

Department of Educational Leadership 2015-16 Assessment Report

Educational Leadership and Administration Program Context

The Educational Leadership and Administration degree program has two pathways: P-12 (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential) and Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership [HEAL] (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration). The Department of Educational Leadership is working on a proposal for HEAL to be a specific option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State through the Department of Educational Leadership, however in light of a recently discussed Executive Order, both pathways may write proposals as two separate master's degrees under the Department of Educational Leadership. For the 2016-17 academic year, our two pathways have a combined 194 students (150 P-12 and 44 HEAL). Our instructional delivery is through a cohort delivery model (eight cohorts); the six P-12 cohorts all operate off the Fresno State campus in partnership districts across the Central Valley. The two HEAL cohorts operate on campus.

Due to the Educational Leadership and Administration Program context and the major changes adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, which significantly impacts the Educational Leadership and Administration Master's Degree and Advanced Credential Program (P-12 pathway), and in consultation with Dr. Jordine, we have revised the assessment report template to better communicate the assessment activity of the Educational Leadership and Administration Program given our local context and evolving state context

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program is undergoing exciting, however major transition and change due to adoption of new standards by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the development stages of a California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), and continued proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option or separate degree. The CTC adopted new standards for the Preliminary Administrator Services Credential, in which all accredited and approved sponsors of programs transitioned to in fall 2015, however, transition still continues with a June 2016 revise of the adopted standards. The CTC approved requiring a performance assessment (CalAPA) for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates completing a Commission approved preparation program. The development of the CalAPA is currently underway, and our program has requested to participate in pilot testing (2016-17), field-testing (2017-18), Scoring (2016-17 and 2017-18), and Standard Setting (2018).

**2015-16 Assessment Activity of the Educational Leadership and Administration Program
(P-12 pathway)**

All P-12 full-time faculty (Academic Task Force) met one to two times a month during the 2015-16 academic year for the purpose of alignment review of the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs – our new student learner outcomes), the new program competency tasks we developed, and the practice experiences/tasks we developed that would result in student competence. We have expanded the types of tools and techniques we are using to evidence and measure student learning. Many of our student learner outcomes are performance outcomes; therefore, we have greatly expanded the use of video and observation. As described by our cohort model structure above, we have multiple cohorts engaged in competency tasks of the same course. The Academic Task Force (ATF) has been reviewing and discussing student work products for a given competency task to assess whether the task, work, product, and criteria for student success are all aligned and evidencing at a competent level the intent of the student learner outcome (CAPE). This has been and is an on-going process due the most recent June 2016 revision of the standards, the current development of the CalAPA, and the on-going updates from the CTC. Continuous alignment and improvement and closing the loop are a focus of every Academic Task Force Meeting. Two ATF meetings a month have already been scheduled for the fall 2016 semester. Two ATF meetings have already been held during August 2016.

Our program is built on a competency/performance based learning and assessment system. Students are reassessed and resubmit assessment products until they meet the indicator(s) for competent. Instructors provide effective feedback as well as design and deliver additional learning experiences to support each student in achieving competence. ATF data collection, through professional conversations and student work samples, has informed and continues to inform lesson and task revisions. We are currently working with Dr. Jordine and team to develop and implement a Program Pathbrite Portfolio for all Competency Tasks beginning with three new fall 2016 cohorts (Clovis, Fresno, and Visalia). Dr. Jordine presented at the New Cohort Orientation for Clovis and Visalia as well as worked with all faculty at the Educational Leadership Department Retreat in August.

Provided below is a sampling of student learning outcomes derived from the CAPEs that were assessed through our initial transition to the new standards in the 2015-16 academic year, their competency task measures, indicators and standards of success, results, discovery from results, and adjustments or changes made based on the results:

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
Graduates/candidates will (a) develop techniques in identifying, collecting, analyzing, and evaluating various types of data that engage and support school staff in analyzing instructional effectiveness and (b) use a 6-step data-driven decision-making process to inform instructional improvement and programmatic decisions.	Written Paper – Unit Development (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
<p>Graduates will develop knowledge and skill in the use of effective training processes and protocols to build teacher capacity in assessment literacy.</p>	<p>Presentation w/peer feedback and self-assessment (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Video clip demonstration with written explanation (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality</p> <p>Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each student success criterion on scoring rubric</p>
<p>Results: 49 of 57 students met indicators on first submission. Two teams of four (4) students were required to revise written presentation materials to evidence deeper concept knowledge of the importance of clear communication in the delivery of new information. Revisions included (a) greater clarity of instructional strategies identified to support student sub-groups and (b) inclusion of research to support application of the 6-step data-driven process.</p> <p><i>Note: Graduates/Candidates must score Competent or Quality for each criterion given a Competency Task in a program course; therefore, graduates/candidates must redo and resubmit any task not meeting the indicator of Competent or Quality.</i></p> <p>Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings: Based on data from faculty feedback sessions (Academic Task Force meetings) and graduate student work products, we discovered that graduates found it difficult to explain the process from the perspective of a school leader. Graduates delivered information as if they were the learner, rather than the facilitator of others’ learning. As a result of these findings, faculty will increase focus on developing graduate (a) concept knowledge of adult learning theories/principles and the role leaders play in system change and (b) skills and approaches in facilitating adult learning and communicating purpose and processes used in teacher-led data-driven decision making. Additionally, Graduates struggled with conceptualizing the relationship between written, taught, and tested curriculum. To deepen Graduate knowledge regarding this relationship, in class activities, such as “unwrapping standards” and development of aligned formative assessment test items, will be integrated into future lesson design and delivery.</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
<p>Graduates/Candidates will conduct a data mining process and examine, analyze, and evaluate a school's information and analysis system (types of data collected, purpose of data collected, data form, frequency of collection, data collectors [who], consumers [users], and processes used to collect, analyze and communicate data).</p> <p>Graduates will use information gained from the data mining process to identify improvement areas for focus and inform next step high leverage actions.</p>	<p>Synthesized Table (Matrix) (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Written Analysis & Evaluation (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality</p> <p>Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each student success criterion on scoring rubric</p>
<p>Results: 50 of 57 graduates met indicators on first submission. Seven (7) Graduates were required to revise a portion of the task and resubmit. The areas graduates did not meet competency on first submission were: (a) gathering sufficient data to inform next best decisions, (b) written analysis and evaluation from a school leader viewpoint/perspective, and (c) identification of high-leverage school improvement actions – actions were based on data collected and some graduates struggled with the concept of high leverage and rationale as to why a particular action would be high leverage.</p> <p>Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings: Graduates struggled with: (a) collection of sufficient rich data required to make informed decisions, (b) considering the entire system (system perspective) over that of just their individual classrooms, (c) distinguishing between actions that are high-leverage vs. actions with limited impact on the system, and (d) use of information across data streams to identify root cause. As a result of these findings, the use of state and national data streams will be expanded in future lesson design and delivery. Additional learning experiences will be provided that support Graduates with practice in turning useful data into information and collaborating with colleagues to make data-driven decisions; understanding how actions can create or eliminate barriers and affect school-wide systems in place at a school.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">2015-16 Learning Outcome Assessed Across P-12 and HEAL Pathways</p> <p>The department of Educational Leadership and faculty in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program focused on assessment activity relate to SLO 7.1 Graduates, as educational leaders, will <i>access and review educational literature and research and write about educational areas, issues and problems</i>. Assessment activity centered on the written communication core competency area, specifically, we assessed student learning on the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR).</p>	

Department faculty (P-12 and HEAL) acknowledged that our current more holistic (pass/fail) rubric for the GWR is inadequate in providing the types of data that will help inform and drive next step decisions: (a) specific graduate/candidate competencies and support and (b) program cohort areas of focus. The focus of this assessment work was not only important, but also extremely powerful in bringing together two distinct pathways (P-12 and Higher Education) as one P-16 system; a system with one very specific set of expectations/learning outcomes in the core competency area of written communication. Department faculty were awarded a 2015 -16 Assessment Grant administered by OIE titled: Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders.

Instrument Used to Assess Outcome

Direct Measure: A rubric developed by five faculty members in the department was used to assess student competency given written prompts for the Graduate Writing requirement. Securing an OIE assessment grant advanced department efforts on this work. The grant funding provided the motivation needed to have a rubric apply to students' GWR assignment in EAD 261. See Appendix for the Rubric. Benchmark (or standard) is 100% passing since the GWR is a graduation requirement.

