

Central Connecticut State University
Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Instructional Technology
Doctoral Program (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership
Assessment Report (2011-2016)

Program Summary

Department: ___ Educational Leadership

Report Preparer: ___ Dr. Penelope L. Lisi

Program Name and Level: ___ EdD in Educational Leadership

Program Assessment Question	Response
<p>URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.</p>	<p>http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/eduLeadership/doctorofEd/learningOutcomes.asp</p>
<p>Assessment Instruments: Please list the source(s) of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is/are used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>The program tracks students by five progress points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. The program is grounded in a set of seven Learning Outcomes/ Propositions. All Propositions/ Learning Outcomes inform course development and implementation. The original Propositions were developed in 2004, and then revised in 2014. With the revision, we now refer to this set as the Learning Outcomes. 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. The original Propositions and the 2014 revised Learning Outcomes are included in this report as Figure 1 and Figure 2. The original rubric and revised rubric for assessing the Leadership Portfolio is attached as Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.</p> <p>The program also uses an analytic rubric to assess student capacity at the very end of the program. At that point, they are required to complete successfully EDL 720 (the dissemination course), during which they much use the results of their dissertation research to disseminate findings to the research community and the world of practice.</p>

<p>3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).</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>4) Results: Since the most recent full report, list</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s) 	<p>The Ed.D. program tracks student progress over time through the use of 5 benchmark points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. As indicated in Table 1, since the beginning of the program, all or almost all students have successfully completed the two years of coursework. We attribute that high course retention rate in large part to our adherence to a cohort model. A group of students is accepted into the program as a cohort, the members of which take all courses together. They grow together as a community, providing support for each other and working together on group projects. With the exception of the 2007 Cohort, members of the cohorts (2011 and 2013) under discussion in this Summary Report have a very high completion rate for the second benchmark- the Leadership Portfolio defense. Cohort 2015 has just completed its first full year of 2 years of coursework. All 2015 students who started the program remain active.</p> <p>Students have performed well on the Leadership Portfolio task over time, and on each of the outcomes which the task represents. Table 2 presents data from 2011 to 2016 relative to student performance on the Leadership Portfolio assessment. Based on five years of data about the cohorts, we find that students perform well on each of the six standards we use to evaluate performance on the seven doctoral propositions/ Learning Outcomes. Students consider the Leadership Portfolio task a significant academic hurdle for which they prepare over many months, often revising their analytic essays many times. Advisors allow a portfolio defense to be scheduled only when their preliminary review indicates that the portfolio is “ready” which is why failures are so rare.</p> <p>Table 3 reports means for each of the six standards we use to evaluate portfolio work for each of the seven propositions/ Learning Outcomes. The</p>

	<p>means range from 1.22 to 1.71, where a score of 1 indicates pass, and a score of 2 indicates distinction. No student received a 0 (did not pass) for either cohort.</p> <p>Table 4 reports data for the four dissemination standards which we assess using our final rubric. A dissemination report submitted by the student to the advisor is the final course requirement of the EDL 720 dissemination seminar and the very last, post-dissertation, task required of our Ed.D. students before they graduate. The data provide additional information about achievements related to Proposition 6 (data and change) and Proposition 7 (research to improve teaching and learning).</p>
<p>5) Strengths: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.</p>	<p>As indicated earlier, 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>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 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.</p> <p>For all three cohorts being discussed in this report (2011, 2013, and 2015 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 all cohorts, we anticipate high graduation rates again. The 2015 cohort has completed their first summer of study.</p>

	<p>Finally, we continue to reflect on the culture and quality of the program. The use of analytic rubrics is the norm, 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. 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. 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>6) Improvements: List ways in which your assessment process needs to improve (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).</p>	<p>In reviewing the data collected through the Assessment Plan for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, 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>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.</p>

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.

That said, we have placed a large focus on writing in the 2015-2016 academic year. We engaged in significant professional development work in the 2015-2016 year to address student writing challenges. We worked to designate a writing assignment in each course as a “W” assignment, and developed a rubric for the assignment that addresses writing quality. We are implementing that work starting in fall 2016 (piloted in summer 2016). Since we are aware that faculty have different “lenses” for assessing student writing, we plan to work to calibrate faculty assessments of student writing so that we are more on the same page in terms of what we consider quality writing. Then, we plan to track and monitor how well students do over time in enhancing the quality of their writing. We will ask the students to register with TaskStream, the new data system being used with the School of Education and Professional Studies, and they will need to input their work and the results of the writing assessments. We believe that the use of Taskstream will allow us to look at patterns and trends over time for individual students, and then allow us to make adjustments in terms of ways we provide supports to students throughout the entire program.

Taken together, we believe that the diversity of interventions we are implementing to support quality student writing will lead to enhanced performance in all 5 progress points in the program.

Central Connecticut State University
Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Instructional Technology
Doctoral Program (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Assessment Report (2011-2016)

Preamble

The doctoral program in educational leadership (Ed.D.) has been designed for delivery to a cohort of full-time educational professionals on weekends, evenings, and during the summer. It serves teachers and administrators in preK-12 education who want to enhance their ability to perform a variety of leadership roles: teacher leader, department head, principal, curriculum and assessment specialist, assistant superintendent, superintendent, and state agency policymaker. Program design is based on the premise that learning takes place through an integration of course work and experiences that stem from a clear conception of leadership, the knowledge base of the field, and a structure that allows doctoral students and faculty to collaborate on their shared work of improving education in Connecticut. A cohort of between 20 and 25 students are accepted into the doctoral program every other year, in uneven years.

The doctoral program is framed conceptually around seven propositions. The propositions, originally developed in 2004, have been used to support course development as well as assessment of student learning (see Figure 1 for the original 7 Propositions). Based on student and faculty feedback, it was determined in fall 2014 that the propositions were in need of revision. The Ed.D. Core Faculty met throughout the fall to discuss and revised the propositions. The result was that the essential ideas still were determined to be important, but the wording of the propositions needed to be simplified to make the propositions clearer and easier to use for the students. In the process, the decision was made to delete the term “propositions” and use instead the term “Learning Outcomes”. For a period of time, we are continuing to use the original propositions for some student assessments, since students (Cohorts 2013 and before) had been introduced to those propositions.

The Propositions, or Learning Outcomes, are especially important because they provide the framework for the program’s primary student benchmark assessment tool that is the development of a Leadership Portfolio. Students begin work on the Leadership Portfolio in the summer of their second year of coursework, and are eligible to defend the portfolio starting in spring of their second year of coursework. The new Learning Outcomes (see Figure 2) were introduced to the 2015 Ed.D. Cohort who started their studies in Summer 2015. The task sheet that is shared with students to support the development of the Leadership Portfolio is presented in Appendix A. The original rubric used with students through the 2013 Cohort is shown in Appendix B. The revised rubric that will be used to assess student learning starting with the 2015 Cohort is included in Appendix C.

As just stated, our assessment of the student’s Leadership Portfolio is one of our principal assessments. In reflecting on the assessment of the Leadership Portfolio, in our advisory capacity, we consider student characteristics (e.g. preparation, experience, selection, performance on various learning tasks) that might be associated with performance on the Leadership Portfolio and dissertation. We debrief at the conclusion of the portfolio as well as dissertation proposal and final dissertation defenses. Over the past several years, two themes

appear to be evident: 1) the quality of writing at admission matters; 2) the quality of support for writing during the program matters. With this in mind, developing supports for our graduate writers has taken on a high level of importance. Appendix D presents our 2015 Faculty Development Grant proposal which was designed to establish supports to address the challenges of writing across the doctoral curriculum. We did receive grant funding to support a variety of activities in the spring semester 2016. Those activities are described in the final grant report provided in Appendix E. A key outcome from this work was the development of a writing rubric that will be used with one assignment, designated a “W” assignment, in every doctoral level course in the future. The rubric was pilot tested in the summer 2016 and we will be collecting data through the use of the rubric in each course starting in fall 2016. The writing rubric is included in this report in Appendix F.

