

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Ed Leadership M.Ed. (503)

Division: Gallaspy College of Education and Human

Development Department: School of Education

Prepared by: Katrina Jordan

Date: June 15, 2021

Approved by: Kimberly McAlister

Date: July 21, 2021

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution committed to acquiring, creating, and disseminating knowledge through innovative teaching, research, and service. With its certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs, Northwestern State University prepares its increasingly diverse student population to contribute to an inclusive global community with a steadfast dedication to improving our region, state, and nation.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is committed to working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge to Northwestern students through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. Through the School of Education and Departments of Health and Human Performance, Military Science, Psychology, and Social Work, the College produces knowledgeable, inspired, and innovative graduates ready for lifelong learning who contribute to the communities in which they reside and professions they serve. Additionally, the GCEHD is dedicated to the communities served by the Marie Shaw Dunn Child Development Center, NSU Elementary Laboratory School, NSU Middle Laboratory School, and the NSU Child and Family Network to assist children and their families related to learning and development.

School of Education Mission. The School of Education 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.

Educational Leadership Program Mission Statement. The Educational Leadership program develops and supports building effective leaders for schools who can improve the lives of every K-12 student. The program cultivates and enhances dynamic, high-performing leadership for the renewal and improvement of schools. The program is designed to help those in leadership roles to provide effective leadership for teaching-learning.

Methodology:

The assessment process for this program includes:

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

1. Data from assessments provide results on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions as appropriate for professional education programs.
2. Data from assessment tools are collected and returned to the program coordinator.
3. The program coordinator analyzes the data to determine whether students have met measurable outcomes.
4. Results from the assessments are discussed with the program faculty.
5. Annually, program faculty and stakeholders review data to make data-driven, curricular decisions.
6. The program coordinator, in consultation with program faculty, propose needed changes to measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next assessment period, and the curricula and overall program.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1.

Course Map:

EDL 5200 Curriculum Development for School Improvement
EDL 5300 Supervision for Evaluation and School Improvement
EDL 5400 The Principalship
EDL 5500 Financial Resources for Public Schools
EDL 5600 Human Resources for Professional Development
EDL 5700 Ethics and School Law
EDL 5800 School Community Relations
EDL 6200 Internship in School Administration
EDCI 5020 Curriculum Development for School Improvement
EDCI 5030 Instructional Improvement and Assessment
EDUC 5010 Educational Research and Evaluation
EDUC 5850 Action Research for School Improvement

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge. (SPA #1, Praxis II)	Students demonstrate content knowledge with passage of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

Measure 1.1.

Prior to enrollment in EDL 6200, Internship in School Administration, students must pass the SLLA. Passage of the SLLA is required for licensure in educational administration by the Louisiana State Department of Education. This exam is produced by Educational Testing Services (ETS) and reflects the most current

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

research on professional judgment and experience of educators across the country. Historically, it was based on both national job analysis studies and a set of standards for school leaders identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). ETS has transitioned from those standards to the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards for future SLLA exams. The benchmark performance is that at least 90% of first-time test takers will earn a passing score of 166 – the minimum requirement for Louisiana – or above.

Finding. Target was not met.

88% (22/25) of the students passed the exam in 2020-2021.

Analysis. In AC 2019-2020 the target was met. In 2019-2020, the target of 90.0% was met as 90.0% of students were able to successfully pass the SLLA on their first attempt, thus demonstrating students gained discipline-specific content knowledge while completing the coursework prescribed in the Educational Leadership (EDL) program. These outcomes resulted from a focus on the ISLLC standards in the EDL program mapped out above. The analysis of the 90.0% student achievement for this SLO confirmed that candidates were prepared for the licensure exam and successfully demonstrated competency with content knowledge.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In 2020-2021, faculty created and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. The goal of this analysis was to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and areas for program improvement both at the topic and subtopics levels to better articulate expectations and focus instructional design. Based on this analysis, faculty incorporated teaching and learning strategies that improved graduate student performance in content-specific areas. Specifically, faculty examined and adjusted course assignments and materials to ensure they reflected learning associated with the NELP standards. Where appropriate, more constructed response formative and summative assessment items were added to the curriculum.

Regardless of these changes, in AC 2020-21 target was not met. These changes did not have a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate discipline- specific content knowledge as only 88% (22/25) of the students passed the exam in 2020-2021.

Decision, action, or recommendation.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was not met as only 88% (22/25) of the students passed the exam in 2020-2021.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will attempt to implement the previous years' changes with increased integrity. Additionally, a new coordinator will be hired to facilitate further changes.

These changes will improve the student's ability to demonstrate content knowledge with passage of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 2.