Three sections of *EAD 261: Introduction to Educational Administration* in Fall 2015 were selected to conduct this assessment activity. EAD 261 was selected because all enrolled students were in their first semester of their first year of their graduate program.

HEAL Pathway

Within the structure of the course curriculum, the Short Essay II assignment embedded into the EAD 261 curriculum, provided a great opportunity for generative writing after admission and early in their program before filing an Advancement to Candidacy petition.

P-12 Pathway

Two-hour written assessment on an assigned topic related to school leadership. Student's use evidence from readings on research and/or best practices in education to make connections and support arguments.

Discovery from the Data

HEAL pathway

Results for this assessment project were derived from n=17 master's students in EAD 261 in Fall 2015. Results showed 100% of students met the graduate writing competency with n=2 (11%) students receiving recommendations to visit the Graduate Writing Studio (GWS) at some point during their first year of graduate studies. These results show that graduate students in the department of Educational Leadership demonstrate effective written communication competencies using generative writing prompts. In addition, results from this assessment activity assist faculty in guiding students in specific areas of growth and development and provide a specific focus for our students' work with the university's GWS.

P-12 pathway

Results for this assessment were derived from n=32 master's students in EAD 261 in Fall 2015. Results showed 97% (31 of 32) of students met the graduate writing competency on the first administration. One student (second language learner) did not meet expectation and was provided effective feedback and a system of support. This student met the graduate writing competency on the second administration of the assessment. The following are the relative strengths and weaknesses that emerged from analysis based on the rubric. Individual relative strengths and weaknesses were shared with students and some students were guided to seek additional support, such as the GWS, for areas in need of growth and development.

Based on rubric:

Relative strengths:

- Focused topics.
- Took a position and presented relevant points/information to support argument.
- Basic grammar and sentence structure appropriate to strong.
- All papers (written responses) were relevant and related to the topic. No papers off-topic.
- Organization of paper was logical.
- Papers included references to research and best practices.
- L-2 interference noticeable in two of the essays (written responses), but did not interfere with meaning, or otherwise detract from the flow of the papers.

Relative Weaknesses:

- Majority of written responses followed a standard format.
- Limited references to research.
- References to research more often discussed through quotes and meaning of quotes rather than deep analysis of the research.
- Connections between ideas somewhat superficial.
- Few "raised important issues or ideas" beyond those at a foundational level.
- More informal than academic writing.
- Minor grammar
- Two written responses would "*serve as a good basis for further research on the topic*" (per rubric)

Changes made as a Result of Data Analysis

Assessment data collected from the GWR direct measure integrated in EAD261 improved the department's curricula and teaching by helping faculty determine how educational leaders use written language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. This assessment will ultimately serve to support the department's graduate students in their growth and development preparing for effective leadership in our region's schools, colleges, and universities.

Because written communication appears in many forms and genres, successful written communication for educational leaders will depend on "mastery of the conventions of the written language, facility with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience, and other situation-specific factors" (WASC, 2013, p. 58).

This definition of the written communication core competency was an important part of the assessment activity. Faculty operated from a perspective to improve the department's academic programs by preparing students to receive consistent and constant feedback on their writing. The assessment activity also provided students timely feedback during their first semester of graduate school. This time of rapid transition and increased academic expectations is crucial for the students we serve at Fresno State.

2015-16 Learning Outcome Assessed Across P-12 and HEAL Pathways

Program Component: Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application
SLO 7.1 Graduates, as educational leaders, will *access and review educational literature and research and write about educational areas, issues and problems.*

All students pursuing a master's degree must meet degree expectations for the culminating master's experience indicated on their Advancement to Candidacy form. One of the culminating experience options is the Master's Degree Research Project (MDRP)/EAD 298. A Project Rubric is used to guide the assessment of the MDRP and the indicator for *meets degree expectation* for this culminating experience is an *A* or *B*, Benchmark: 95%.

Fifty-six students pursuing a master's degree (combined P-12 and HEAL pathways), with intent to graduate in 2015-16 academic year, selected the MDRP option. Of the 56 students, 55 completed a MDRP and met degree expectation of an *A* or *B* (98%). One student has not yet met expectation and is enrolled to complete in fall 2016.