We continue to grapple with the notion of *grading the dissertation* (and the proposal that precedes it) but we have not adopted a particular process or rubric.

Section 1: Learning Outcomes

As explained in Table 1, we track students by five progress points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. All seven Learning Outcomes are assessed as part of the Leadership Portfolio assessment task which students complete and defend at the conclusion of major coursework. It serves as a “qualifying” examination for the dissertation, and requires students to demonstrate learning achievements in both academic *and* applied leadership contexts.

Students begin to prepare their Leadership Portfolio in the second summer of their coursework. At least two artifacts (one from courses and one that demonstrates learning applied to leadership in a school or school district) and an analytic essay are required to document learning related to each of the seven doctoral Learning Outcomes. When the major advisor approves the portfolio, an oral presentation and defense is scheduled before a three-person committee consisting of the advisor, the program director, and an appropriately credentialed practitioner or a third member of the doctoral faculty. Following the defense and the conversation among committee members, the primary advisor completes the Leadership Portfolio Rubric. A complete description of the portfolio process is found in Appendix A; the original analytic rubric is in Appendix B; the revised rubric is in Appendix C.

Proposition One: Effective educational leaders are skillful in creating a sense of a **collaborative learning community** for all those with whom they work. These leaders are sensitive to their ethical and moral obligation to design and implement programs that promote positive learning for all. Further, these leaders have the organizational and conceptual skills to advance the work of institutions, communities, and organizations.

Proposition Two: Effective educational leaders know that **teaching and learning** is at the heart of everything they do. They are familiar with current curricular, instructional, and assessment practices and know how to help others improve their skills in these areas. They know how to create and sustain a powerful vision of the importance of teaching and learning and have skills in program evaluation and assessment to monitor efforts to improve classroom and organizational growth. Further, they know how to provide the professional development, coaching, and mentoring services that are fundamental to organizational growth and renewal.

Proposition Three: Effective educational leaders are able to connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger **philosophical and historical contexts** that support educational change. They know how to effectively engage others in the change process and to generate and allocate resources for innovation.

Proposition Four: Effective educational leaders recognize **diversity** as a strength and know how to develop systems, programs, and services that are responsive to the needs of learners, faculties, and communities. These leaders work to create a culture of success for all learners and know how to effectively partner with community and national groups and networks to enhance the educational environment for their learners. Further, these leaders are skillful in developing a variety of community avenues to inform others in the wider community.

Proposition Five: Effective educational leaders know how to use **technology** to support and advance the learning environment. These leaders demonstrate skills in using a variety of media for communication purposes as well as effectively using building-wide and system-wide information processing systems.

Proposition Six: Effective leaders are committed to the processes of **continuous quality improvement** and know how to collect, research, analyze, and interpret salient data to inform the change process. These leaders know how to communicate this information to a variety of audiences to help enlist their support for improvement.

Proposition Seven: Effective educational leaders **value and apply research** in determining best practice. These leaders know how to evaluate and bring critical judgment to bear on educational research and they can communicate research to teachers, parents, and members of the community. They have the skills to conduct and provide leadership for action research aimed at improving teaching and learning.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for the Doctoral Program (Original Propositions, 2004)

We believe that:

1. Effective educational leaders demonstrate an ethical and moral commitment to collaborative work that promotes positive learning for all members of the organization.
2. Effective educational leaders understand teaching and learning is at the heart of the organization and demonstrate the ability to foster best practice.
3. Effective educational leaders connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger philosophical, political, and historical context, and the organization's mission.
4. Effective educational leaders establish a commitment to social justice through their work and act in ways that promote social justice in their organization
5. Effective educational leaders utilize evolving technologies to improve organizations, enhance learning, and build institutional identity.
6. Effective educational leaders foster continuous organizational improvement grounded in the collection, analysis, interpretation, and application of data.
7. Effective educational leaders locate, interpret, and assess relevant educational research and apply it to both practice and the design and conduct of research.

Figure 2: Learning Outcomes for the Doctoral Program (revised, 2014)

Section 2: Findings

Table 2 reports the percentage and number of students, by cohort, completing the Leadership Portfolio who did not pass, passed, and passed with distinction for the past 5 years. There is a separate rubric for each of the seven doctoral Learning Outcomes. As stated earlier, the wording of the Learning Outcomes was revised in fall 2014. The new rubric to assess the Leadership Portfolio is being used starting with the 2015 Cohort.

Table 3 reports means for each of the six standards we use to evaluate portfolio work for each of the seven propositions/ Learning Outcomes. The means range from 1.22 to 1.71, where a score of 1 indicates pass, and a score of 2 indicates distinction. No student received a 0 (did not pass) for either cohort.

Table 4 reports data for the four dissemination standards which we assess using our final rubric. A dissemination report submitted by the student to the advisor is the final course requirement of the EDL 720 dissemination seminar and the very last, post-dissertation, task required of our Ed.D. students before they graduate. The data provide additional information about achievements related to Proposition 6 (data and change) and Proposition 7 (research to improve teaching and learning).

While students work on their dissertations, in the dissemination seminar, EDL 720, they develop a plan to bring their dissertation research to the attention of both the academic and practitioner communities. After the dissertation defense, they execute the plan and submit a report that includes artifacts for the two categories of dissemination activity and a reflective essay. The primary advisor provides a holistic summary of the student's capacity to develop and implement a Dissemination Work Plan that includes three expectations to be completed prior to graduation. These expectations include:

(From the course materials) The **Dissemination Work Plan** must describe tasks, timelines and deliverables related to the three dissemination components required of all students:

- (1) Dissemination of the dissertation manuscript: Once your advisor has approved any changes your committee requires as a condition for approving your dissertation, you must submit an electronic version (typically an e-mailed attachment) to the Graduate School for editorial and format review including all APA and CCSU requirements described in *Completing the Dissertation* (2015 updated ed.). This process should be completed as soon as possible following your defense. Additional changes may be required after review of the submission. Once all format and editorial changes have been completed, you are ready to complete the final requirements for dissemination of the dissertation: An abstract in proper format for submission by the University to ProQuest/Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI); copies of the dissertation in the proper paper form for binding; and an electronic copy of the dissertation in proper form for digitizing. The additional paperwork that is required is explained in the *Completing the Dissertation* document.

AND

- (2) Dissemination of the findings to the scholarly community: A manuscript submitted for publication in a refereed journal manuscript with the letter of submission, and a confirmation of receipt from the journal OR a conference proposal and the manuscript for presentation at a national/international conference that uses a blind review process;

AND

- (3) Dissemination of the findings to the world of practice as appropriate to your study: For example: A report to the research site(s), a professional development workshop in your organization, a presentation to a local or state level conference of practitioners, a website, a mini-conference or symposium which you and others organize on campus, in your district, or in another venue.

Table 1. Composite Doctoral Student Progress across Indicators by Cohort as of September 1, 2016

Cohort	Status with Cohort <i>N</i> and <i>N</i> of						Core/Methods Courses	Portfolio Defense ¹	Proposal Defense ²	Dissertation Defense ³	Dissemination (EDL 720) ⁴
	Active	Inactive	Withdrew	Dismissed	Graduated						
2002	23	0	0	1	0	22 (96%)	24	24	23	23	23
2003	25	1	0	1	3 ⁵	20 (80%)	24	24	22	21	21
2005	22	3	3	1	0	17 (78%)	22	22	18	16	15
2007	23	1	1	4	0	15 (68%)	22	17	16	15	15
				(Donlon) (Jackson)							
2009	21	2	2	1	0	16 (76%)	21	20	17	16	16
2011	23	8	1	0	0	14 (61%)	23	23	17	14	14
2013	21	11	0	0	0	10 (48%)	21	19	14	10	10
2015	18	18	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0
Total	176	40	5	16	0	114	175	149	128	114	114

Notes:

As of Sept. 1, 2016, the program has graduated 114 students. Program graduates include 7 African American females, 3 African American males, 3 Asian females, 3 Hispanic females, 3 Hispanic males, 67 White females, 24 White males, and 4 Jamaicans.