Course Map:

EDUC 5010 Educational Research and Evaluation
EDUC 5850 Action Research for School
Improvement

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.	Students engage in inquiry through conducting research, analyzing and evaluating data, and drawing conclusions from their practice.

Measure 2.1.

Students enrolled in EDUC 5010 and EDUC 5850 complete a research project centered on Educational Leadership, which includes the following: introduction; review of the related literature; methodology; results; summary, conclusions, and recommendations; and an oral defense. The research project is conducted in the students' schools/districts in which they are employed. The research project is evaluated using a rubric collaboratively developed by EDL faculty and based on academic standards indicative of graduate level work. Each student is assigned a major professor and committee members who review students' written work and oral defenses in order to ensure and maintain high quality in regard to the assessment rubric and final student product. The benchmark performance is that at least 90% of students will meet or exceed standards with their research project.

Finding. Target was met.

100% (16/16) of the students successfully completed the project.

Analysis. In AC 2019-2020 the target was met. Having implemented the plan of action from 2018-2019 to provide extensive advising and quality feedback to students during the process of completing their research project, the benchmark of 90% of students meeting or exceeding standards with their research project was met in AC 2019-2020.

Furthermore, the percentage of those who met standard remained at 100%. The

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

analysis of 2019-2020 results reflect that students were prepared to successfully conduct and defend the application of discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice. However, upon evaluating the content and meaning of students' research topics, it was noted that some students' research projects focused on teacher-centered issues with research conducted from the perspective of a teacher-- this is as opposed to being from the perspective of a school leader whose functions move beyond a single classroom, encompassing the entire school. As a result, from the beginning of the advising process, when students explore and choose topics, student were guided toward research topics and research questions that explored the types of leadership behaviors that school leaders must exhibit in order to ensure that they lead high performing schools.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In 2020-2021, faculty created and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. The goal of this analysis was to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and areas for program improvement both at the topic and subtopics levels to better articulate expectations and focus instructional design. Based on this analysis, faculty incorporated teaching and learning strategies that improved graduate student performance in content-specific areas. Specifically, in 2020-2021 faculty provided students new exemplars (strong and weak) of research projects completed at NSU and at other universities to establish criteria that served to ensure an even higher quality finished product. Additionally, during the advising process, faculty guided students to explore research meaningful and relevant topics from the perspective of a school leader that are focused on leadership behaviors.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2020-2021, the target was met. 100% (16/16) of the students successfully completed the project.

The changes implemented had a direct impact on the student's ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.

Decision, action, or recommendation.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was met as 100% (16/16) of the students successfully completed the project.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In AC 2021-2022, a new coordinator of the programs will be assigned. This person will revamp courses, including the final paper course. More feedback and formative

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

feedback along with grading will be entered systematically. Additionally, faculty create and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement.

These changes will improve the student's ability to engage in inquiry through conducting research, analyzing, and evaluating data, and drawing conclusions from their practice, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 3

Course Map:

EDL 5400 The Principalship

EDL 6200 Internship in School Administration

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics. (Dispositional Evaluation)	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.

SLO 3 was measured through a portfolio defense in EDL 6200. The assessment was evaluated using the portfolio defense and the benchmark performance was that 90% or more students would successfully defend their portfolio.

Finding. Target was met.

Target was met, with 90% (18 of 20) of the students in the fall and spring sections successfully defending a portfolio

Analysis. In AC 2019-2020 the target was met. In 2019-2020, the target of 90% was met and exceeded as 100% of students successfully defended their portfolio according to rubric standards, thus demonstrating that students used foundational knowledge of the field and professional ethical principles and practice standards to inform education practice, engaged in lifelong learning, advanced the profession, and performed leadership responsibilities. These outcomes resulted from faculty providing extensive, quality feedback in the coursework and academic activities leading up to this capstone experience where they demonstrated the aggregation of their knowledge and skills. With the objective of supporting future students and increasing the quality of student work, EDL faculty ensured the incorporation of NELP standards in all classes. Faculty analyzed the current rubric used in this course to ensure that it also reflects the NELP standards.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In 2020-2021, faculty created and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. The goal of this analysis was to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and areas for program improvement both at the topic and subtopics levels to better articulate expectations and focus instructional design. Based on this analysis, faculty incorporated teaching and learning strategies that improved graduate student performance in content-specific areas. Specifically, in 2020-2021 faculty implemented changes accompanying the transition from the ISLLC to the NELP standards and introduce the standards associated with the dispositional evaluation to students taking the early course, EDL 5400, and the capstone course, EDL 6200.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2020-21, the target was met, with 90% (18 of 20) of the students in the fall and spring sections successfully defending a portfolio. The changes implemented had a direct impact on the student's ability to 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.