During the spring of 2015, our department faculty selected an EAD 298 Project Ad Hoc Committee to work on issues as well as opportunities for improvement generated through department professional learning conversations relative EAD 298 Project. Data conversations revealed one primary issue that needed to be addressed and three areas as opportunities for improvement. The primary issue was the variability in student research preparedness for the MDRP, and the three areas as opportunities for improvement included: improve the clarity and develop shared understanding of the research study component and applied component; improve the clarity and develop shared understanding of the department IRB process; and review, revise, and develop, as appropriate and needed, written documents for continuity and quality of support provided to students. Our most compelling issue was the variability in student research preparedness for the MDRP. ERE 220 is a primary course in laying the foundation for our culminating master's experiences. This is a common course used across most master's degrees in the School of Education. Although there is a common course master syllabus, findings revealed great variability among our cohorts of students in the knowledge and skills they developed as a result of the focus of their work in ERE 220. Many of the instructors for this course are instructors outside our department and adjunct faculty. This is not a criticism of the instructors, but an indication of a larger systems issue of alignment and the need to build shared understanding of *sound preparedness* for culminating master's experience options in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program.

During the 2015-16 year, the Department of Educational Leadership executed the following actions to address the primary issue and opportunities for improvement:

- Worked more closely with the department that schedules the instructors for ERE 220 to: (a) include more Educational Leadership faculty teaching this course to Educational Leadership and Administration cohorts, (b) select specific consistent adjunct faculty who will teach Educational Leadership and Administration Program cohorts, and (c) to provide all instructors who are assigned to teach ERE 220 Educational Leadership and Administration Program cohorts with professional development regarding what *sound preparedness* means as well as the specific outcomes including work products expected as a result of Educational Leadership and Administration Program students' active participation in this course.
- Revised the MDRP Handbook for students and advisers to provide more detail and clarity regarding the research study component and applied component.
- More clearly defined the Department IRB process through the revision and development of written documents and selection of a more formal department review committee.
- Dr. Susana Hernández developed EAD 298 on-line modules for faculty to provide better guidance and consistent support to students. Dr. Hernández piloted the modules in spring 2016. Two additional department faculty are piloting in fall 2016, with intent of full use by all faculty in spring 2017.

SOAP: Learning Outcomes, Instruments, and Assessment Methods

The SOAP for the Educational Leadership and Administration Program is currently under construction to reflect transition to the new California Administrative Services Credential (ASC) program standards, revised CAPEs, development of the CalAPA, and a proposal for HEAL to either become an option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State or a separate master's degree, in light of Executive Order 1071. Therefore, strong alignment of our latest documented SOAP and our program's current specific assessment activity (student learning outcomes, instruments, and assessment methods) does not exist. The signature assignment and embedded field work scores are being replaced with student learning results on foundation and competency tasks as these tasks and criteria for student success more fully develop (fall 2016 and after CalAPA pilot and scoring - spring 2017) and will continue to be reviewed and revised as appropriate, post CalAPA field-test and scoring (2017-18) and post Standard Setting (2018).

Two direct measures and assessment methods indicated on our latest documented program SOAP, Graduate Writing Score and Culminating Experience Assessment Scores, will transfer to the new SOAPS under construction. The Graduate Writing measure and two Culminating Experience measures (Thesis and Master's Degree Research Project) are used across both pathways (P-12 and HEAL)

Assessment Activities in 2016 - 17 Academic Year

- A department goal for 2016-17 submitted on our Annual Report to the Provost was: *Implement, adjust, and refine the foundation system developed for the Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders bringing together both pathways (PreK-12 and HEAL).*

By December 2016, the Graduate Writing Department Ad Hoc Committee should be completed with their work based on the work of the grant with the goal of educating all department faculty in January/February 2017 and full implementation of our system in fall 2017. Assessment activity program-wide will be focused in this area.

- A department goal for 2016-17 submitted on our Annual Report to the Provost was: *By fall 2017, finalize the digital platform for EAD 298/Project with expected training of and use by all faculty advisers.* Assessment activity program-wide related to the culminating master's degree program option EAD 298 will continue to be a focus of assessment activity.
- The culminating master's degree program option of Comprehensive Exam will be a focus of program-wide assessment activity.

