

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Administration and Supervision (M.Ed. with PK-12 licensure in Administration)

SUBMITTED BY: Sister Patricia and Jessica Lewis

DATE: 9-30-18

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

Data is collected each semester from the Director of the Catholic School Leadership Program who is responsible for seeing that data is compiled in the Education Database on the “S” drive of the School of Education and Human Services in the Education folder under Assessment. Data is submitted electronically through Google Surveys. The database is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education and is password controlled. Only the Chair of the Department, the Director of the program, Assessment Coordinator, and Clinical Experiences Coordinator have access.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

Administration and Supervision, PK-12 (M.Ed.)

This master's degree program is designed to prepare candidates for school administration in public and private schools. It also provides the Catholic values and perspectives essential to fostering Catholic unity and identity within a school community. In addition to developing competencies in educational leadership, the program focuses on the Church’s history, teaching, and moral perspectives while encouraging participants’ own faith and spiritual growth. A unique feature of the program is that most of the courses are offered online.

Students in this program may complete an internship and should contact the program director for instructions on applying for the internship.

Students seeking licensure are required to successfully complete the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) during their second year. Students who complete the program, including the internship, and pass the SLLA are eligible for Virginia endorsement in administration and supervision (PK-12).

Upon successful completion of the administration and supervision program, students will be able to

- develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being;
- develop supportive, inclusive, and rigorous learning communities through coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote student academic success and well-being;

- develop and engage a network of learning community stakeholders in meaningful and reciprocal ways to promote student academic success and well-being; and
- act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being.

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

This program is designed to prepare candidates through a rigorous and integrated graduate curriculum for school administration in public and private schools. It also provides the Catholic values and perspectives essential to fostering Catholic unity and identity within a school community. In addition to developing competencies in educational leadership, the program focuses on the Church’s history, teaching, and moral perspectives while encouraging participants’ own faith and spiritual growth. Below is a chart highlighting where our Student Learning Outcomes align with the University’s Mission Hallmarks.

Marymount University Mission: Marymount University is an independent Catholic university that emphasizes academic excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Committed to the liberal arts tradition, the university combines a foundation in the arts and sciences with career preparation and opportunities for personal and professional development. Marymount is a student-centered learning community that values diversity and focuses on the education of the whole person, promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth of each individual. Scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics are hallmarks of a Marymount education.

University Mission Hallmarks	Scholarship	Leadership	Service	Ethics
Administration and Supervision Student Learning Outcomes: Graduates will:	develop supportive, inclusive, and rigorous learning communities through coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote student academic success and well-being;	act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being.	develop and engage a network of learning community stakeholders in meaningful and reciprocal ways to promote student academic success and well-being; and	develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being;

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

To keep current with the changes made at the national level for this program, our assessment process of the Catholic School Leadership program (CSLP) has undergone a major revision this past year. Previously, our program was based upon the standards for school leadership as set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers in collaboration with the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA). However, these standards were revised by those organizations and are now called the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL). Previously, we identified five (5) Critical Assignments and the internship experience (ED 593) to assess our program on the ISLLC standards. With the new standards, we created ten (10) Critical Assignments, one for each of our ten (10) courses, representing one each of the ten (10) PSEL. Through careful examination of these new standards, each course instructor, along with the Director of the Catholic School Leadership Program, has identified one assignment that represents the broad purpose of the course and focuses on one of the PSEL to help strengthen our preparation program in school leadership. Each of our ten (10) courses in this program is now aligned with one of the ten (10) PSEL so that each standard can be assessed with a specific and targeted Critical Assignment. Adjuncts, who play a critical role in our program, have been kept up-to-date with the changes and have been provided guidance and support on how to make any necessary changes. We have also included an alignment with the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE UPS) Uniform Performance Standards for Principals for those particularly seeking licensure in Virginia.

This past year as we transitioned to the PSEL, all revised, updated, and new documents and rubrics were sent to all of our CSLP faculty, explaining why we were making changes and asking them to look at their current Critical Assignments in light of the revised rubrics and standards and see if they needed to add anything to those assignments. The Portfolio Guidelines were also rewritten to allow for potential changes for 2017-18 so that the 2016-18 (the class impacted the most) graduating class can stay with the old and the new group can begin to adapt to the new. We have embraced the new standards and are ensuring that our students are getting exposure to the most updated professional knowledge and expectations. A new lecturer position was created for the 2017-18 year to lend support to the Director of CSLP and to help in areas of marketing, assessment, and recruitment.

