



## Submission Guidelines for **INTERIM** Assessment Reports (assessment results from AY 2014-15)

### Guidelines:

- 1) *Submission deadline: **September 25, 2015**, early submissions are encouraged*
- 2) *Submit electronically to Yvonne Kirby (Director of OIRA) as an email attachment ([ykirby@ccsu.edu](mailto: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. Where possible, the assessment cycle will be aligned with the accreditation cycle and a Summary report will be due in the year the self-study is due to the accrediting body.

**Interim reports:** complete ONLY the Overview for the program, complete with contribution to general education.

URL to Assessment website resources: [http://web.ccsu.edu/oira/assessment/assessment\\_aap.asp](http://web.ccsu.edu/oira/assessment/assessment_aap.asp)

**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 are encouraged to address the questions using bullet statements rather than paragraph form —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) <b>URL:</b> Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	<a href="http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/eduLeadership/doctorofEd/learningOutcomes.asp">http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/eduLeadership/doctorofEd/learningOutcomes.asp</a>
2) <b>LO Changes:</b> Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	The program includes 7 Learning Outcomes, previously titled, Program Propositions. The propositions were developed and used as a framework for the program since 2003. However, in fall 2014, a review of the propositions was conducted by the director and program faculty. This review included an analysis of the data from using the propositions as a benchmark assessment for all doctoral students, as well as use of the propositions to develop course content. We determined that the propositions as originally developed were not as clear as they should be for the students, nor as useful as they should be for faculty in course development. We revised the propositions in fall 2014, simplifying the language so that they were clearer and easier to understand for the students. Since the Learning Outcomes are used to support a primary benchmark assessment, we also revised the rubric used to assess student capacity in the Learning Outcomes.
3) <b>Strengths:</b> What about your assessment process is working well?	<p>As indicated in the 2013-2014 Interim Assessment Report, 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 was revised in fall 2014 and 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.</p> <p>A summary across cohorts and check-points is presented in Table 1, <i>Doctoral Cohort Progress across Indicators</i> as of September 1, 2015. The two earliest indicators of progress in the program are Core and Methods Course Completion, and Leadership Portfolio defense.</p> <p>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, Learning Outcome #4 states that, “Effective educational leaders establish a commitment to social justice through their work and act in ways that promote</p>

social justice in their organization.” In one course, EDL 705 (Leadership for Teaching and Learning), students are required to conduct a textbook bias investigation. While this is a very demanding expectation, and the majority of students include the resulting paper as evidence in the Leadership Portfolio of their commitment to social justice, students also noted that most of their learning around social justice and this Learning Outcome comes from engagement in EDL 705. We are working now to adjust content of other doctoral courses to include readings and assignments related to social justice leadership work.

Also related to the Leadership Portfolio as an important benchmark assessment, in 2014-2015, we invested time and energy in supporting Cohort 2013 students more deeply in development of their portfolios. With past cohorts, the defense of the portfolio in front of a faculty committee stretched out for many candidates beyond the two years of coursework. With that happening, students were then delayed in being able to launch into the process of developing their dissertations. In summer 2014 (when students were entering their second full year of coursework), the new program director conducted a workshop for all doctoral students on development of the portfolio. Interestingly, several students indicated that they had not received much information about the portfolio prior to the workshop. Following the workshop, all students were required to develop one of the learning outcomes (a project that included writing a synthesis of relevant research and selection of two exemplars of student work related to that proposition) in summer 2014. Each student submitted the single learning outcome project to the director in summer 2014 for written feedback, and again in fall 2014 for final feedback. This was a new addition to the program assessment process. In fall 2014 and spring 2015, the director continued to provide feedback on development of the other learning outcomes to the students, in addition to the feedback provided by each student’s advisor. In spring 2015, the director provided several additional two-hour workshops for interested students in portfolio development. The results of this investment of time and energy were that by June 2015, 18 of the 21 students in the 2013 cohort had passed the portfolio assessment. We anticipate the remaining three will be able to defend their portfolios in fall 2015. 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 for cohorts between 2002 and 2009 has stayed at 68% or higher. For the 2007 Cohort, one student is still actively engaged and 1 student is inactive, though still in the program. We anticipate a graduation rate higher than the current 68% for that cohort. For the 2009 cohort, two students are still active, two are inactive, and one has withdrawn.

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. For the 2011 cohort, 12 of the 23 students have graduated and 10 are still actively engaged. One is inactive. For the 2013 cohort, 18 of 21 have completed their portfolio defense and are working on developing their dissertations. The 2015 cohort has completed their first summer of study.

Finally, we continue to reflect on the culture and quality of the program. The use of analytic rubrics is the norm,

