

## **A. Doctoral Degree in Educational Leadership and Administration (and/or District License Candidates)**

Programs in educational leadership are examined both by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) in conjunction with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). These programs complete a rigorous review of data regarding student learning for the KSDE/NCATE accreditation process (most recent review, Spring 2016) and will be transitioning to incorporate new standards and expectations outlined in Council of Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP) which will replace NCATE. In addition, yearly reports are filed in the College of Education summarizing the attainment of student learning outcomes (SLO's) for each program. The following is a summary of the report highlighting the assessment of student learning and accreditation for each graduate degree program. In the Educational Leadership programs, EDD will be noted for the doctoral program (and/or District Leadership) and MS for the masters program (and/or Building Leadership).

The program assessment team is comprised of EDLEA faculty and the Department Chair.

## **B. Outcome Reporting**

### **Student Learning Outcomes**

The Ed.D. in the Department of Educational Leadership is characterized by three primary outcomes (Content Area, Internship, and Research). The SLO's for the Ed.D. in EDLEA are described below using these three categories.

- Student Learning Outcome One - Content Area in Educational Leadership: The primary goal is to prepare educational leaders to acquire knowledge, establish beliefs, and develop skills in the following areas: Vision for Learning, Culture for Learning, Management for Learning, Community for Learning, Ethics for Learning, Context for Learning, and Internship for Learning. The educational leader (student/candidate) will be able to promote the success of all students in each of these content areas. The student/candidate will also acquire a breadth of knowledge in the historical, philosophical, socio-cultural, and psychological bases for professional education practice.
- The focus of Student Learning Outcome Two is on the Internship. The student/candidate will be able to interpret theoretically grounded and research based information, adapt to changing situations, make complex decisions, solve problems, and evaluate actions in a professional education setting.
- The third Student Learning Outcome is Research. The student/candidate will demonstrate a depth of knowledge across the broad discipline of educational research and apply a method of inquiry to their specific content field of choice through established research methods.

### **Assessment Method(s)**

#### **Direct Assessment**

All students/candidates admitted to the doctoral program in the Department of Educational Leadership are assessed on a regular basis for each of the SLO outcomes. For SLO I, preliminary exams (revised form 2013) and the dissertation defense rubric serve as direct measures of the achievement of content area outcomes. The dissertation defense rubric is completed by consensus of committee members at the time of the student's/candidate's defense presentation and includes both the areas of content and research. The indirect measure for SLO I includes a self-assessment rubric containing concepts inherent in the ISLLC standards and serves to document progress on SLO 1 for content area outcomes. The self-assessment rating is based on the student's/candidate's perceptions of acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to successful leadership across the six standards.

For SLO II, there are two direct assessments used to determine proficiency levels of students regarding standards/objectives set forth by the internship guideline agreements. These assessments include: the Field Supervisor Internship Assessment and the University Supervisor Internship Assessment. Every semester a student enrolls in internship hours for credit, the student prepares a plan outlining the

standards/objectives for the internship experience that align with selected ISLLC standards in consultation with the field supervisor and the university advisor. The student keeps a log of activities and produces artifacts documenting completion of their learning objectives. The field supervisor rates the student on completion of the goals for the experience and the advisor does the same (as well as providing a course grade for the hours enrolled.) These two assessments serve as formative data to guide student growth in the program with a culminating goal for students to interpret theoretically grounded, research-based information, adapt to dynamic situations, make complex decisions, solve problems, and evaluate actions within the professional education setting.

For SLO III, two direct measures provide data regarding student/candidate acquisition of knowledge, performances, and dispositions regarding the important area of research. The dissertation defense rubric provides an opportunity for the committee to denote consensus on the student's knowledge of the procedures used for the identified research paradigm, the demonstration of the skills associated with the research paradigm, and the behaviors associated with the tenets of ethical research (dispositions expected of good research practices.) In addition, the dissertation advisor (major professor) completes an evaluation considering grades in methods courses, observations of performance on the research proposal, level of performance at each stage of the research process, and at completion of the research and defense. Program goals include student/candidate demonstration of knowledge across the broad discipline of educational leadership and the ability to apply a method of inquiry to specific content fields.

### **Indirect Assessment**

An indirect measure for SLO I includes the Student/Candidate Exit Report (with ratings for ISLLC related areas of content). At the end of all the internship hours required on the program of study, the university advisor provides a rating on all standards that were addressed during the comprehensive experiences in the field.

The student exit report also includes two sections pertaining to internship experiences which serve as an indirect measure for SLO II. The student exit report is completed at degree completion. At this time, students are asked to record their perceptions of growth on each of the six ISLLC leadership standards and then asked their perceptions of the degree to which the internship experiences provided opportunities to engage in activities targeted for each of the standards.

For SLO III, the student/candidate completes a Self-Assessment of Research Skills. This rubric is completed prior to graduation and indicates the student's/candidate's overall perception of each element of the research process.

### **Additional Program Evaluation**

The Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership includes established measures to assess program effectiveness for the KSDE/NCATE and highlights program evaluation and effectiveness aligned with KSDE/NCATE standards and expectations for full program accreditation.