Among the 16 students who have withdrawn or were dismissed, there are 3 African American females, 1 Hispanic male, 12 White females

¹Major assessment tool. Data are reported in Tables 2 and 3.

²Currently report as pass/pass with conditions/fail.

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

⁴Report as pass/fail

Table 2. Summary of Ed.D. Student Performance on the Leadership Portfolio by Cohort, 2011-2016

Learning Outcomes	Does not achieve standard at doctoral level (% and N)			Fully achieves standard at doctoral level (% and N)			Distinction/ exceeds expectations (% and N)		
	2011	2013	2015	2011	2013	2015	2011	2013	2015
1. Collaboration	0	0	NA	53% (9)	57% (10)	NA	47% (8)	43% (8)	NA
2. Learning	0	0	NA	59% (10)	57% (10)	NA	41% (7)	43% (8)	NA
3. Context	0	0	NA	71% (12)	65% (11)	NA	29% (5)	37% (7)	NA
4. Diversity	0	0	NA	71% (5)	48% (9)	NA	29% (5)	52% (9)	NA
5. Technology	0	0	NA	59% (10)	50% (9)	NA	41% (7)	50% (9)	NA
6. Data, Change	0	0	NA	65% (11)	66% (12)	NA	35% (6)	34% (6)	NA
7. Research	0	0	NA	65% (11)	69% (12)	NA	35% (6)	31% (6)	NA

Notes:

1. There was a change in program directors in June 2104. Upon taking on the position at that time, the current director was not provided with the data from the rubrics for the remaining 2011 cohort. Thus the data provided here reflects a representative sample of student performance for Cohort 2011 that was logged prior to the retirement of the previous director. Cohort 2011 = 22 members
2. The rubrics are completed by the primary advisor following defense of the Leadership Portfolio. While efforts have been made repeatedly to collect the rubrics and data from the advisors, 2 are still missing, and 1 student will defend in fall 2016. Thus, the data presented here for Cohort 2013 is considered a representative sample. Cohort 2013 = 21 members.
3. The 2015 Cohort members are entering their second year of coursework. They are beginning to prepare their leadership portfolios and will be eligible to defend their portfolios beginning with the end of the spring semester 2017. Cohort 2015 = 18 members.

Table 3. Means for Portfolio Scores¹ Reported by Standard and Proposition (Learning Outcome)

Proposition/ Learning Outcome	Collaboration 1			Learning 2			Contexts ¹ 3			Equity 4			Technology 5			Data/Change ² 6			Research 7			Mean across standard		
	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15
Standard																								
Sound rationale	1.53	1.28	N/A	1.53	1.5	N/A	1.35	1.5	N/A	1.41	1.56	N/A	1.59	1.5	N/A	1.53	1.39	N/A	1.59	1.33	N/A	1.50	1.44	N/A
Significant issue	1.47	1.61	N/A	1.41	1.5	N/A	1.41	1.33	N/A	1.53	1.61	N/A	1.59	1.61	N/A	1.41	1.28	N/A	1.65	1.33	N/A	1.50	1.47	N/A
Knowledge base	1.41	1.33	N/A	1.35	1.33	N/A	1.29	1.22	N/A	1.35	1.44	N/A	1.47	1.61	N/A	1.41	1.39	N/A	1.47	1.28	N/A	1.39	1.37	N/A
Evidence of impact	1.47	1.5	N/A	1.47	1.39	N/A	1.35	1.39	N/A	1.41	1.5	N/A	1.47	1.67	N/A	1.53	1.39	N/A	1.59	1.39	N/A	1.47	1.46	N/A
Leadership growth	1.53	1.5	N/A	1.47	2.0	N/A	1.59	1.33	N/A	1.41	1.56	N/A	1.59	1.39	N/A	1.47	1.33	N/A	1.71	1.28	N/A	1.51	1.48	N/A
Quality of writing, etc.	1.35	1.39	N/A	1.35	1.28	N/A	1.29	1.22	N/A	1.29	1.5	N/A	1.53	1.44	N/A	1.47	1.28	N/A	1.42	1.28	N/A	1.39	1.34	N/A
Proposition Mean	1.46	1.44	N/A	1.43	1.5	N/A	1.38	1.33	N/A	1.40	1.53	N/A	1.54	1.54	N/A	1.47	1.34	N/A	1.57	1.32	N/A	---	---	---

¹ Portfolio standards are scored 0 (not passed), 1 (passed), and 2 (passed with distinction).

² Two propositions (context and equity) align with Outcome 3.

³ Two propositions (data/change and research) align with Outcome 5.

Table 4. Scores from Dissemination Report Rubrics by Cohort from 2011- 2016

Standards for Dissemination Report Aligned with Outcome 5 (data/research)	%/N not passed			% /N Passed			%/N Distinction		
	11	13	15	11	13	15	11	13	15
Your dissemination report includes all required elements.	0	0	NA	67% 6	70% 7	NA	33% 3	30% 3	NA
Narrative report and reflection about impact of dissertation research are appropriate examples of doctoral thinking and writing.	0	0	NA	67% 6	70% 7	NA	33% 3	30% 3	NA
The artifacts provided to document dissemination to the scholarly community are complete and professional. (Outcome 5a, Proposition 6)	0	0	NA	56% 5	30% 3	NA	44% 4	70% 7	NA
The artifacts provided to document dissemination to the world of practice are complete and professional. (Outcome 5b, Proposition 7)	0	0	NA	56% 5	30% 3	NA	44% 4	70% 7	NA

Notes

¹ As with other rubrics used in the doctoral program, this is a 3-point rubric: Not Passed (0), Passed (1), and Distinction (2).

Data is from a representative sample for 2011 Cohort and 2013 Cohort

Cohort 2011 has 23 members; 14 defended the dissertation, 8 are still active, 1 is inactive; Dissemination Report Rubrics were completed on 9 of 14 dissemination reports.

Cohort 2013 has 21 members; 10 have defended the dissertation, 11 are still active.

Dissemination Report Rubrics were completed on 10 of 10 dissemination reports.

Section 3: Analysis

As previously described, the program tracks student progress over time through the use of 5 benchmark points: course completion, Leadership Portfolio, proposal defense, dissertation defense, and dissemination activities. As indicated in Table 1, since the beginning of the program, all or almost all students have successfully completed the two years of coursework. We attribute that high course retention rate in large part to our adherence to a cohort model. A group of students is accepted into the program as a cohort, the members of which take all courses together. They grow together as a community, providing support for each other and working together on group projects. With the exception of the 2007 Cohort, members of the cohorts (2011 and 2013) under discussion in this Summary Report have a very high completion rate for the second benchmark- the Leadership Portfolio defense.

Students have performed well on the Leadership Portfolio task over time, and on each of the outcomes which the task represents. Table 2 presents data from 2011 to 2016 relative to student performance on the Leadership Portfolio assessment. Based on five years of data about 3 cohorts, we find that students perform well on each of the six standards we use to evaluate performance on the seven doctoral propositions/ Learning Outcomes. Students consider the Leadership Portfolio task a significant academic hurdle for which they prepare over many months, often revising their analytic essays many times. Advisors allow a portfolio defense to be scheduled only when their preliminary review indicates that the portfolio is “ready” which is why failures are so rare.

During the current reporting period (July 1, 2011- September 1, 2016), 23 of 23 members of Cohort 2011, and 19 of 21 members of Cohort 2013 completed their portfolios. We agree with the previous director’s assessment of why this is happening. Stated Dr. Beyard in her 2011 Summary Assessment Report:

Last year we wrote about the possibility of ratings creep because we had noted an increase in “with distinction” ratings. As one explanation, we pointed out that we have become more skillful in helping students learn how to prepare their portfolios and portfolio defenses. We also believe that our commitment to continuous improvement, a strong collaborative and team teaching culture, and regular focus groups with our doctoral cohort lead us to make meaningful adjustments in instruction in advance of hard data. After nearly 10 years, there is also a considerable amount of craft knowledge related to portfolio preparation that is passed from cohort member to cohort member, and cohort to cohort.