Decision, action, or recommendation.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was met with 90% (18 of 20) of the students in the fall and spring sections successfully defending a portfolio.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In AC 2021-2022, faculty will work with the new coordinator to update courses. Faculty will also faculty create and facilitate collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. Additionally, faculty will incorporate teaching and learning strategies to improve graduate student performance in content-specific areas.

These changes will improve the student's ability to 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, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

SLO 4

Course Map:

EDCI 5030 Instructional Improvement and Assessment

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline	Students complete a study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of practice.

Measure 4.1.

Students enrolled in EDCI 5030, Instructional Improvement and Assessment, are required to complete a study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of education. Using this knowledge, candidates observe in a classroom to identify best practices utilized by the teacher. This project requires the candidate to review the school's improvement plan and analyze accountability data to identify strengths and areas needing improvement within the school and draw associations between the results of their teacher observations, the school improvement plan, and the accountability data. Candidates then make recommendations based on their knowledge of best practices. This action-based research project is conducted in the students' schools/districts in which they are employed. A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the lesson planning template to align with Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based. The template is aligned to InTASC standards and possesses content validity. A panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous lesson plan work samples submitted by candidates in four different initial teacher preparation programs. For 2018- 2019, it was decided that this action-based research project would be evaluated using a rubric collaboratively developed by EDL faculty and based on academic standards indicative of graduate level work. The benchmark performance is that at least 90% of students will meet or exceed standards with their project.

Finding. Target was not met.

The data set is incomplete.

Analysis. In AC 2019-2020 the target was met. In AC 2019-2020, the target of 90% was met and exceeded as 100% of students met or exceeded standards with their project according to rubric standards determined by EDL faculty and demonstrated the ability to complete a study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of practice. The analysis of the 100% student achievement for this SLO confirmed that candidates were successful exhibiting creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In 2020-2021, faculty created and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. The goal of this analysis was to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and areas for program improvement both at the topic and subtopics levels to better articulate expectations and focus instructional design. Based on this analysis, faculty incorporated teaching and learning strategies that improved graduate student performance in content-specific areas. Specifically, in AC 2020-2021, EDL faculty ensured the alignment of the observation instrument used in the study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of education with NELP standards and adjusted the instrument as appropriate, ensuring candidates planned for and explained elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based.

Despite these changes, in AC 2020-21, the target was not met as the assessment was not implemented with fidelity across sections, therefore making the data set incomplete. In the section that implemented the assessment correctly, 100% (7 of 7) students completed the assessment successfully. However, the data set was incomplete as the same assessment was not implemented in both sections.

It cannot be determined if past changes had a direct impact on all of the student's ability to complete a study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of practice. However, those in the data set who completed the assessment were overwhelmingly successful, which was most likely due to the implemented changes.

Decision, action, or recommendation.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was not met as the data set was incomplete.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In AC 2021-2022, faculty will meet about key assessments and plan to implement the key assessments with fidelity. The new Ed Leader coordinator will work with faculty to ensure correct implementation.

These changes will improve the student's ability to complete a study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of practice, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

SLO 5

Course Map:

EDL 5300 Supervision for Evaluation and School Improvement

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate (SPA #5, Student Learning Impact)	Students complete a school-based intervention project in which they collect, analyze, and interpret data.

Measure 5.1.

Students enrolled in EDL 5300, Supervision for Evaluation and School Improvement, are required to complete a school-based intervention project that demonstrates ability in collection, analysis, interpretation, and use of data. The project must be focused on a school's needs based on data analysis and approved by the school principal. The project designed by the candidate must address the identified need. Since the project will be unique to the school setting, the candidate must define "program" in terms of the project created. Ideally, the program would integrate students, staff, families, and the community; however, candidates must allow the data to determine the direction taken. Candidates, in consultation with the school principal or designee, must determine what sources of data will contribute to the project's topic. Candidates are expected to use existing data to ensure that the project topic is selected objectively.

The assessment requires candidates to plan for, create, administer, and analyze student learning. Candidates then reflect on and make instructional decisions based on their analyses. The assessment is aligned to InTASC standards and possesses content validity. This action-based research project is using a rubric collaboratively developed by EDL faculty and based on academic standards indicative of graduate level work. The benchmark performance is that at least 90% of students will meet or exceed standards with their project.

Finding. Target was not met.

74% (14/19) of students met or exceeded expectations.