The assessment process has remained relatively the same in that the Critical Assignments are part of the normal curriculum of the course. The instructor first scores the assignment based on the criteria set for the class and then re-scores the assignment based upon the PSEL for that course. The score, based on the PSEL, is then forwarded to the Director of the Catholic School Leadership Program who compiles the data, and forwards it to the Clinical Coordinator for Education who then enters results into the database. The internship of the CSLP is the capstone of the program and three evaluations are part of the assessment system. By the end of the 2018-19 year, this process should be completely done electronically through Google docs.

Both the On-site Supervisor and the University Supervisor complete the same evaluation that focuses on the observed performance of the student (intern). The intern also uses the same form for a self-evaluation which is then discussed at the time of the internship visit. The student also completes a portfolio that is submitted to the Director of the CSLP. The ratings for these instruments or documents are gathered by the CSLP Director.

Both a strength and a challenge of our assessment system for the all programs in the Education Department is that it plays an essential role, not only for internal accountability but also for the requirements of our accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE) and to satisfy the requirements of our programs to maintain approval by the Virginia Department of Education. Spring 2018 was our second data collection for our CAEP report that we will be writing in 2019.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
Graduates will exhibit an effective and caring attitude that seeks to develop the whole child intellectually, physically, emotionally, socially, and spiritually.	Our planned improvement includes analyzing and evaluating the new assessment data on our students under the new national standards, new Portfolio assignments, and Critical Assignment rubrics. With more detailed rubrics and targeted assignments in each course, we plan on taking a deep dive into the new data we will be collecting and making any revisions to the instruments, assignments, curriculum, or program, if necessary.	With the magnitude of changes that took place this past year for our program, we are proud to say that we were able to successfully move our program over to the PSEL. This is the first time we are assessing our program with the new standards and believe that this first cycle of data is providing more targeted evidence since there are more standards that require the data to be disaggregated. We are looking forward to having a second set of data to begin to look for trends that might be emerging.
Graduates will employ appropriate and effective instructional and budget planning processes and leadership strategies that impact the curriculum and assessment of all students	Our planned improvement includes analyzing and evaluating the new assessment data on our students under the new national standards, new Portfolio assignments, and Critical Assignment rubrics. With more detailed rubrics and targeted assignments in each course, we plan on taking on taking a deep dive into the new data we will be collecting and making any revisions to the instruments, assignments, curriculum, or program, if necessary.	<i>Same as above</i> <i>We revised our Student Learner Outcomes: this one has been changed</i>
Graduates will understand basic legal issues and demonstrate knowledge of resources related to safe and effective management of student, faculty, and school issues.	Our planned improvement includes analyzing and evaluating the new assessment data on our students under the new national standards, new Portfolio assignments, and Critical Assignment rubrics. With more detailed rubrics and targeted assignments in each course, we plan on taking a deep dive into the new data we will be collecting and making any revisions to the instruments, assignments, curriculum, or program, if necessary.	<i>Same as above</i> <i>We revised our Student Learner Outcomes: this one has been changed</i>

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:

Review: Report Accepted as Submitted: Assessed "Exemplary" on *all* of the six areas on the Academic Assessment Evaluation Rubric

No Recommendations

Other Comments: *It was a pleasure to read and a model for other programs. Well-done!*

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR THE 2017-18 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION PROGRAM**

As stated in the 2017-18 Graduate Catalog

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1., Develop, advocate and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally-responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being	N.A.	2018	2020
2. Develop supportive, inclusive and rigorous learning communities through coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote student academic success and well-being	N.A.	N.A.	2019
3. Develop and engage a network of learning community stakeholders in meaningful and reciprocal ways to promote student academic success and well-being	N.A.	N.A.	2019
4. Act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being	N.A.	2018	2020

Below is a chart of our how our revised Student Learning Outcomes align with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and VDOE Uniform Performance Standards for Principals and how they will be assessed.