Looking at each cohort’s (2011 and 2013) average rating on each of the 7 propositions / Learning Outcomes, the number of “with distinction” ratings appears to be fairly even. In fact, the 2013 Cohort appeared to perform at noticeably higher levels on Proposition/ Learning Outcomes #3 (Context), #4 (Diversity) and #5 (Technology). The change towards the positive on these three outcomes may be due to an increased coursework focus on organizational change, social justice, and use of technologies.

When we approach two other major benchmark assessments of the program, the dissertation proposal and dissertation, our completion rate is not as strong as we would like them to be. For each of the cohorts being discussed in this report, there is still a relatively large number of active students (8 of 23 for 2011 and 11 of 21 for 2013). That said, students do have 6 years to complete the program from the time of admission. While some students are able to complete the program fairly quickly, there are others for whom the six-year timeframe is important. We are optimistic that our graduation rates for the 2011 and 2013 cohorts will end strongly. However, we are cognizant that after the two years of coursework that are completed as a cohort, the dissertation writing process is very much an individual endeavor. We adhere to a rather traditional approach to the dissertation, with the student working individually with the primary advisor, and consulting with the student's dissertation committee. Sometimes, this is where the momentum to keep moving along regularly can slow down. Going forward, the doctoral core faculty have discussed the idea of incorporating periodic writing seminars into the dissertation process. We are planning to hold monthly seminars during which students in the dissertation stage would bring drafts of chapters they are working on, discuss their work with faculty members who hold those seminars, and give and get feedback from peers. The seminars would be treated somewhat as writing support groups. We plan to initiate this process with the 2015 Cohort when they begin the dissertation process in summer 2017.

The data illustrated in Table 3 of means by standard and proposition is also interesting. However, as with data from previous years, the range is restricted (1.22 to 1.71). This is true both when the data are considered across standard within a single proposition, and across propositions. Mean across the standards when comparing data from 2011 and 2013 indicates a slight decline. And a comparison of the proposition mean when considering data from 2011 and 2013 indicates a slight decrease in 4 of the 7 propositions.

Scorers for the rubrics vary with cohorts, which might contribute to the slight variation in mean scores. Additionally, a continuing concern is what seems to be "scorer fatigue", evidenced by the identical ratings given by some scores to all or most standards across all or most outcomes. The rubric that has been used since the beginning of the program, as well as the revised rubric we will use starting with the 2015 Cohort, is lengthy and perhaps abit cumbersome. In some instances, the primary advisor who completes the rubric may succumb to this "scorer fatigue". We continue to discuss score fatigue individually with doctoral advisors. This will be especially important to do as we bring new advisors into the dissertation advising process, which is taking place with the 2015 Cohort.

Table 4 includes two years of data related to Learning Outcome 5 (data/research). As previously discussed, the final course taken by doctoral students is a dissemination course. Table 4 illustrates student outcomes on 4 important standards. The data indicate there is some positive movement in students' dissemination to the scholarly community and to the world of practice. We are pleased to see this direction.

In 2011 and 2013, dissemination to the scholarly community included presentations at national and regional conferences (EERA, NERA, NEERO, AERA), and manuscripts submitted to significant scholarly publications (e.g. Educational Leadership, Journal of

Cases in Educational Leadership, Journal of Science Teacher Education) . Dissemination to the world of practice included guest presentations in higher education classes for school leaders, presentations to state level conferences of educators, and district professional development.

Section 4: Use of Results

In our Core Faculty meetings, we regularly discuss data from the courses and defenses, as well as use of rubrics. We continue to identify a number of areas where we are able to make improvements in the program and in quality of instruction. As a result of the data relative to the Leadership Portfolio and specifically the quality of graduate student writing, we devoted approximately 10 months in focused work to enhance student writing. As a faculty we are newly committed to providing extensive and meaningful feedback to students about their writing from the beginning of the program through participation in the dissemination course.

To improve work on the standard that requires “evidence and rationale have a sound relationship to research and knowledge base”, we began to develop a more substantial and scholarly canon of readings for our students. And we have greatly increased our emphasis on conceptual frameworks. Nonetheless, this is an area where we need to continue our efforts to be rigorous and to assure that each advisor has the same high expectations related to the standard.

Dr. Beyard’s statements in 2011 still ring true:

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.

The number that we accept into a cohort every other year is quite small. We do know that our pool of applicants has tended to improve (based on undergraduate GPA and GRE scores). And we are committed to responding to program weaknesses. We do discuss regularly, for example, the data summaries, and especially in Table 1, and ways that we can get a higher number of students to move from completion of coursework to defense of the dissertation. 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 admission process, and find this is quite important. We are incorporating writing standards on all formative assessments.

Overall, we believe we continue to build on our strengths while at the same time, acknowledging areas that could use growth and attention. We are especially happy to have devoted substantial amounts of energy, time, and fiscal resources to enhancing our capacity to support student writing. Our next primary area of intervention will now be to support our students in new and meaningful ways once they enter the dissertation phase. Our goal is certainly to increase our final graduation rate.

Appendix A

Leadership Portfolio Task Sheet *Revised December 2014*

Overview

The Leadership Portfolio is intended to provide an alternative to the comprehensive exam, traditionally used to assess candidates' content knowledge and to determine whether or not they are ready to proceed with the dissertation. Candidates must successfully defend the Leadership Portfolio in front of a faculty committee in order to move on to the development of the dissertation. The rationale often cited for the comprehensive exam is that it ensures that candidates can demonstrate in writing the ability to conceptualize and apply content associated with the field at an advanced, doctoral level. Most often this exam has consisted of questions chosen by the faculty and administered to the candidates over two, three-hour time blocks. The arguments for an alternative assessment rather than the more traditional comprehensive exam are twofold. First, this approach is more broadly based, that is, the portfolio requirements call for showing the integration of ideas and their application in ways not possible on a written examination. Second, this approach goes beyond what candidates "know" by also assessing their capabilities in important areas of leadership.

As an assessment instrument, the purpose of the Leadership Portfolio is threefold: (1) to provide evidence of the candidates' progress so feedback can be provided in timely fashion; (2) to provide evidence that each candidate meets identified program standards; and (3) to provide faculty with evidence that candidates are ready to proceed with the doctoral dissertation. In addition, the portfolio assessment process provides the faculty with an important source of data about the quality of selection and admission processes, instruction, and program design.

Candidates are introduced to the task of the Leadership Portfolio in the first year of the program. They begin work on the Leadership Portfolio during the second summer of the Program with the development of one proposition for purposes of receiving

feedback from the program director before development of all other propositions. During the second year of the program (Fall and Spring Semesters) each candidate will continue work on the Leadership Portfolio for the purpose of summative review and evaluation. During the spring semester of the second year of the program, candidates work with their primary dissertation advisors on the Leadership Portfolio. This final portfolio will consist of evidence of their capabilities in each of the seven Foundational Propositions for the program (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

Learning Outcomes for the Doctoral Program

1. Effective educational leaders demonstrate an ethical and moral commitment to collaborative work that promotes positive learning for all members of the organization.
2. Effective educational leaders understand teaching and learning is at the heart of the organization and demonstrate the ability to foster best practice.
3. Effective educational leaders connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger philosophical, political, and historical context, and the organization's mission.
4. Effective educational leaders establish a commitment to social justice through their work and act in ways that promote social justice in their organization
5. Effective educational leaders utilize evolving technologies to improve organizations, enhance learning, and build institutional identity.
6. Effective educational leaders foster continuous organizational improvement grounded in the collection, analysis, interpretation, and application of data.
7. Effective educational leaders locate, interpret, and assess relevant educational research and apply it to both practice and the design and conduct of research.

Procedures for Portfolio Development

Candidates will begin by developing a narrative statement for each proposition in which they define what each proposition means for them. In the proposition narrative statement, candidates will also synthesize important and relevant literature studied throughout the

program and clearly demonstrate their understanding of the advanced standards in educational leadership related to that proposition. This introductory narrative to the proposition will be approximately 2-3 pages in length and include a reference list of significant literature discussed in that particular proposition's narrative statement.