Analysis. In AC 2019-2020, the target of 90% was met as 100% of students were able to meet or exceed standards with their project according to rubric standards determined by EDL faculty, thus demonstrating their ability to complete a school-based intervention project in which they collect, analyze, and interpret data. The analysis of the 100% student achievement for this SLO confirmed that candidates successfully made responsible decisions and problem solved, using data to inform actions when appropriate. With the objective of supporting future students and increasing the quality of student work, EDL faculty ensured incorporation of NELP standards in all classes and increased instructional focus on reflecting on and making instructional decisions based on the analysis of data.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In 2020-2021, faculty created and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. The goal of this analysis was to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and areas for program improvement both at the topic and subtopics levels to better articulate expectations and focus instructional design. Based on this analysis, faculty incorporated teaching and learning strategies that improved graduate student performance in content-specific areas.

Regardless of these changes, in AC 2020-21, the target was not met. While 7 of 7 (100%) students in the spring section met or exceeded expectations, only 7 of 12 (58%) of the students met or exceeded expectations. Overall, 74% (14/19) of students met or exceeded expectations on this key assessment. Therefore, the target was not met.

These changes had a direct impact on some of the student's ability to complete a school-based intervention project in which they collect, analyze, and interpret data, while others were not successful.

Decision, action, or recommendation.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was not met as only 74% (14/19) of the students scored the needed score of 90% on this assessment.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement.

In AC 2021-2022, faculty will communicate the directions and expectations for the assignment and follow up with those students who do not turn in work promptly. Checkpoints for the key assessment will be established so that the instructor is aware if students are struggling with the assignment. Likewise, a video explanation of the assignment will be included in the course shell.

These changes will improve the student's ability to complete a school-based intervention project in which they collect, analyze, and interpret data, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Seeking Improvement Based on Analysis of Results.

Program faculty made several decisions after examining results of data analysis from AC 2019-2020 which resulted in improved student learning and program improvement in AC 2020-2021.

- SLO 1 – Based on the analysis of the data, faculty built upon the students' learning experience in AC 2020-2021 by examining and adjusting course assignments and materials to ensure they reflected learning associated with the NELP standards. Coursework was examined and modified to reflect the new standards. Topics/content that lent themselves to being taught and learned by utilizing constructed response formative and summative assessment items were also identified. Where appropriate, more of these items were added to the curriculum.

SLO 2 – Based on the analysis of the data, faculty built upon the students' learning experience in AC 2020-2021 by providing students more current exemplars (strong and weaker) of research projects completed at NSU and at other universities. This was used to establish, among faculty and students, criteria that served to ensure an even higher quality finished product. Additionally, during the advising process, faculty guided students to explore meaningful and relevant research topics from the perspective of a school leader that were focused on leadership behaviors.

- SLO 3 – Based on the analysis of the data, faculty built upon the students' experience in AC 2020-2021 by implementing changes accompanying the transition from the ISLLC to the NELP standards, along with introducing the standards associated with the dispositional evaluation to students taking the early course, EDL 5400, and the capstone course, EDL 6200. This was in addition to incorporating those standards into all EDL courses.
- SLO 4 – Faculty ensured the alignment of the observation instrument used in the study of best teaching practices in a selected core area of education with NELP standards and adjusted the instrument as appropriate, ensuring candidates planned for and explained elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based.
- SLO 5 – Faculty ensured the alignment of the student learning impact assessment used in the school-based intervention project with NELP standards and adjusted the instrument as appropriate, ensuring candidates planned for, created, administered, and analyzed student learning and reflected on and made instructional decisions based on their analyses.
- During the 2020-2021 assessment cycle, EDL faculty increased collaboration planning and implementation sessions to specifically identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were strengths, weaknesses, and

AC 2020 – 2021 Assessment

areas for program improvement. Faculty improved upon and created more content and assessments based on NELP standards and based on continuous program evaluation.

Plan of Action for Moving Forward:

Program faculty examined the evidence and results of data analysis from AC 2020-2021 and will take steps to continue to improve student learning in AC 2021-2022:

- SLO 1: Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will attempt to implement the previous years' changes with increased integrity. Additionally, a new coordinator will be hired to facilitate further changes.
- SLO 2: Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, a new coordinator of the programs will be assigned. This person will revamp courses, including the final paper course. More feedback and formative feedback along with grading will be entered systematically. Additionally, faculty create and facilitated collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement.
- SLO 3: Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will work with the new coordinator to update courses. Faculty will also faculty create and facilitate collaboration sessions regarding this assessment to identify, describe, and analyze content-specific student performance strengths and weaknesses for improvement. Additionally, faculty will incorporate teaching and learning strategies to improve graduate student performance in content-specific areas.
- SLO 4: Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will meet about key assessments and plan to implement the key assessments with fidelity. The new Ed Leader coordinator will work with faculty to ensure correct implementation.
- SLO 5: Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will communicate the directions and expectations for the assignment and follow up with those students who do not turn in work promptly. Checkpoints for the key assessment will be established so that the instructor is aware if students are struggling with the assignment. Likewise, a video explanation of the assignment will be included in the course shell.