### **Student Sample and Reporting Process**

All students/candidates completing a doctorate degree are included in the program assessment process. Students are expected to perform at Level 3 – proficient. Scores from the designated data collection rubrics are compiled for the academic year and then reported by the total group. The data collection measures are used at the end of each academic year to assess students/candidates completing the degree. This data is compiled, analyzed, and reported to EDLEA faculty in the fall of the following academic year to assist with program development and improvement targets. Data from each of the measures are compiled yearly in an aggregate format (results for all students/candidates for that year) and are reviewed at a regularly scheduled departmental meeting each academic year (fall semester). All faculty members involved in the EDLEA program review results and make recommendations for program revisions and improvement goals.

## **C. Program Self Review**

### **Faculty Review of Assessment Data and Process**

The Ed.D. leadership programs at Kansas State University are very successful. Data trends indicate that all candidates are exiting their programs with the necessary knowledge and skills required of an entry-level district leader/administrator. Many candidates develop competencies beyond the basic level and are regarded as proficient or higher. The data therefore emphasize a need to continue what is working well and to continue using data throughout the candidates' experiences to inform the program and to guide individual candidate growth. The data clearly show that there are no candidates performing at unacceptable levels (i.e., Level 1), and that fact speaks favorably to the efforts of Faculty to motivate candidates to perform at the highest level appropriate to the candidate's career development stage. KSU graduates from the Ed.D. program also fare exceedingly well upon employment entry evidenced by high rates of graduates being hired into formal leadership roles across Kansas and in neighboring states. The KSU program and its strong relationships with Kansas districts provides an impetus for supportive environments that allow for high levels of professional growth with peer interactions as well as school district personnel who recognize the quality of KSU's district leadership candidates.

The Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership continuously considers ways to improve the district leadership preparation program. The collaborative efforts of faculty include:

1. Ongoing dialogue among faculty as annual data reports are shared with department and college faculty by the Assessment Director. This discussion identifies ongoing areas for improvement that warrant meaningful discussion and program accommodations in order to best serve students and districts in effective preparation of district leaders.
2. New faculty joining EDLEA promote necessary conversation in order to build understanding of current practice, consideration of new ideas and perspective, and natural program advancements that result from collaborative discussions, sharing of ideas, and informed reflections.

### **Program Improvements**

The district leadership program/doctoral program at Kansas State University strives to continually improve program courses and program goals in order to best serve and prepare leaders for tomorrow's schools and districts. Program data along with a structured process for continuous improvement allow faculty to engage in meaningful discussion and opportunities to change and adjust program components to be continually responsive to student feedback, respond to local district and state needs, and national leadership preparation goals. The Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership has taken the following actions and appropriate revisions to continuously implement and improve program results and student success as a response to assessment results:

- Increase understanding and improve expectations to improve inter-rater reliability on project and rubric assessments
- General program improvements to support feedback provided by students through exit reports and overall reflections of faculty/committee members at the culminating dissertation defense experience
- Meaningful data disaggregation and analysis of selected variables identified by faculty through review of annual data as well as through responsive planning to address new leadership preparation standards and changing district and state needs
- Disaggregation of data by meaningful characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, length of time in the program, etc.) to address any identification of underrepresented populations in program enrollment
- Consideration of areas such as academic writing, increasing research course requirements, cohort structures, and transition of field practitioners to engage in dissertation work are topics to review for inclusion in course content and program design
- Continued partnership with Kansas districts and other leadership programs including ongoing communication of program goals/objectives to the field

- Development of a clear process to collect and analyze program data by department faculty
- Continue to achieve excellence in instruction through various delivery formats (on-line, blended, face-to-face)

### **Future Plans**

The Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership continue to consider and engage in targeted efforts to improve the district leadership program. These plans consist of alignment and revision of curriculum objectives, scoring guides, and assessment rubrics with new KSDE, ISLLC, NELP, and CAEP standards. This process will provide a clear direction for program clarification and revising course offerings and content for the District Leadership Program. These revisions could include:

- Course and curriculum revisions to align objectives to changes in these specific standards. This alignment and revision process should include review of the latest research on effective preparation for school and district leaders and anticipated needs in the profession. Current assessments would need to be revised to more accurately align with emerging standards related to state and national leadership preparation
- Clarification of rater expectations on rating procedures for district leader competencies
- Upon completion of curricular revisions, professional learning activities to ensure faculty development in gaining knowledge about new standards, area of emphasis, and discussion about program impact may be necessary
- Revision of other tools (i.e., alignment matrix, learning outcomes for individual courses) to consider major connections between coursework and application projects may also prove beneficial.

### **Summary of this Report**

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University offers an Ed.D. degree/district license option for students pursuing an opportunity to increase their knowledge and skills in educational leadership through high quality courses utilizing skillful approaches in instructional delivery. Annual review of data reveals high achievement levels across leadership preparation and state standards and as rated by students. Department faculty strive to maintain the highest level of instructional excellence and service to each student through on-going dialogue to target and improve all program courses and components and respond to the changing and diverse needs of district level leadership and the earning of the doctorate degree in Educational Leadership at Kansas State University.