Candidates will then select two examples of their work relative to each proposition. The exhibits candidates choose to place in the portfolio should reflect "best work" as well as work that demonstrates growth as an educational leader. One of the portfolio entries for each proposition will be a product (papers, projects, evaluations) that resulted from assignments in core courses, inquiry seminars, or specialty electives. The other entry for each proposition will be an example that candidates choose to represent the results of their everyday work or the products associated with their internships.

Each example entry should be accompanied by a brief (2 to 3 pages) reflective essay. The reflective essay should describe why the entry best represents the candidate's work related to the proposition and how leader standards are demonstrated in the work. In addition, the candidate should reflect about what was learned, and explain how the work or activity could be changed or improved in the future. The narrative statement in total will number approximately 6-10 pages, with an attached reference list. All writing should adhere to APA formatting. Candidates are permitted to use the same entry to support more than one proposition, but are expected to present in support of each proposition at least one example that represents course assignments and one example that represents leadership in action. Candidates should consult with their advisor or the program director about specific concerns related to portfolio development.

Candidates will place all materials on a flash drive that includes a clearly marked "folder" for each proposition (which includes the introductory narrative, artifact #1 and its reflective statement, and artifact #2 and its reflective statement). Candidates are responsible for making and distributing multiple copies for committee members.

Portfolio Assessment

Candidates will submit the Leadership Portfolio to a portfolio committee consisting of the following three members: (1) the student's dissertation advisor; (2) the Ed.D. program director or strand coordinator; and (3) someone who has been mutually chosen by the

advisor and the candidate, either an educational practitioner who holds a doctorate or a faculty member from outside the core Ed.D. teaching faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership. This third person must be approved by the program director or strand coordinator. The candidate is responsible for scheduling a date and time that is convenient for him/herself and members of the committee.

Portfolios must first be approved by the candidate's advisor. The candidate will then provide the advisor-approved portfolio to all committee members at least two weeks in advance of a scheduled portfolio presentation meeting and defense. All committee members will attend the presentation and defense, which is anticipated to be about one hour in length. At that time, the candidate will make a 15-20 minute presentation that is intended to synthesize the salient features of the reflections and the products, integrate the entries into a coherent whole, and establish clearly for the committee what the candidate believes are the salient features of the portfolio as related to the candidate's growth as a leader in the field and readiness to embark on the dissertation. In addition, the presentation should demonstrate appropriate use of technology and other communication tools. The remaining part of the meeting provides time for questions, clarifications, and discussion.

An Assessment Guide (attached to this Project Description) is used by the committee to assess the portfolio. The evidence and reflections submitted in support of each doctoral proposition, as well as the presentation and defense, will be judged by the committee using a three-category rubric: Distinguished, Meets Standards, and Does Not Meet Standards. "Distinguished" will be reserved for truly outstanding work. Propositions for which there is insufficient evidence or evidence of insufficient quality will be judged "Does Not Meet Standards" and will require revision and/or additional documentation. If the candidate does not meet standard, a timetable for revision and review of the revision will be established. Passing the defense of the portfolio at the Distinguished or Meets Standard levels is a prerequisite for moving into the stage of development of the dissertation.

Appendix B
Original Leadership Portfolio Rubric

DOCTORAL PORTFOLIO RUBRIC (1/04)

Candidate: _____ Cohort: _____ Date of Defense: _____ Result: Repeat Passed Distinguished

Proposition One: Effective educational leaders are skillful in creating a sense of a *collaborative learning community* for all those with whom they work. These leaders are sensitive to their ethical and moral obligation to design and implement programs that promote positive learning for all. Further, these leaders have the organizational and conceptual skills to advance the work of institutions, communities, and organizations.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essay requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a deep commitment to collaboration in a learning community.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essay requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents significant contributions to creating learning community in her or his school/work setting.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essay requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents a very high level of knowledge about the literature and best practices related to learning communities.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essay requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides convincing evidence of having had a meaningful impact on her or his learning community.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essay requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership artifact and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective essays requires improvement.	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

Proposition Two: Effective educational leaders know that *teaching and learning* is at the heart of everything they do. They are familiar with current curricular, instructional and assessment practices and know how to help others improve their skills in these areas. They know how to create and sustain a powerful vision of the importance of teaching and learning and have skills in program evaluation and assessment to monitor efforts to improve classroom and organizational growth. Further, they know how to provide the professional development, coaching, and mentoring services that are fundamental to organizational growth and renewal.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a powerful vision and commitment to supporting the growth of others.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents significant achievements in supporting the growth of others.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents a very high level of knowledge about the literature and best practices related to teaching and learning.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides convincing evidence of having had a meaningful impact on teaching and learning.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essays requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional, one of the very best.	

Proposition Three: Effective educational leaders are able to connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger *philosophical and historical contexts* that support educational change. They know how to effectively engage others in the change process and to generate and allocate resources of innovation.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds Expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a deep understanding of the change process, and a commitment to changing educational environments.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate demonstrates that he or she has led change resulting in organizational improvements.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents an understanding of the literature and best practices related to organizational improvement..	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides convincing evidence of having had a meaningful impact on her or his educational environment.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

Proposition Four: Effective educational leaders recognize *diversity* as a strength and know how to develop systems, programs and services that are responsive to the needs of learners, faculty and communities. These leaders work to create a culture of success for all learners and know how to effectively partner with community and national groups and networks to enhance the educational environment for their learners. Further, these leaders are skillful in developing a variety of community avenues to inform others in the wider community.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a deep commitment to diversity and responsiveness to differences in the learning community.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents significant contributions to diversity in the learning community and the culture of success.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents an understanding of the literature and best practices related to diversity and community involvement.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides convincing evidence of impact on enhancing the educational environment for all learners.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

Proposition Five: Effective educational leaders know how to use *technology* to support and advance the learning environment. These leaders demonstrate skills in using a variety of media for communication purposes as well as effectively using building-wide and system-wide information processing systems.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a deep commitment to achieving TSSA standards and to appropriate use of technology.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents important applications of technology to improve teaching and learning.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents an understanding of the literature and best practices related to technology.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides convincing evidence of having had a meaningful impact related to technology and learning.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition and the TSSA standards.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

Proposition Six: Effective educational leaders are committed to the processes of *continuous quality improvement* and know how to collect, research, analyze and interpret salient data to inform the change process. These leaders know how to communicate this information to a variety of audiences to help enlist their support for improvement.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document a deep commitment to the importance of continuous quality improvement and a willingness to undertake the role of leader as change agent.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides substantial data and other evidence of success in leading significant change that has improved teaching and learning.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents an understanding of the literature and best practices related to organizational improvement and leadership for change.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate provides substantial data and other evidence of being an effective change agent.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth in leadership skills for school improvement.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate's work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

Proposition Seven: Effective educational leaders *value and apply research* in determining best practice. These leaders know how to evaluate and bring critical judgment to bear on educational research and they can communicate research to teachers, parents, and members of the community. They have the skills to conduct and provide leadership for action research aimed at improving teaching and learning.

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard At doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
A <i>rational</i> relationship between proposition and evidence; reflective essay clearly articulates the relationship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate's evidence and essay document an exceptional ability to evaluate, communicate, and conduct research.	
Artifacts and products address an important educational issue or tackle a <i>significant</i> educational problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents the ability to conceptualize significant research studies.	
Evidence and rationale have a <i>sound</i> relationship to research and knowledge base about individual and organizational learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents an exceptional understanding of appropriate research methods for studying learning.	
There is data or evidence of <i>impact</i> on the world of practice (especially important for leadership in action).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents that her or his research skills have had an exceptional impact on teaching and learning.	
Evidence and essay document <i>growth</i> and development in leadership. Candidate provides an appropriately critical appraisal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, candidate documents exceptional growth related to this proposition.	
<i>Quality</i> of each product, reflective writing, and use of technology is commensurate with a high level of responsibility for leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> __ Program artifact and/or __ Leadership artifact and/or __ Reflective essay requires improvement. 	Both program and leadership artifacts meet standards of quality; reflective essay provides context, rationale, and critical self-reflection.	In addition to the preceding, the quality of this candidate' work is exceptional; one of the very best.	