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY CSLP LEARNING OUTCOMES 2017-18

LEARNING OUTCOMES: Graduates will:	DATE TO BE ASSESSED	CRITICAL ASSIGNMENT / PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE	EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT TO BE ASSESSED
1., Develop, advocate and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally-responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being PSEL Standards: 1, 2, 3 VDOE UPS: 1, 6, 2	2018	Course assignments: ED 581, ED 589, ED 587 Portfolio Standards: 1, 2, 3	Supervisor Evaluation of Student Intern and Marymount University On-Site Advisor Evaluation of Student Intern: Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms Standard 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness
2. Develop supportive, inclusive and rigorous learning communities through coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote student academic success and well-being PSEL Standards: 4, 5 VDOE UPS: 1, 5	2019	Course assignments: ED 584, ED 592 Portfolio Standards: 4, 5	Supervisor Evaluation of Student Intern and Marymount University On-Site Advisor Evaluation of Student Intern: Standard 4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Standard 5: Community of Care and Support for Students
3. Develop and engage a network of learning community stakeholders in meaningful and reciprocal ways to promote student academic success and well-being PSEL Standards: 6, 7, 8 VDOE UPS: 1, 3, 5, 4	2019	Course assignments: ED 588, ED 582 Portfolio Standards: 6, 7, 8	Supervisor Evaluation of Student Intern and Marymount University On-Site Advisor Evaluation of Student Intern: Standard 6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel Standard 7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff Standard 8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community
4. Act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being PSEL Standards: 9, 10 VDOE UPS: 7	2018	Course assignments: ED 591, ED 583 Portfolio Standards: 9, 10	Supervisor Evaluation of Student Intern and Marymount University On-Site Advisor Evaluation of Student Intern: Standard 9: Operations and Management Standard 10: School Improvement

**MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY CSLP ALIGNMENT OF
NATIONAL STANDARDS AND PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE**

#	Professional Standards Educational Leadership (PSEL)	Course(s)	Portfolio Evidence for M.Ed. in Administration & Supervision/Catholic School Leadership Program
Std. 1	<u>Mission, Vision & Core Values</u> Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.	ED 581	<p>A. <u>CA – Reflective Essays</u> (2) on History & Mission of Schools</p> <p>B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course.</p> <p>C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
Std. 2	<u>Ethics & Professional Norms</u> Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.	ED 589	<p>A. <u>CA - Reflective essay</u> will consist of a description of what “morality” or the “moral life” means to you. This follows <u>Group project and presentation</u> will consist of designing and presenting to the class an instructional unit about character, moral, and ethical education with age appropriate materials, activities, and instruction</p> <p>B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course.</p> <p>C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
Std. 3	<u>Equity & Cultural Responsiveness</u> Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and well-being	ED 587	<p>A. <u>CA – Review or Creation of School Handbooks and Legal in-Basket #3</u></p> <p>B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course.</p> <p>C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>

<p>Std. 4</p>	<p><u>Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment</u> Effective educational leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>ED 584</p>	<p>A. <u>CA - Curriculum Plan</u> to Address a Specific Issue B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
<p>Std. 5</p>	<p><u>Community of Care & Support for Students</u> Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.</p>	<p>ED 592</p>	<p>A. <u>CA – School-Wide Implementation Plan</u> incorporates inclusive practices into the framework of an elementary or secondary school. The plan spans a period of three years. B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
<p>Std. 6</p>	<p><u>Professional Capacity of School Personnel</u> Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student's academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>ED 588</p>	<p>A. <u>CA – Leadership Supervision Paper</u>. Defend the rationale for using the instruments for supervising and evaluating teachers and support staff. B. <u>CA Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
<p>Std. 7</p>	<p><u>Professional Community for Teachers & Staff</u> Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student's academic success and well-being</p>	<p>ED 588</p>	<p>A. <u>CA – Leadership Supervision Paper</u>. Defend the rationale for using the instruments for supervising and evaluating teachers and support staff B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>

