

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

### Program: Educational Leadership and Instruction E.d.S. (582)

College: GCEHD

Prepared by: Dustin Hebert

Date: 6/7/18

Approved by: Kim McAlister

Date: 6/29/18

**Northwestern Mission.** Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

**Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission.** The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is a committed and diverse community of scholars, educators, students, and future leaders working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. The College produces graduates with the capabilities and confidence to be productive members of society equipped with the skill sets necessary to promote economic and social development thereby improving the overall quality of life in the region. The College offers a wide variety of exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare candidates for career success across the spectrum of professional roles and settings. These programs include teacher education, leadership, and counseling; health and human performance; psychology and addiction studies; social work; and military science. Candidates are taught to become adaptive critical thinkers and problem solvers in diverse scenarios capable of leveraging new technologies to enrich lifelong learning. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive role models in their communities and leaders in the nation's military.

**Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling Mission.** The Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and professional endeavors.

**Program Mission Statement:** The Education Specialist program prepares in-service educators, who already hold at least master's degrees, for roles beyond strictly classroom teaching. The program's mission is to prepare in-service teachers to serve in public or private educational settings as school leaders, special education curriculum

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

specialists, or technology directors. Candidates explore and test theory, research, and best practices in their respective disciplines through coursework and clinical experiences.

### Methodology:

Data are collected from key assessments in courses identified for each SLO. The assessments are administered as capstone assessments in the courses, and all are evaluated with analytic rubrics. Results are reviewed annually using descriptive statistics, comparisons across administration cycles, and, anecdotally, student feedback.

### SLO 1

#### Course Map:

EDUC 5890

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1)	Students use valid and reliable assessment practices.

### Measure 1.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Field Study Proposal

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment is aligned to the Graduate School's field study guidelines.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The assessment criteria are aligned to the frameworks used to develop the assessment requirements. Performance indicators are qualitative and progressive across the rating scale.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

75% (n=3) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

**Finding:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. In 2017-2018, 50% (n=2) of candidates met the benchmark.

**Analysis:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 50% (n=2) of candidates met the benchmark. Ratings on formatting, writing, and grammar were routinely below benchmark, which accounts for the below benchmark performance. Since 2016-2017, additional APA style, writing tips, and grammar support were provided to candidates; however, patterns of consistent errors in candidate work were identified, which revealed that candidates did not take advantage of the additional resources nor did they, overall, integrate corrections from draft assignments into their final assignments on which these data are based.

**Action - Decision or Recommendation:** Additional assignments will be added to EDUC 5890 that focus on APA style, writing, and grammar, which are the areas where candidates have for two years earned the lowest performance ratings. Since ratings on “content” items are consistently at benchmark, data do not indicate adjustments to those criteria are necessary. For 2018-2019, assignments based on the additional resources will be included into the course so that candidates are held accountable for reviewing those resources and so that performance on these assignments can be compared to final project rubric ratings to determine on which topics candidates struggle the most of APA style, writing, and grammar. Analyses of those data will determine next steps.

### SLO 2

#### Course Map:

EDUC 5990

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #4)	Students conduct, evaluate, and use inquiry to guide professional practice.

#### Measure 2.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Field Study

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment is aligned to the Graduate School’s field study guidelines.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The assessment criteria are aligned to the frameworks used to develop the assessment requirements. Performance indicators are qualitative and progressive across the rating scale.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

100% (n=9) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

**Finding:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark.

**Analysis:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark, which is consistent across cycles of EDUC 5990. Committee members provide feedback to candidates regularly in an effort to support student learning and ensure their successful completion of the field study research. Committee members complete multiple reviews of field studies, provide feedback, request revisions, and then critique again. This process continues until all committee members agree that the field study meets expectations.

**Action - Decision or Recommendation:** Faculty will review opportunities to restructure the feedback and assessment procedures in EDUC 5990 to determine ways to track performance from draft to draft so that more actionable data can be reported annually.

### SLO 3

#### Course Map:

EDUC 5990

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics.	Students use foundational knowledge of the field and professional ethical principles and practice standards to inform education practice, engage in lifelong learning, advance the profession, and perform leadership responsibilities.

#### Measure 3.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Field Study Oral Defense

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment is aligned to the Graduate School's field study guidelines.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The assessment criteria are aligned to the frameworks used to develop the assessment requirements. Performance indicators are qualitative and progressive across the rating scale.

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

100% (n=9) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

**Finding:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark.

**Analysis:** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark. Candidates present their research findings, and committee members lead question-and-answer sessions with candidates. These sessions are conversational, and faculty use probing questions as needed to help candidates provide complete and accurate responses. In cases where candidates struggle to respond completely and accurately, committee members used multiple probing questions and referenced passages from the field studies and/or prior course readings to guide candidates through their responses.

**Action - Decision or Recommendation:** Faculty will review opportunities to restructure the feedback and assessment procedures in EDUC 5990 to determine ways to track performance from draft to draft so that more actionable data can be reported annually.

### Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results:

**SLO 1.** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 50% (n=2) of candidates met the benchmark. Ratings on formatting, writing, and grammar were routinely below benchmark, which accounts for the below benchmark performance. Since 2016-2017, additional APA style, writing tips, and grammar support were provided to candidates; however, patterns of consistent errors in candidate work were identified, which revealed that candidates did not take advantage of the additional resources nor did they, overall, integrate corrections from draft assignments into their final assignments on which these data are based.

**SLO 2.** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark, which is consistent across cycles of EDUC 5990. Committee members provide feedback to candidates regularly to support student learning and ensure their successful completion of the field study research.

## AY 2017-2018 Assessment

Committee members complete multiple reviews of field studies, provide feedback, request revisions, and then critique again. This process continues until all committee members agree that the field study meets expectations.

**SLO 3.** In 2016-2017, 100% of candidates met benchmark. Faculty were concerned that all candidates met benchmark; therefore, rubrics were revisited, and adjustments were made to ensure qualitative performance indicators. In 2017-2018, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark. Candidates present their research findings, and committee members lead question-and-answer sessions with candidates. These sessions are conversational, and faculty use probing questions as needed to help candidates provide complete and accurate responses. In cases where candidates struggle to respond completely and accurately, committee members used multiple probing questions and referenced passages from the field studies and/or prior course readings to guide candidates through their responses.

Based on the analysis of the results, all students met benchmark expectations. Faculty acknowledge that, while this is admirable, assessment practices that yield evidence of student learning should be revisited to ensure objectivity and actionability.

**Plan of Action Moving Forward:** Based on evidence, faculty will revisit the EDUC 5990 assessment tools and procedures to work toward establishing evidence quality and providing more actionable assessment practices to yield accurate reflections of student learning and provide for program improvement.

**SLO 1:** Additional assignments will be added to EDUC 5890 that focus on APA style, writing, and grammar, which are the areas where candidates have for two years earned the lowest performance ratings. Since ratings on “content” items are consistently at benchmark, data do not indicate adjustments to those criteria are necessary. For 2018-2019, assignments based on the additional resources will be included into the course so that candidates are held accountable for reviewing those resources and so that performance on these assignments can be compared to final project rubric ratings to determine on which topics candidates struggle the most of APA style, writing, and grammar. Analyses of those data will determine next steps.

**SLO 2:** Faculty will review opportunities to restructure the feedback and assessment procedures in EDUC 5990 to determine ways to track performance from draft to draft so that more actionable data can be reported annually.

**SLO 3:** Faculty will review opportunities to restructure the feedback and assessment procedures in EDUC 5990 to determine ways to track performance from draft to draft so that more actionable data can be reported annually.