STANDARDS FOR PRESENTATION AND ORAL DEFENSE OF THE PORTFOLIO

Standards	Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	Distinguished/ Exceeds expectations	Evidence (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
Presentation synthesizes the salient features of the portfolio, integrates the entries into a coherent whole, and demonstrates communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology, and audience sensitivity).	Improvement needed in: ___ Synthesis/integration ___ Oral communication ___ Use of technology ___ Audience sensitivity	Candidate uses communication skills effectively to present the salient features of the portfolio. The presentation coherently integrates and reflects upon standards and personal growth.	In addition to the preceding, candidate communicates with exceptional clarity and eloquence.	
Responses and discussion demonstrate deep understanding and mastery of both content and leadership standards.	___ Knowledge base is superficial or lacks breadth, and/or ___ Responses are unclear or unrelated, and/or ___ Inadequate knowledge of leader standards.	Candidate responds to questions by making reference to theory, research, and philosophical/historical contexts and relating that knowledge to standards.	In addition to the preceding, candidate is accurate, fluent and specific in referencing sources and ideas.	

HOLISTIC JUDGMENT

Standards	<u>Revise and Repeat</u> Does not fully achieve standard at doctoral level	<u>Passed</u> Fully achieves standard at doctoral level	<u>Distinguished</u> Exceeds expectations of standards	<u>Evidence</u> (from portfolio and/or oral presentation)
Overall, there is demonstrable evidence that candidate has mastered course content and leadership standards, and documented readiness to begin the dissertation.	Improvements needed: ___ Artifacts ___ Reflection ___ Writing skills ___ Oral communication skills ___ Technology skills See pages 1-7 for specifics.	Candidate has provided substantial and meaningful evidence of achievement, and as judged by the portfolio committee, possesses the skills required to commence the dissertation.	Considered as whole, the portfolio and presentation represent work of exceptionally high quality; one of the very best.	See above and also pages 1-7 for specific evidence related to this judgment.

Portfolio Committee Members: (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

Additional comments:

Appendix C

Doctoral Program Leadership Portfolio Assessment Guide

Revised 12/12/2014

Candidate _____ Cohort _____ Date of Defense _____
 Faculty reviewer _____

The Candidate's Leadership Portfolio Committee will evaluate evidence provided in a candidate's portfolio using four standards. Responses by the Committee members during the Portfolio Defense are logged on the Portfolio Assessment Record by the candidate's advisor and submitted to the Doctoral Director.

Learning Outcomes	Standard 1: Knowledge of individual and organizational learning	Standard 2: Application of key concepts to discussion of the artifacts	Standard 3: Skill in Reflection on learning	Standard 4: Communication Skill in written and oral presentation	Summary score by Learning Outcome
<p>1. Effective educational leaders demonstrate an ethical and moral commitment to collaborative work that promotes positive learning for all members of the organization.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact.</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	

<p>2. Effective educational leaders understand teaching and learning is at the heart of the organization and demonstrate the ability to foster best practice.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>3. Effective educational leaders connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger philosophical, political, and historical context, and the organization's mission.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>4. Effective educational leaders establish a commitment to</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-</p>	

<p>social justice through their work and act in ways that promote social justice in their organization.</p>	<p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>5. Effective educational leaders utilize evolving technologies to improve organizations, enhance learning, and build institutional identity.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>6. Effective educational leaders foster continuous organizational improvement grounded in the collection, analysis,</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas</p>	

<p>interpretation, and application of data.</p>	<p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>7. Effective educational leaders locate, interpret, and assess relevant educational research and apply it to both practice and the design and conduct of research.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking 2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking. 1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact. 2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact. 1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition 2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition 1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct. 2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general. 1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well- sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>Summary score by standard</p>					

<p>Oral presentation</p>	<p>3 Candidate discusses personally important learning; compelling presentation that synthesizes salient features of the portfolio; demonstrates strong communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates deep understanding and mastery of content and leadership standards</p> <p>2 Candidate discusses some personally important learning; interesting presentation that synthesizes features of the portfolio; demonstrates adequate communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates some understanding and grasp of content and leadership standards</p> <p>1 Candidate does not discuss personally important learning; presentation lacks interest and synthesizes features of the portfolio in a minimal way; demonstrates low-level communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates little understanding and grasp of content and leadership standards</p>
---------------------------------	--

Holistic Score for the Leadership Portfolio

- _____ 3 Distinguished: Considered as a whole, the portfolio and presentation represent work of exceptionally high quality
- _____ 2 Meets standard at doctoral level: Candidate has provided substantial and meaningful evidence of achievement and possesses the skills required to commence the dissertation
- _____ 1 Does not meet standard at doctoral level: Improvements are needed before candidate is approved to move on.

Comments

Appendix D

Faculty Development Grant Proposal

Internal Grant Proposal Cover Sheet

SUBMISSION DATE	October 28, 2015
PRIMARY FACULTY APPLICANT	Dr. Penelope L. Lisi
DEPARTMENT	Educational Leadership
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF PROPOSAL	<i>Building Capacity for Scholarly Writing in the CCSU Ed.D. Program</i>
Faculty Co-Applicant(s)	
Student Co-Applicant(s) <i>Please include Student ID# and status: G- Graduate or UG- undergraduate.</i>	
TYPE OF GRANT (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full-Time Faculty Development <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty – Student Research <input type="checkbox"/> Part-Time Faculty Development <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Development
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$5,000

2015-2016 Faculty Development Proposal Narrative

Title: *Building Capacity for Scholarly Writing in the CCSU Ed.D. Program*

October 28, 2015

Description of Activity

Clearly define the activity you are proposing, and provide a well-reasoned description of how this activity will assist in your professional growth within the context of your overall career goals.

When students are accepted into graduate programs—particularly doctoral programs—we tend to believe they are skilled in writing. This must be true if, in fact, they were accepted into the program! We also tend to believe that faculty are equipped to teach any missing writing skills to their students. After all, they completed dissertations themselves! Unfortunately, while students may be good writers when they are accepted into a doctoral program, and faculty may be committed to their students, the type of writing that is expected in doctoral programs is different. The bottom line is that the type of scholarly or academic writing that is expected of doctoral students can be difficult to learn, and difficult to teach.

Our proposal describes a project that responds to a critical question: How should faculty help doctoral students develop the skills required to produce doctoral-level technical writing? Our cohorts include students who do not write well. We want to help them.

Since the CCSU Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership was established in 2003, 102 candidates have graduated. Our application process requires the GRE writing assessment and a writing sample. In our review of applications, we make great efforts to select candidates with good writing skills. Even so, the skills required to write academic papers and a dissertation at the doctoral level require a different type of skill than those brought in by many of our candidates. While immersed in the program, candidates engage significantly in the writing process. And many struggle with the process throughout their coursework. Several fail to complete the dissertation.

At present, faculty typically note editorial concerns on individual papers, score writing using the holistic standard found on the rubric for most assignments, and provide support to students on an individual basis and to the extent that time permits. Our intentions are good, but we need to refine our skills. We also need a systematic process for helping students develop proficiency in technical writing before embarking on their dissertations.

Currently, 52 candidates are actively engaged in coursework and/or dissertation writing. Twelve full-time faculty are engaged as teaching faculty and/or primary dissertation advisors in the program.

We accept a cohort every two years. When students are in the process of writing the dissertation, they and their faculty advisors know that the program provides the services of an editor at the end of the dissertation writing process. Depending on the student, the amount of feedback that the editor has had to provide the student has ranged from minimal to extensive. Due to financial constraints, with our newest cohort (2015), a post-dissertation editorial service will no longer be available. Thus, the pressure on teaching faculty and dissertation advisors to provide critical feedback on student writing is increased.

