in the program come primarily after the point when students have completed coursework and launch into independent study with the assigned dissertation advisor.

Even so, there is still room for growth in writing capacity with our accepted students. We need to continue to address quality of writing, which is an ongoing challenge. We are working to incorporate writing standards on all formative assessments so that we can more reliably trigger interventions. Whatever we decide, we will fold information about our progress in assessing "writing across the program" into our next report. Once candidates are accepted into the program, we need to be more effective in helping some of the excellent leaders and thinkers we admit become adept scholarly writers. |
|---|---|

For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs):
1. **LO #1)__** Create collaborative learning communities which reflect sensitivity to the ethical and moral obligations of leaders to design and implement programs that promote positive learning for all.
_____

| 5) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.) | As discussed in the previous section, student progress in addressing the Learning Outcomes is assessed at five progress points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. For the first progress point - coursework- we monitor retention and rate of student progress based on satisfactory completion of core and research courses in the end of year 2, In all core courses, students complete assignments that correspond to a faculty-developed rubric.

The Leadership Portfolio, which makes use of an analytic scoring rubric, is the primary instrument used to assess student capacity in all Learning Outcomes. Each category of the scoring rubric is structured very specifically around one of the Learning Outcomes. Achievement in each Learning Outcome is assessed according to six standards and on a three-point scale (does not fully achieve, fully achieves at the doctoral level, and exceeds expectations). For each Learning Outcome in the Leadership Portfolio, the student develops a six to nine-page narrative statement about his/her capacity in that particular Learning Outcome and includes two exemplars of his or her skill in addressing that outcome. In the narrative statement, the student is required to synthesize themes and concepts from throughout the program that demonstrates a deep understanding of, and capacity in that particular outcome. The student shares the Portfolio with a three-person review committee consisting of the program director, the student's dissertation advisor, and another faculty member, and makes a presentation to that committee about the Portfolio. |
|---|---|

	The next major data source is the dissertation proposal defense. This activity occurs after the student has successfully defended the Leadership Portfolio, and takes place at the end of year 2 or later. Achievement is recorded as passed/not passed based on the professional judgment of 4-person committee.

The next major data source is the dissertation. Defense of the dissertation typically takes place at the end of year 3 or later, and is recorded as passed/not passed based on the professional judgment of the same 4-person committee involved in the dissertation proposal defense.

Finally, the last major data point is successful completion of dissemination activities as indicated through EDL 720. Students complete the requirements for this course after that have defended the dissertation. The purpose of this course is for students to prepare findings of their research for sharing with educators in their own communities as well as with the broader educational community. Our assessment tool for this activity is a holistic rubric which we use to assess the post-dissertation dissemination report. Dissemination to both the world of practice and the scholarly community is a signature requirement of our doctoral program which blends a practitioner degree with rigorous scholarly requirements. |
| 6) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | Data across all five progress points is collected and interpreted by teams of faculty members.

Typically all courses are team taught and therefore, faculty teams assess candidate progress on projects in each course.

Again, the Leadership Portfolio is assessed by the three-person faculty committee, which includes the program director, the candidate's dissertation advisor, and a third educator. Following the defense, the committee meets to discuss the candidate's work and make a decision using the Leadership Portfolio analytic rubric.

The dissertation proposal and the dissertation itself are both assessed by the candidate's dissertation committee.

Achievement in addressing the activities of the dissemination course (EDL 720) is assessed by the two faculty members who teach the course, as well as the student's dissertation advisor. |

7) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: In the 2012-2013 report, the director wrote that, "There have been no significant changes in the implementation of our assessment plan". That is still the case. The data across 5 check-points indicates the program continues to be strong and we will continue to make use of all available data. As stated earlier, we are working to make greater use of knowledge of writing scores in the selection process, as well as in support for and expectations of students concerning their writing. With those activities in place, we anticipate an even higher program completion rate. Also, from the 2012- 2013 assessment report, the director wrote, " To address weaknesses in research design and quantitative analysis identified in previous reviews of student performance and assessment data, we have continued to fine-tune the second year research sequence (713-714-715) and have also brought quantitative study into the first summer residency. We struggle with differentiation in a cohort program: some people need a more personal and supportive environment for learning quantitative skills; others want more challenge. But in general, the re-engineering of our advanced inquiry seminars has assisted students to make better progress on their portfolios and dissertation proposals which in turn, we hope, will support them in completing their dissertations in a timely fashion." We continue to fine-tune the research sequence in particular and believe we are headed in the right direction. To address the challenges of quality of writing, we have introduced the portfolio process earlier in the program (spring of the first year of coursework), and are working to address quality of writing more consistently during coursework in the first two years of the program.
	Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See Table 1
	Changes: There have been no significant changes in the implementation of our assessment plan. As discussed earlier, our changes have more to do with fine-tuning the process. We will be working to develop an analytic rubric for assessment of the dissertation. We are continuing to work to address quality of student writing.
2. **LO #2)__** Create and sustain a powerful vision of teaching and learning that promotes individual and organizational learning through assessment, professional development, program evaluation, and action research. _____	
5) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the	Same as for LO #1

data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	
6) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion:
	Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:
3. **LO #3)**_ Demonstrate an appreciation for diversity by creating a culture of success that is connected to salient historical, philosophical, cultural, community, and political contexts. _____	
5) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	Same as for LO #1
6) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion:
	Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:

4. LO #4)__ Use technology to support and advance learning, improve communication, and process information. _____	
5) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	Same as for LO #1
6) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion:
	Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:
5. LO #5)__ Research, collect, analyze, and interpret data that informs the change process; evaluate research critically; apply research to determine best practice; and provide leadership for research that improves teaching and learning. _____	
5) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	Same as for LO #1
6) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a	Conclusion:
	Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:

result of the conclusion(s).	

Interim reports: append clearly labeled supporting data tables, organized by LO

General Education: Here is the URL for the list of approved general education courses and LO/objectives: http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=14893

NOTE: If department contributes to more than one LO, complete one summary for each LO

Department: _____

General Education LO Assessed: _____

Report Preparer: _____

General Education Question	Response
1) **Courses**: General Education course(s) taught	
2) **Assessment Instruments**: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	
3) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course.	
4) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion:
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	Changes:
5) **Strengths**: What about your assessment process is working well?	
6) **Improvements:** What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	

Interim reports: append clearly labeled supporting data tables, organized by LO

Doctoral Cohort Status and Completion of Progress Indicators as of September 1, 2014

Cohort	Status with Cohort Starting *N* and *N of* Active/Inactive/WD/Dismissed/Grad & Rate						Core/Methods Courses	Portfolio Defense[1]	Proposal Defense[2]	Dissertation Defense[3]	Dissemination (EDL 720)[4]
2002	23:	0	0	1	0	22 (96%)	23	23	23	22	22
2003	25:	0	0	5	0[5]	20 (80%)	25	25	22	20	20
2005	22:	0	0	5	0[5]	17 (78%)	22	22	19	17	17
2007	22:	0	2	5	0[5]	15 (68%)	21	17	15	15	15
2009	21:	3	1	2	0	15 (71%)	21	20	17	15	15
2011	23:	16	0	0	0	7 (30%)	23	23	13	7	7
2013	21:	21	0	0	0	0 (0%)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	157	40	3	18	0	96	134	131	109	96	96

Note. As of Sept. 1, 2014, the program has graduated 96 students. Program graduates include 6 African American females, 1 African American males, 2 Asian females, 3 Hispanic females, 3 Hispanic males, 58 White females, 19 White males and 4 Jamaicans.

[1]Major assessment tool.
[2]Currently report as pass/pass with conditions/fail. Rubric is under consideration.
[3]Currently report as pass/fail. Rubric is under consideration.
[4]Secondary assessment tool.

Among the 18 students who withdrew or were dismissed, there are 3 African American females, 1 Hispanic male, 12 White female