<p>Std. 8</p>	<p><u>Meaningful Engagement of Families & Community</u> Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>ED 582</p>	<p>A. CA - <u>Leadership Mission Statement, Back to School Night Remarks, Case Scenario</u> B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
<p>Std. 9</p>	<p><u>Operations & Management</u> Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>ED 591</p>	<p>A. CA – <u>Budget Narrative</u> The first section of the final project asks you to write a narrative about the rationale for your 5- year financial budget. <u>Five Year Budget</u> – each student creates this. <u>Comprehensive Institutional Advancement</u> with specific guidelines. B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>
<p>Std. 10</p>	<p><u>School Improvement</u> Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>ED 583</p>	<p>A. CA – <u>Game Plan</u> with personal vision, review and application of specific theories studied B. <u>Reflection</u> on the course and assignment and its personal and professional value; include specific reference to PSEL standard(s) identified for the course and supporting evidence from each course. C. <u>Internship</u> – 4 On-Site Advisor Evaluations; University Supervisor Evaluation, Log and Reflective Journal; Portfolio Evaluation Rubric and Student Reflection on correlating internship activities, and Final Summary of Internship Project.</p>

Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will develop, advocate and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally-responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being.

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>1. Critical Assignments for ED 581, ED 587, and ED 589 (direct)</p> <p>ED 581: Foundation of American Education and Leadership</p> <p>ED 587: Private School Law</p> <p>ED 589: Fostering Moral and Ethical Development</p>	<p><u>PSEL Standard #1:</u> <i>Mission. Vision & Core Values</i> Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #2:</u> <i>Ethics & Professional Norms</i> Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Instructors in courses with a Critical Assignment assess the assignment based on the aligned PSEL Standard #1 and then forward the score to the Director of the Catholic School Leadership Program who double scores the assignment. The mean score is the average between the two raters.</p> <p><u>Population:</u> The scores are from students who completed their internship and their program in the 2017-18 academic year. Critical Assignments would have been completed over their enrollment in the two-year program (2016-2018).</p>	<p>1. <u>Analysis Process:</u> Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.</p>

academic success and well-being.

PSEL Standard #3:
Equity & Cultural Responsiveness
Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and well-being

Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment using a four-column rubric; in which level 3 “Proficient” is the acceptable level of student performance.

Critical Assignment: PSEL Standards (N=12)		Mean Score
ED 581: PSEL Standard #1		3.92
ED 589: PSEL Standard #2		3.67
ED 587: PSEL Standard #3		3.55

Rubric Scale:
1 = Unacceptable 3 = Proficient
2 = Developing 4 = Exemplary

Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for Critical Assignment Mean Score (N = 12)		
Course	Rubric Score Mean Score	
	3.0	4.0
ED 581	8% (1)	92% (11)
ED 589	33% (4)	67% (8)
ED 587	42% (5)	58% (7)

Rubric Scale:
1 = Unacceptable 3 = Proficient
2 = Developing 4 = Exemplary

2. Findings:

A. For the 12 students who completed their program in 2017-18, the mean scores on the Critical Assignments for all three courses were above the *Proficient* level.

B. For each course, 100% of all students were assessed at or above a 3.0 score. No one received lower than a 3.0

C. ED 581 had the highest number of students (11) earning a 4.0 score on their Critical Assignment, which resulted in 92% of the students’ work being assessed as “Exemplary.”

2. On-Site Advisor Evaluation (indirect)

PSEL Standard #1: Mission, Vision & Core Values

Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.

PSEL Standard #2: Ethics & Professional Norms

Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

Interns are assessed on PSEL Standard #1 during their internship with a four-column rubric; with level 3 "Meets Expectations" as the acceptable level of student performance.

PSEL Standard #3: Equity & Cultural Responsiveness

Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being

Collection: The On-Site Advisor filled out an evaluation of their intern during and at the end of their placement based upon a four-column rubric during the spring 2018 semester.

Population: The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.

On-Site Advisor Evaluation Ratings	
N = 12	Mean Score
PSEL St. #1	3.50
PSEL St. #2	3.79
PSEL St. #3	3.50

Rubric Scale:

1 = Unsatisfactory 3 = Meets Expectations
2 = Developing 4 = Exceeds Expectations

Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for On-Site Advisor Evaluation Mean Score (N = 12)		
	Rubric Score Mean Score	
PSEL Standard	3.0	4.0
#1	50% (6)	50% (6)
#2	25% (3)	75% (9)
#3	50% (6)	50% (6)

1. Analysis Process:

Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.