Review of evidence from applications to the program (e.g. GRE scores, writing samples in the form of candidate statements), as well as from written work while in the program (e.g. course projects and expectations, development of reflections for the Leadership Portfolio, and review of dissertations)- all indicate that there is a need for on-going and focused support for our doctoral students throughout the entire program. In terms of support that is available, the campus does have a writing center. We have consulted with the director of the center, who indicated that the primary activity of the center is tutoring undergraduates. There are no materials available on the center's website to support student writing, nor are there any professional development opportunities for faculty. There are no supports specifically for doctoral students.

This proposal seeks funding to enhance our capacity to support student scholarly writing at the doctoral level. We anticipate engaging in three primary activities during the spring semester 2016. First, doctoral program staff will travel for daylong visits to two different institutions of higher education that have established writing centers with specific supports for doctoral level scholarly writing. These institutions include the University of Connecticut, and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The intention of the visits will be to meet with directors and staff of the centers and learn about professional development options available to faculty and how doctoral students are supported in enhancing their writing capacity. A review of the websites for those centers indicates that there are a wide variety of options available to students, as well as professional development opportunities for faculty.

Second, the doctoral program will host a series of 3 half-day workshops for CCSU doctoral program faculty. The content of these workshops will be developed in January and February, and the workshops will be offered during the spring semester 2016. One part of the training will include collaborative review of student work using the rubrics and standards developed for our existing assessment system with the goal of establishing scoring norms across the faculty. We anticipate contracting with CambridgeEditors (Boston) to

provide the 3 half-day sessions of faculty professional development. CambridgeEditors is a small firm dedicated to quality work, with nearly two decades of experience in supporting scholarly writing, primarily in the social sciences.

Third, program faculty will attend a two-day conference from April 2-3, 2016, sponsored by the Northeast Writing Centers Association in Keene, NH. Since our doctoral faculty are not aware of the variety of interventions available to doctoral students, it is anticipated that we will be able to learn from other attendees about options available on their own campuses. The Northeast Writing Center Association (NEWCA) is a regional affiliate of the International Writing Center Association (IWCA)--founded in 1983. Its purpose is to foster communication among writing centers and providing a forum for concerns for faculty and peer supporters.

Our project benefits doctoral faculty and will have an impact on the instructional process. With the development and implementation of faculty development we anticipate being in a strong position to build a menu of interventions and referrals to be made available to our doctoral students throughout the program. Our overall goal therefore, is to ensure that doctoral students embarking on dissertations and dissemination requirements have an appropriate level of writing skills. We will improve our ability to teach, assess, and provide feedback about student writing.

Activities

January and February 2016

Meet with staff of CambridgeEditors (Boston) for ½ day to discuss the project and plan for 3 half-day workshops with the CCSU doctoral faculty. Continue collaborative planning for the half-day workshops to be offered in the spring semester.

January- February 2016

Schedule and conduct 2 campus visits to meet with directors of writing centers and consult about professional development options available to doctoral faculty and interventions available to support doctoral student writing.

February- April 2016

1 staff member/editor from CambridgeEditors will deliver 3 half-day workshops to CCSU doctoral teaching faculty and dissertation advisors (impacting 12 full-time faculty) to support them in enhancing their capacity to work effectively with doctoral students in their writing. Examples of workshop topics are:

- Learning to write at the doctoral level
- Responding to student writing: Guiding principles, the big mistakes, grading
- Barriers to writing effectively
- Advancing your argument/ presenting your evidence
- Editing for style: How to improve your writing

April 2-3, 2016

1 faculty member's attendance at the Northeast Writing Centers Association 2016 Conference, Keene, NH.

Throughout the spring semester

Program faculty will consult with with Dr. Elizabeth Brewer, Director of the CCSU Writing Center, to collaborate on the development of resources that could be made available for doctoral students and faculty.

Significance

Articulate how the proposed activity will advance your work with regard to your field, department and teaching objectives, and why this particular activity is unique or critical to your work.

The CCSU doctoral program in educational leadership is a very strong and well-regarded program. We typically attract many more applicants than we are able to accept. We want to continue to offer a very strong program, and be able to build the program's capacity in new areas. An area that could benefit from focused attention is student scholarly writing.

We are now expanding our capacity in the doctoral program. With the spring semester 2016, we will launch our very first cohort of candidates in a new strand of the program that focuses on Higher Education. We have also received approval in Connecticut to deliver our doctoral program to students in Jamaica and anticipate recruiting our first cohort in 2016, to start in winter 2017. There are other doctoral programs in the School of Education and Professional Studies at CCSU that are in the developmental stages right now, including Marriage and Family Therapy, and Nursing. The development of enhanced capacity to support student academic writing in all CCSU doctoral programs would not only benefit the students and program faculty, but would serve the university as well.

With support through this faculty development project, we will be able to develop internal capacity and additional resources to enhance the program's capacity to support powerful and strong student scholarly writing. Our new approaches, skills, and knowledge will be useful not only for the existing program, but for programs that are also in the pipeline and soon to be launched. Approval of funding for the project will allow us to gain new insights and information on how other institutions support student academic writing at the doctoral level.

Results

Specify the anticipated impact of the activities on your professional development.

Our project has the potential for supporting our own work with doctoral students. Engagement in this project will enhance faculty capacity to serve our doctoral students more effectively. We anticipate this will be true for our existing program with 52 active students, as well as for our doctoral programs soon to be initiated.

While faculty development is critical, we plan to extend the work in the spring semester through collaborative development by doctoral faculty of a plan to help us better guide students with deficiencies in writing skills. As a result of training in how to support our doctoral students in the writing process, and in addition to building individual faculty capacity, a logical next step will be to develop a series of interventions for students. These may include workshops for students once they are accepted into the program, writing workshops available to doctoral students throughout the program, and resources posted on the program website (e.g. articles, webinars, links, etc.).

The challenges we face in helping practitioners improve their writing skills are common to educational leadership programs. Thus, our work will be interesting to others. A preliminary literature search on writing instruction and assessment in doctoral programs yielded little, so we expect to develop one or more conference presentations for Division A of the American Educational Research Association) (AERA and/or the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). There is also the potential for one or more publications in such journals as the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, an on-line journal managed by UCEA, or *Educational Administration Quarterly*. The *Peabody Journal of Education* also publishes articles about doctoral education.

Appendix E
Faculty Development Grant Final Report

Internal Grant Final Report Form

PRIMARY APPLICANT NAME	Dr. Penelope L. Lisi
TITLE OF PROPOSAL	<i>Building Capacity for Scholarly Writing in the CCSU Ed.D. Program</i>
YEAR OF AWARD	2015- 2016
Faculty Co-Applicant(s)	
Student Co-Applicant(s)	

TYPE OF GRANT
(check one)

Full-Time Faculty Development
 Part-Time Faculty Development
 University Research

Faculty – Student Research
 Curriculum Development

Amount Awarded \$ 3,500 **Amount Expended** \$ 3,500

How many CCSU students were involved in the activities covered by this award?

UG	<u>-</u>
Grad	<u>22</u>

Approximately what proportion of the total award funded student activity?

0 %

Grant Activities: Give a brief summary of the major activities conducted and the time frame in which they were performed.

As one component of development of the EdD Writing Institute, P. Lisi attended several modules in a Copyediting program at Emerson College, Boston, MA. Course modules that I attended took place on the following days in 2016:

Jan. 25, 27

Feb. 1, 3, 8, 10, 22

March 21, 23

Emerson modules included:

- CEO281 Copyediting: Getting Started
- CEO 284: Grammar for professionals
- CEO 285: Editing for Style
- CEO 287: Editing for Accuracy
- CEO 291: Precision Proofreading

Another component of the EdD Writing Institute was to sponsor a series of Workshops on Graduate Level Writing for graduate level faculty. Faculty outside of the doctoral program were invited to participate. Three workshops (each attended by approximately 15 faculty) were facilitated by Dr. Tom Deans, Director of the University of Connecticut Writing Center (Graduate Level) in the spring semester. Topics included the following:

- Discussion:
 - What is academic writing? How are we doing in our program?
 - Overview of what is done now to support student writing
 - Current issues/ challenges with student writing
 - Developing a vision of academic writing in the doctoral program
- Explore possibility of setting one assignment per course as a “W” assignment; faculty give feedback to the content and the writing

As an outcome of the focus on writing with the CCSU doctoral faculty, we developed a rubric to be used with one writing assignment in every course in the program. The rubric was used for assessing a “W” designated assignment in each course, starting in Summer 2016.