	<p>and the presence of multiple faculty at key assessment events (portfolio defense, proposal defenses, dissertation defense) leads to discussions about improvements. It also helps promote reliability and consistency of our measurements. In fall 2015 we are working on developing a rubric for assessing the program's dissertations. This has been a goal for a number of years, and we are actively addressing this in 2015. We also regularly ask students participating in these courses 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. This was done in fall 2014, spring 2015, and summer 2015. The comments are content coded and the results are shared with the teaching faculty. This data is particularly useful in informing teaching practice in the coming semester.</p>
<p>4) <b>Improvements:</b> What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)</p>	<p>In addition to our practice of collecting, analyzing, and discussing the data we do collect regularly, we are working as a doctoral faculty to develop an analytic rubric to assess the dissertation. We anticipate completing this process by the end of the fall semester.</p> <p>As discussed in the 2013-2014 Interim Assessment Report, attending to student writing capacity is critically important. In 2014-2015, we recruited, interviewed, and accepted a new cohort to begin the program in spring 2015. Our review and discussions of the data related to previous cohorts' writing capacity lead us to focus even more intently on writing capacity at the application stage. We paid particular attention to the GRE scores and writing samples submitted by applicants. The result is that we accepted 25 students into the program in 2015 that we believed had strong writing skills. In actuality, because of financial challenges, and personal challenges, 18 students did start the program in the spring. However, in reviewing their capacity to engage in rigorous writing assignments in the summer intensive courses, we believe our attention to their writing at the application stage paid off. Faculty reported that there were significantly fewer writing challenges during courses this past summer than in previous summers. In terms of support that is provided to students once they are accepted into the program, faculty are working to provide much greater feedback on the writing process (e.g. development of a synthesis, use of APA for writing style, developing drafts, etc.) than appears to have been the case in previous years.</p> <p>We believe that the workshop process provided to students for development of the Leadership Portfolio as a major benchmark assessment has contributed significantly to the enhanced quality of the student portfolios. Again, each student now receives extensive written feedback twice from the director for his/her writing of the reflection of one of seven Learning Outcomes, before that student can move on to writing the other 6 Learning Outcome reflections. And again, 18 of 21 cohort 2013 students were able to defend their Leadership Portfolio by early in the summer 2015- an accomplishment that in the past lasted well into the summer and fall semester after completion of two years of coursework.</p>
<p><b>For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs):</b></p>	

**LO #1)**

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. In fall 2014, because the Learning Outcomes were revised, it was necessary for us to develop a new analytic rubric to be used to assess student capacity in each of the 7 Learning Outcomes. The new Learning Outcomes and the new Analytic Rubric are being used for the first time with the 2015 Cohort.

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 four standards (Knowledge of individual and organizational learning; Application of key concepts to discussion of the artifacts; Skill in reflection on learning; and Communication skill in written and oral presentation), and on a three-point scale that essentially indicates the candidate 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 they have defended the dissertation. The

	<p>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.</p>
<p>6) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Data across all five progress points is collected and interpreted by teams of faculty members.</p> <p>Typically all courses are team taught and therefore, faculty teams assess candidate progress on projects in each course.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The dissertation proposal and the dissertation itself are both assessed by the candidate’s dissertation committee.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>7) <b>Results:</b> Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>In reviewing the data collected through the Assessment Plan for the EdD in Educational Leadership, it’s clear that the program is making progress in reviewing and updating components of the assessment plan. In 2014-2015, the primary focus for plan review was to analyze and revise the Learning Outcomes themselves. We are pleased with the revised Learning Outcomes and the development of the new analytic rubric for the Leadership Portfolio and believe this work will impact student work and faculty teaching capacity.</p> <p>The data across 5 check-points in 2014-2015 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.</p>

Based on the data, particularly relative to the research sequence (EDL 713-714-715), it was apparent that students were at different points in their understanding and learning of research methods and design. We worked hard and as a team to differentiate instruction in that sequence. Again, feedback from students in the end of semester focus group, as well as student outcomes in course expectations indicates our approaches to differentiation were beneficial. For example, in the spring semester 2015, three faculty (including the director) team-taught the course, each working with a small group of students on a particular area of need. The students were extremely happy with the approach and their completion of course requirements was much stronger than in previous sections. To us, this indicates that 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:**  
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 are working to develop an analytic rubric for assessment of the dissertation. We are continuing to work to address quality of student writing.

LO #2)	
5) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> 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) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn 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:
LO #3)	
5) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> 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) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn 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:



LO #4)	
5) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> 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) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn 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:
LO #5)	
5) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> 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) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn 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:

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://web.ccsu.edu/registrar/classesregistration/generalEduProgram.asp>

**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) <b>Courses:</b> General Education course(s) taught	
2) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> What data/evidence, other than GPA, is used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	
3) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course.	
4) <b>Results:</b> Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	<b>Conclusion:</b>
	<b>Evidence</b> (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x):
	<b>Changes:</b>
5) <b>Strengths:</b> What about your assessment process is working well?	
6) <b>Improvements:</b> 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, 2015*

Cohort	Status with Cohort Starting N and N of Active/Inactive/WD/Dismissed/Grad & Rate						Core/Methods Courses	Portfolio Defense <sup>1</sup>	Proposal Defense <sup>2</sup>	Dissertation Defense <sup>3</sup>	Dissemination (EDL 720) <sup>4</sup>
2002	23:	0	0	1	0	22 (96%)	23	23	23	22	22
2003	25:	0	0	5	0	20 (80%)	25	25	22	20	20
2005	22:	0	1	4	0	17 (78%)	22	22	19	17	17
2007	22:	1(Donlon)	1(Typh)	5	0	15 (68%)	22	17	15	15	15
2009	21:	2	2	1	0	16 (76%)	21	20	17	16	16
2011	23:	10	1	0	0	12 (52%)	23	23	17	12	12
2013	21:	21	0	0	0	0 (0%)	21	18	2	0	0
2015	18:	18	0	0	0	0 (0%)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>

*Note.* As of Sept. 1, 2015, the program has graduated 102 students. Program graduates include 6 African American females, 1 African American male, 2 Asian females, 3 Hispanic females, 3 Hispanic males, 61 White females, 22 White males and 4 Jamaicans.

<sup>1</sup>Major assessment tool.

<sup>2</sup>Currently report as pass/pass with conditions/fail. Rubric is under consideration.

<sup>3</sup>Currently report as pass/fail. Rubric is under consideration.

<sup>4</sup>Secondary assessment tool.

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