

## **Educational Doctorate (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 just completed the rigorous review of data regarding student learning for the KSDE/NCATE accreditation review. In addition, yearly reports are filed in the College of Education summarizing the attainment of student learning outcomes (SLO) for each program.

In response to a request for a summary of the progress made since 2004 on the assessment of student learning for each graduate degree program, the following is being provided:

- The most recent report summarizing the use of SLO (2007-2008).
- An excerpt from the KSDE/NCATE report reflecting the recent accreditation cycle with three years of data (2004-2007).

### **Program Assessment Data Response 2007-2008**

Name of Program: Educational Administration--When responses differ by the level of the program, it will be noted with EDD for the doctoral program (and/or District Leadership) and MS for the masters program (and/or Building Leadership.)

Names of persons considering the data: Program Assessment Team (Mary Devin, Teresa Miller, Trudy Salsberry) with review by program chair, David Thompson

1. After considering the data, what strengths do you see in your program?
  1. The MS academy style of delivery has increased the numbers enrolled overall. The number of those typically underrepresented in leadership programs (women and persons of color) have increased as well.
  2. Our programs are more balanced in terms of gender (numbers of students enrolled.)
  3. We have maintained administration admission standards to protect the quality of the program. Writing scores (GRE) and GPAs for EDD students are some of the highest in the unit/college.
2. In what ways can these strengths be further enhanced?
  1. Continued support for the MS leadership academies needs to continue.
  2. Exploration of a form of 'academy' or cohort is being piloted for the EDD and will be pursued depending on outcomes of the first pilot.
  3. MS academies could pursue new models for developing groups (multi-district approach).
  4. Providing professional development of and support for mentors in MS academy programs.
  5. Increase the participation of partner district leaders in the co-planning and co-delivery of content in MS academy programs.
3. After considering the data, what specific concerns do you have about your program?
  1. The programs need to consider what effective enrollment goals should be (balancing resources and numbers of students.)

2. In addition to establishing enrollment goals, the programs need to consider how to adequately provide both strands (traditional and academy delivery formats) in terms of staffing issues, timing of course delivery, communicating/monitoring students, etc. Common assessments that are authentic and accurate for the two strands is also an issue that will need to be addressed.
3. A continual, concerted effort needs to be maintained to attract more persons of color.

4. Were there additional data you consulted that helped you identify strengths or concerns? If so, what?

MS academy interviews and portfolios have yielded rich information about student satisfaction with the program in addition to assessing student growth. A policy of conducting exit interviews for all students (MS and EDD) might need to be considered as part of the program completion process (masters exams and preliminary exams?). We do get feedback from partner districts about the progress of graduates of academies.

5. Given the above concerns, which one(s) do you intend to focus on in the next year? What specific changes will you make, and on the basis of what data?

Based on the data from the MS academy interviews and portfolios, more experiences integrating the work of prominent authors/researchers that affect administrator practice are planned. The principalship class/course was revised based on informal interviews conducted in the field (graduates of the academy in their first two years of practice in an administrative position.)

6. What changes in your program were made on the basis of data distributed in this Program Assessment Process last year or collected during the past year (please describe the changes and the data that lead to the changes)? How successful were the changes?

Last year, we continued establishing new MS academies (based on the data indicating a more consistent and even increasing number enrolling.) The commitment to MS academies was so successful that we are now piloting a version of this with the EDD students. Student/district satisfaction was noted by requests for new academies (4 in Geary County; 2nd with Salina, and a potential second doctoral cohort.) Qualitative data indicating satisfaction can be found in the interviews.

Note: There are lingering concerns about the usefulness of the COE numerical data for improving programs. Minimal information can be gleaned from the summary provided by the unit. Data collected for NCATE/KASCD was somewhat helpful in identifying student satisfaction and growth and identifying discrepancies in field and instructor perceptions of student growth. The use of the new format of the assessments for NCATE/KASCD will need to be monitored for quality of the information derived from the data. Of most important to the leadership programs are the professional contacts in the field and the data obtained from interviewing students.

7. After considering the data you have collected on your transition points, what can you conclude about the effectiveness of that data? What changes, if any, need to be made?

Not all transition points were included in the materials provided by the unit for review. Admission and graduation data cause some concerns. The accuracy of the data is still questionable (or at least unclear at times how it was calculated and/or reported.) Data bases continue to differ and with smaller numbers this skews how the information is interpreted. We also need to continue to consistently solicit and learn from feedback from academy partners. The most meaningful activity to enact would be to hold a yearly program meeting dedicated entirely to review of all program data (NCATE/KSDE, SLOs/NCA, etc.) by all faculty involved as a precursor to strategic planning/program revisions. This review should

look annually and longitudinally. Finally, program faculty may wish to engage in research projects focusing on program improvement as a supplement to required data collection and analysis.

## **KSDE/NCATE Report— Section V**

### **Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance**

Although the EdD/district license administrative leadership preparation program at Kansas State University has long been driven by external standards promulgated by organizations including the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA), the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE), the increasing convergence of all these organizations' standards toward a set of common standards has only intensified this faculty's interest in a data-driven improvement model. The result over time has produced the advanced administrative leadership preparation program described in this folio, so that today an EdD/district license sequence at KSU closely adheres to national standards espoused in our language as: (1) Vision for Learning, (2) Culture for Learning, (3) Management for Learning, (4) Community for Learning, (5) Ethics for Learning, (6) Context for Learning, and (7) Internship for Learning. This language mirrors that of our accrediting agencies and is consonant with the Conceptual Framework of the College of Education at Kansas State University, so that advanced program graduates will have pursued a curriculum based in theory and best practice and which has been subjected to continuous internal review and improvement arising from both professional knowledge bases and data analysis on program outcomes.

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University has established a system for collecting and analyzing data on leadership candidates for the purpose of degree/license program monitoring and improvement. The assessment system described throughout this folio has resulted in specific program changes as follows:

1. Based on the need for better and more comprehensive data, a candidate tracking matrix has been established that follows each student from beginning to end of degree/license program and is used to monitor individual progress and to signal advising needs.
2. Based on the need for a more sequential course of study, initial and capstone courses for earning the district level license have been designed--both for curriculum integrity purposes and for data-gathering purposes.
3. Based on the need to systematically gather data, a set of assessment instruments has been designed to depict candidates' growth and mastery of knowledge and practice.
4. Based on the increased accountability faced by administrator preparation programs, changes to the curriculum and teaching styles have been made, resulting in a very high pass-rate for program graduates on the state's conditional license examination.
5. Based on the process of aligning standards, required assessment, and curriculum, changes in the district level program are being revisited for the next cycle.
6. Based on the lack of data for some standards (where students are allowed to select a focus during clinical and internship hours), program faculty are considering refinements of the internship (and clinical) experiences in terms of relationships with and expectations of field supervisors (district personnel) and requirements for hours required.

7. Based on the low numbers of candidates entering a district license, faculty are engaging in strategic planning for possible cohort groups, changes in delivery formats, and consideration of requirements (with those competing for enrollments.)