Another component of the project was to work with the CCSU Writing Center to offer a series of workshops for the doctoral students on how to enhance writing capacity. Three workshops were offered in May and July 2016.

Finally, we were able to develop an extensive set of resources and materials for graduate level writers. The resources were uploaded to the doctoral program website and linked to the website for the CCSU Writing Center.

Outcomes: Describe how the grant activities contributed to the quality of your teaching, learning and scholarship, and how these activities will benefit the University.

Faculty learned new strategies for supporting enhanced student writing. This included how to build writing assignments, how to provide useful feedback, and how to develop a writing rubric.

Long-term, we anticipate the intensive focus on writing will impact student capacity in developing their dissertations.

We learned new approaches to editing student work, particularly on the large scale (e.g. dissertations).

Budget Summary: Briefly explain how the funds were spent.

In light of the reduced amount of funds available for the project, and the relatively high cost of working with Cambridge Editors, the decision was made to use the AAUP funds to support my participation in the Emerson College editing program. Other funds were secured to support faculty development through workshops provided by UConn faculty, development of website materials and links, and workshops for students.

\$3,500 funds from 2015-2016 Faculty Development Grant were used for the Emerson course modules on editing

Submit report to grants@ccsu.edu no later than 30 days after the grant end date.

Appendix F

Doctoral Program Writing Assessment Tool

Rubric for Assessing Writing Assignments in Ed.D. Courses
Developed and approved, June 2016

Name:

Project/ Assignment:

Criteria	2 Exceeds expectations	1 Meets expectations	0 Below expectations
<p>Argument, integration and analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depth • Breadth • Accuracy 	<p>Ideas are detailed, well-developed, supported with specific examples;</p> <p>Sources are exceptionally well-integrated and they effectively support claims argued in the paper;</p> <p>Document presents current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed;</p> <p>Various and possibly conflicting opinions are presented in a balanced manner and seamlessly woven together;</p> <p>Essential findings of multiple sources are accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated;</p>	<p>Ideas are developed with some detail, supported with some examples;</p> <p>Sources are integrated and they support claims argued in the paper;</p> <p>Document presents somewhat current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed;</p> <p>From time to time, various and possibly conflicting opinions are presented and woven together;</p> <p>Findings of several sources, for the most part, are accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated;</p>	<p>Ideas lack supporting detail, and very few examples;</p> <p>Sources are not well- integrated and do not support claims argued in the paper;</p> <p>Document does not present current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed;</p> <p>Various and possibly conflicting opinions are not presented;</p> <p>Findings of several sources are not accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated;</p>

	Original sources are clearly identified and correctly cited in the body of the text and the references.	For the most part, original sources are identified and correctly cited in the body of the text and the references.	Original sources are not identified nor correctly cited in the body of the text and the references.
Content and Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization • Content • Flow • Logical structure 	<p>Organization of the paper is excellent;</p> <p>Topic is carefully focused;</p> <p>Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument;</p> <p>Capacity to synthesize appropriate literature is clear and of the highest level;</p> <p>Includes appropriate transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, and conclusions;</p> <p>Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another.</p>	<p>Organization of the paper is adequate;</p> <p>Topic has focus;</p> <p>Ideas are logically arranged to present somewhat of a sound scholarly argument;</p> <p>Capacity to synthesize appropriate literature is evident and of an adequate level;</p> <p>Includes some transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, and conclusions;</p> <p>Writing flows, for the most part, smoothly from one idea to another.</p>	<p>Paper lacks strong organization;</p> <p>Topic lacks clear focus;</p> <p>Ideas are not logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument;</p> <p>Capacity of ability to synthesize appropriate literature is not evident, nor appropriate for doctoral level work;</p> <p>Paper lacks transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, and conclusions;</p> <p>Writing does not flow smoothly from one idea to another.</p>
Style and format <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience • Purpose • Style 	<p>Purpose is clear;</p> <p>Author writes to a particular and clearly identifiable audience;</p>	<p>Purpose is clear for the most part;</p> <p>Author writes somewhat to a particular audience;</p>	<p>Purpose is not clear;</p> <p>Author does not write to a particular and clearly identifiable audience;</p>

	<p>Writing is suited to audience and purpose;</p> <p>Writing is elegant and publication quality.</p>	<p>Writing is adequate for the audience and purpose;</p> <p>Writing is adequate and, with some additional work, would be publication quality.</p>	<p>Writing is not suited to audience and purpose;</p> <p>Writing lacks elegance and is not publication quality.</p>
<p>Mechanics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APA • Punctuation • Grammar • Format 	<p>No errors in grammar, spelling, syntax and punctuation</p>	<p>Some errors in grammar, spelling, syntax and punctuation</p>	<p>Numerous errors in grammar, spelling, syntax and punctuation</p>
<p>APA style</p>	<p>APA formatting is used consistently, completely, and appropriately throughout the document</p> <p>Quotations and works cited conform to APA style.</p>	<p>APA formatting is used consistently, and appropriately for the most part throughout the document</p> <p>Quotations and works cited conform sometimes to APA style.</p>	<p>APA formatting is not used consistently, completely, and appropriately throughout the document</p> <p>Quotations and works cited do not conform to APA style.</p>

Comment

Appendix E
Dissemination Rubric

EDL 720 Assignment 1B: Narrative Report and Documentation of Your Dissemination Work

Name: _____ Course: _____ Cohort: _____ Scored by: _____ Date: _____

Special Instructions:

Standard (see handouts)	Needs improvement	Expected level of quality	Distinguished
<p>Your dissemination report includes all required elements.</p>	<p>One or more element is missing: ___ Advisor signed cover sheet or memo. ___ Narrative report of dissemination activities ___ Reflection about the impact of your dissertation research ___ DAI abstract ___ Graduate School correspondence ___ Documentation for scholarly dissemination (see Assignment 2 for requirements) ___ Documentation for world of practice dissemination (see Assignment 2)</p>	<p>Complete.</p>	<p>Your report communicates with exceptional clarity.</p>

<p>Your narrative report, and especially your reflection about the impact of your dissertation research, is an appropriate example of doctoral thinking and writing.</p>	<p>A superficial report and reflection, or one which contains significant errors or omissions will not be accepted.</p>	<p>Your narrative is complete and your reflection documents that you have taken a step back and thought about the impact of your dissertation research.</p>	<p>You have reflected deeply and self-critically – as good scholars and practitioners do -- and you have a very good sense of the meaning of your work, and what your next steps should be.</p>
<p>The artifacts you provide to document dissemination to the scholarly community are complete and professional.</p>	<p>Incomplete or at a level of quality that we do not deem to be “professional”. For example, if a conference presentation, we will use the presentation rubric to judge “professionalism”.</p>	<p>Complete and at an appropriate level of scholarly quality for a student about to earn a doctoral degree.</p>	<p>We are proud of your scholarly work, and think you have a high likelihood of success in bringing this work to the attention of other scholars.</p>
<p>The artifacts you provide to document dissemination to the world of practice are complete and professional.</p>	<p>Incomplete or at a level of quality that we do not deem to be professional. For example, if your work has errors, is superficial, or would not provide value-added to the audience, we would judge it to need improvement.</p>	<p>Complete and at an appropriate level of quality for an experienced educator who is prepared to be an educational leader.</p>	<p>We are proud of your applied work, and think you have a high likelihood of making an impact on the world of practice.</p>
<p>Considered as a whole, this project represents the appropriate culmination of your work as doctoral student</p>			<p>Congratulations Dr. _____!!!!</p>

Comments:

June 2010