2. Findings:

A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the *Meets Expectations* level.
B. Nine (9) students, constituting 75%, were assessed as *Exceeds Expectations* for Standard #2. No individual student received less than a 3.0 on their rubric.

3. University Supervisor Evaluation (indirect)

PSEL Standard #1: Mission, Vision & Core Values

Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.

PSEL Standard #2: Ethics & Professional Norms

Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

Interns are assessed on PSEL Standard #1 during their internship with a four-column rubric; with level 3 "Meets Expectations" is the acceptable level of student performance.

Collection: The University Supervisor filled out an evaluation of their intern during their placement based upon a four column rubric during the spring 2018 semester.

Population: The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.

Rubric Scale:

1 = Unsatisfactory 3 = Meets Expectations
2 = Developing 4 = Exceeds Expectations

MU University Supervisor Evaluation Ratings	
N = 12	Mean Score
PSEL St. #1	4.0
PSEL St. #2	3.92
PSEL St. #3	3.92

Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for University Supervisor Evaluation		
The Mean Score (N = 12)		
	Rubric Score Mean Score	
PSEL Standard	3.0	4.0
#1	0% (0)	100% (12)
#2	8% (1)	92% (11)
#3	8% (1)	92% (11)

1. Analysis Process:

Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.

2. Findings:

- A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the *Meets Expectations* level.
- B. Twelve (12) students (100%) were assessed as *Exceeds Expectations* for Standard #1. No individual student received less than a 3.0 on their rubric.

<p><u>PSEL Standard #3:</u> <i>Equity & Cultural Responsiveness</i> Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being</p>		<table border="1" data-bbox="741 240 1449 505"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">COMPARISON between On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor Evaluations</th> </tr> <tr> <th>PSEL Standard</th> <th>On-Site Advisor</th> <th>University Supervisor</th> <th>Self-Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td># 1</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td># 2</td> <td>3.79</td> <td>3.92</td> <td>3.58</td> </tr> <tr> <td># 3</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.92</td> <td>3.33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Unsatisfactory 3 = Meets Expectations 2 = Developing 4 = Exceeds Expectations</p>	COMPARISON between On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor Evaluations				PSEL Standard	On-Site Advisor	University Supervisor	Self-Assessment	# 1	3.50	4.0	3.67	# 2	3.79	3.92	3.58	# 3	3.50	3.92	3.33	<p>B. Comparison: Among the three groups, the students self-assessed lower than both the On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor. It appears that there is no common evaluation of standards in which the On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor assessed at the highest or lowest.</p>
COMPARISON between On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor Evaluations																							
PSEL Standard	On-Site Advisor	University Supervisor	Self-Assessment																				
# 1	3.50	4.0	3.67																				
# 2	3.79	3.92	3.58																				
# 3	3.50	3.92	3.33																				
<p>4. Dispositions Ratings by On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor (indirect)</p>	<p>Interns are rated five times on thirty-one observational dispositions during their internship in ED 593 on a four column rubric; in which “<i>Meets Expectations</i>” is the acceptable level of each observable disposition. Six dispositional statements have been selected for this Student Learning Outcome.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> The On-Site Advisors and University Supervisor filled out a Dispositions evaluation of their intern during their placement based upon a four column rubric during the spring 2018 semester. <u>Population:</u> The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.</p>	<p>1. <u>Analysis Process:</u> Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.</p>																				