P-12 Pathway Assessment Activities in the 2016-2017 AY

- Execute a cycle of review for each Competency Task in EAD 261, EAD 272, EAD 280T and EAD 262 and further develop the criteria for success scoring rubrics.
- Come to consensus on Pathbrite **Program Portfolio** competencies; build faculty and student capacity in the use of Pathbrite Educational Leadership and Administration **Program Portfolio**, and initiate use with three new fall 2016 cohorts for CAPE competencies in EAD 261, EAD 272, and EAD 280T.
- Develop a system for documenting PASC District Mentor work in **Pathbrite Program Portfolio** and assessment review.

HEAL Pathway Assessment Activities in the 2016-2017 AY

- Initiate development of the Comprehensive Exam as a culminating experience option for HEAL pathway in alignment with P-12 pathway.

Progress from Last Program Review Action Plan

*Our program participated in an Accreditation review process under which our program was evaluated by two external bodies, NCATE and CCTC, during the 2013-2014 school year. This review and evaluation process included an on-site visit and review of our program from April 6 – 8, 2014. NCATE findings revealed that **all six NCATE standards were fully met, and no areas for improvement (AFIs) were indicated.** CCTC findings revealed that **all of our program standards were fully met.***

We will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports us in sustaining a program of high quality, which was acknowledged and recognized by our external reviewers.

However, as stated in the opening section of this Assessment Report under **Context**, *the Educational Leadership and Administration Program is undergoing exciting, yet major transition and change due to adoption of new standards by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the development stages of a California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), and continued proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option or separate degree.* Progress regarding this transition and these changes occurs weekly as evidenced by the work already completed by the Academic Task Force and HEAL Team to date. This work continues as described in the **Context** section of the report.

Appendix: GWR Rubric for the Department of Educational Leadership

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Meets Graduate Writing Competency (3)</i>	<i>Meets Graduate Writing Competency — Visit the Graduate Writing Studio (2)</i>	<i>Does Not Meet Graduate Writing Competency— Visit the Graduate Writing Studio (1)</i>
Objective(s) are clearly stated	<p>The writer’s purpose or position is clear and is the primary voice throughout the paper.</p> <p>The writer allows for individuality of expression and purpose</p>	<p>The writer’s purpose or position is generally clear and is the primary voice for parts of the paper</p>	<p>The writer’s purpose or position is not clear</p>
Provides orderly presentation of ideas supported by evidence	<p>The writer provides supporting evidence which demonstrates a strong relationship to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is cohesive and logically developed</p>	<p>The writer provides some supporting evidence which demonstrates a moderate relationship to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is somewhat cohesive and is not logically developed</p>	<p>The writer does not provide supporting evidence which relates to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is not cohesive and is not logically developed</p> <p>Provides irrelevant or no sources</p>
Precise and clear expression	<p>The writer is frugal with words and communicates the objective with smooth transitions and consistent verb tenses.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are well developed and varied, avoids jargon.</p>	<p>The writer embellishes and exceeds recommend page length and communicates the objective with some sudden transitions and inconsistent verb tenses.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are somewhat developed and varied, uses jargon sparingly.</p>	<p>The writer embellishes and makes abrupt transitions. Unnecessary shifts in verb tense in the same or adjacent paragraphs.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are not developed or varied, uses jargon throughout.</p>

<p>Style and formatting</p>	<p>The writer adheres to all style requirements of the most up to date edition of the APA Publication Manual</p> <p>Cites sources correctly</p> <p>The writer commits no spelling, grammar, and style errors. Demonstrates thoroughness in overall formatting.</p>	<p>The writer generally adheres to some style requirements of the most up to date edition of the APA Publication Manual</p> <p>Cites some sources correctly, but is inconsistent</p> <p>The writer commits some spelling, grammar, and style errors but demonstrates thoroughness in overall formatting.</p>	<p>The writer does not adhere to the style requirements of the APA Publication Manual.</p> <p>Does not cite sources correctly</p> <p>The writer commits multiple spelling, grammar, and style errors and fails to demonstrate thoroughness in overall formatting.</p>
------------------------------------	--	--	---