

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
ASSESSMENT
FALL 2011-SPRING 2012**

MASTER OF SCIENCE

The master's degree in educational leadership is designed to prepare teacher leaders who are capable of enhancing the effectiveness of their organization. There are two strands from which students may choose. Strand I: Educational Leadership (30 credits) is designed to prepare graduates to assume teacher leadership positions within their school or organization. Strand II: Curriculum Leadership (30 credits) is designed to prepare graduates to assume roles involving curriculum renewal and evaluation.

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students in the program are expected to:

1. Design, implement, and evaluate instructional programs to promote student learning;
2. Develop learning programs that are responsive to cultural and learning differences;
3. Conduct fair, equitable, and effective classroom supervision;
4. Design, implement, and evaluate professional development activities that promote teacher learning;
5. Use standardized and classroom-based student performance data to improve student learning;
6. Understand, interpret, and critique educational research.

The admission standard for the Educational Leadership M.S. program includes either a 3.00 undergraduate GPA or a 2.70 GPA with a 3.00 upper-level GPA.

COURSE AND CAPSTONE REQUIREMENTS:

Core Requirements (18 credits):

EDF 500 Contemporary Educational Issues (or EDF 516, 524, 525, 538, 583)

ED 511 Principles of Curriculum Development

EDL 513 Supervision

ED 517 Evaluation

ED 540 Educational Motivation and the Learning Process

ED 598 Research in Education Strand Requirements and Electives (12 credits)

Strand I — Educational Leadership Required courses (6 credits):

EDL 514 Administration

EDL 555 Leadership for Culturally Diverse Schools

Elective courses (6 credits):

Students select advisor-approved elective courses to complete their graduate program

Strand II — Curriculum Leadership Required courses (6 credits):

EDL 551 Curriculum Leadership

EDL 555 Leadership for Culturally Diverse Schools Elective courses (6 credits):
Students select advisor-approved elective courses to complete their graduate program.

ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND FINDINGS:

The department uses the capstone comprehensive examination to measure student attainment of the learning outcomes. The capstone is a three hour examination that covers all components of the curriculum. The core skills for the program are assessed by three questions the students must respond to. The process includes a dissemination of a case scenario and 11 questions which the candidates receive one month prior to administration. At the day of examination, the students respond to only 3 of the 11 questions. The three questions cover basic issues in leadership/administration, curriculum, and research. Within these questions, issues of professional development and evaluation, program development and evaluation, and staff, student and community diversity are all addressed. Following the administration of the comprehensive examination, faculty independently scores the student responses. We use a four point, wholistic rubric to determine the level of response. Faculty then submits all scores to the Department Chair who totals the scores and determines overall pass rates. At department meetings the overall performance is reviewed and discussed. A copy of the comprehensive examination and rubric is attached.

PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAM COMPLETERS ACHIEVING LEARNING OUTCOMES.

This table represents four years of data, the 2007-08 cohort which had 47 candidates, the 2008-09 cohort which had 39, the 2009-10 cohort which had 41 and the 2010/11 cohort which had 43 students taking the comprehensive examination. The following chart indicates the numbers of students meeting target for each of the Learning Outcomes for each of the cohorts.

2008/09 cohort n=39 candidates
2009/10 cohort n=41 candidates
2010/11 cohort n=43 candidates
2011/12 cohort n=42 candidates

Learning Outcomes	Unacceptable				Acceptable				Target				Above Target			
	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%
Design, implement, and evaluate instructional programs to promote student learning;	3/8%	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%	19/49%	22/54%	18/42%	17/40%	7/18%	18/44%	19/44%	21/50%	10/26%	1/2%	5/12%	4/10%
Develop learning programs that are responsive to cultural and learning differences;	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	17/44%	5/12%	7/16%	6/14%	19/49%	17/42%	17/40%	17/40%	3/7%	19/46%	19/44%	19/45%
Conduct fair, equitable, and effective classroom supervision;	0/0%	1/2%	1/2%	1/2%	5/13%	21/51%	8/19%	12/28%	30/77%	15/37%	19/44%	20/48%	4/10%	4/10%	15/35%	10/22%
Design, implement, and evaluate professional development activities that promote teacher learning;	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	12/31%	13.5/33%	10/23%	8/19%	21/54%	17.5/43%	21/49%	20/48%	6/15%	10/24%	12/28%	14/33%
Use standardized and classroom-based student performance data to improve student learning;	0/0%	1/1%	1/2%	1/2%	3/8%	13/32%	9/21%	7/16%	31/79%	16/39%	22/51%	27/64%	5/13%	11.5/28%	9/21%	8/19%
Understand, interpret, and critique educational research.	0/0%	1/2%	1/2%	0/0%	4/10%	21.5/52%	20/46%	15/36%	32/82%	16.5/40%	17/40%	22/52%	3/8%	2.5/6%	5/12%	5/12%

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS: (describe here program strengths and weaknesses as measured by performance in capstone courses or other assessment tools)

To analyze the data, we collapsed the performance levels from four groups to two. We divided the continuum of performance into those responses that fell above the target level and below. Our weaknesses fall in three areas. The most recent data from 2012 indicates that outcome one is the area where our students do the poorest. Only 60% of our candidates scored at or above the target area. Learning outcome six was the second lowest area with only 64% of the students scoring at or above the target level. Learning outcome three was also below 80% proficiency. Our strengths are in the other three learning outcomes. For learning outcome four our students scored at the 81% level at or above the target level. For learning outcome two, our students scored at 83% at or above the target level and for outcome one the score at or above the target level were 85%. As indicated in the table above the recent scores are similar to the profiles of students for the past three years. When compared to data for the above target area, there is a clear improvement when comparing recent scores with the 2008/09 scores. Learning outcomes two and four indicate a significant improvement over the past four years. The scores at the lowest level of performance (unacceptable) have remained steady with few students scoring in this area.

USE OF FINDINGS: (Insert here summative comments regarding program changes under consideration or being implemented as a result of data collection)

Revision to the MS are in process. We have proposed a 30/36 credit program that would lead to a new certification as Teacher Leader. We are working with the Dean of the Graduate School to determine the timing of moving this program forward. At the moment, the State of Connecticut has not officially proposed the Teacher Leader certification and its future is uncertain at this time. As for the analysis of the 2011-12 data, learning outcome one and six has the lowest performances by our students. For learning outcome one -- design, implement, and evaluate instructional programs to promote student learning -- our discussion at faculty meetings indicates that the State has initiated several major changes in the way education is conducted and evaluated and both our curriculum and our students have not integrated these changes at this time. The new Common Core Standards, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and the principles of Universal Design for Learning are all major changes that are in transition across the state and we believe that this confusion is operating in the data we see at the program level. We believe that the new curriculum we are teaching may include many of these key concepts but they may be new to our students and not fully understood by the time they take our comprehensive assessment. Overtime, as the new initiatives take more hold on educational practice across the state, we anticipate the scores will improve. As for learning outcome six -- understand, interpret, and critique educational research -- our new courses that extend learning about research from one to two semesters was not in place for this assessment. So, we feel we have made corrective changes but that they have not be implemented at this time. We anticipate that the changes will help students understand how to read and use professional research to improve their practice. It is not expected that changes in this area will be evident in the next assessment as the students are in the first year of this change and the results should not show up until the 2013/14 assessment.