		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="724 207 961 532">Dispositional Observed Performance Statement: Student intern:</th> <th data-bbox="961 207 1129 532">On-Site Advisor Mean Score N = 12</th> <th data-bbox="1129 207 1297 532">University Supervisor Mean Score N = 12</th> <th data-bbox="1297 207 1465 532">Self-Assessment Mean Score N = 10</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 532 961 630"><i>Demonstrates morals and ethics</i></td> <td data-bbox="961 532 1129 630">3.75</td> <td data-bbox="1129 532 1297 630">4.0</td> <td data-bbox="1297 532 1465 630">3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 630 961 662">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 630 1129 662">83% (10)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 630 1297 662">100% (12)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 630 1465 662">50% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 662 961 695">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 662 1129 695">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 662 1297 695">0 (0%)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 662 1465 695">50% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 695 961 727">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 695 1129 727">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 695 1297 727">0 (0%)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 695 1465 727">0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 727 961 833"><i>Demonstrates interpersonal relations</i></td> <td data-bbox="961 727 1129 833">3.45</td> <td data-bbox="1129 727 1297 833">3.75</td> <td data-bbox="1297 727 1465 833">3.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 833 961 865">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 833 1129 865">58% (7)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 833 1297 865">83% (10)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 833 1465 865">60% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 865 961 898">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 865 1129 898">33 % (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 865 1297 898">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 865 1465 898">40% (4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 898 961 930">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 898 1129 930">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 898 1297 930">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 898 1465 930">0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 930 961 1036"><i>Demonstrates sensitivity to diversity</i></td> <td data-bbox="961 930 1129 1036">3.63</td> <td data-bbox="1129 930 1297 1036">3.92</td> <td data-bbox="1297 930 1465 1036">3.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 1036 961 1068">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 1036 1129 1068">67% (8)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1036 1297 1068">92% (11)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1036 1465 1068">30% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 1068 961 1101">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 1068 1129 1101">25% (3)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1068 1297 1101">0 (0%)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1068 1465 1101">70% (7)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="724 1101 961 1133">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="961 1101 1129 1133">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1101 1297 1133">8% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1101 1465 1133">0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="724 1149 1465 1255"> Rubric 4 - Exceeds Expectations 3 - Meets Expectations 2 - Developing 1 - Unsatisfactory </p>	Dispositional Observed Performance Statement: Student intern:	On-Site Advisor Mean Score N = 12	University Supervisor Mean Score N = 12	Self-Assessment Mean Score N = 10	<i>Demonstrates morals and ethics</i>	3.75	4.0	3.5	4.0 Rating	83% (10)	100% (12)	50% (5)	3.0 Rating	8% (1)	0 (0%)	50% (5)	2.0 Rating	8% (1)	0 (0%)	0% (0)	<i>Demonstrates interpersonal relations</i>	3.45	3.75	3.4	4.0 Rating	58% (7)	83% (10)	60% (6)	3.0 Rating	33 % (4)	8% (1)	40% (4)	2.0 Rating	8% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)	<i>Demonstrates sensitivity to diversity</i>	3.63	3.92	3.3	4.0 Rating	67% (8)	92% (11)	30% (3)	3.0 Rating	25% (3)	0 (0%)	70% (7)	2.0 Rating	8% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)	<p data-bbox="1480 215 1848 857"> 2. Findings: A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the <i>Meets Expectations</i> level, except for one (8%) who was assessed at level 2: <i>Developing</i>. B. Both the On-Site Advisors and University Supervisor assessed the highest number of students on <i>Demonstrates morals and ethics</i>. C. The same student received the lowest assessment of level 2 from both the On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor on all three dispositional statements. </p>
Dispositional Observed Performance Statement: Student intern:	On-Site Advisor Mean Score N = 12	University Supervisor Mean Score N = 12	Self-Assessment Mean Score N = 10																																																				
<i>Demonstrates morals and ethics</i>	3.75	4.0	3.5																																																				
4.0 Rating	83% (10)	100% (12)	50% (5)																																																				
3.0 Rating	8% (1)	0 (0%)	50% (5)																																																				
2.0 Rating	8% (1)	0 (0%)	0% (0)																																																				
<i>Demonstrates interpersonal relations</i>	3.45	3.75	3.4																																																				
4.0 Rating	58% (7)	83% (10)	60% (6)																																																				
3.0 Rating	33 % (4)	8% (1)	40% (4)																																																				
2.0 Rating	8% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)																																																				
<i>Demonstrates sensitivity to diversity</i>	3.63	3.92	3.3																																																				
4.0 Rating	67% (8)	92% (11)	30% (3)																																																				
3.0 Rating	25% (3)	0 (0%)	70% (7)																																																				
2.0 Rating	8% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)																																																				

**5. 2017-18
Graduating
Student Survey
(indirect)**

Survey conducted by Academic Affairs aggregates statements into the percentage students responded “Good or Excellent” for each provided statement. We have chosen seven survey statements.

Collection/Population: “Attached are the results for your department(s) from the 2017-2018 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), as well as the overall report. This survey was sent to students who graduated in December 2017 and May 2018, as well as students who will graduate in August 2018.”

Evaluation of Preparation	
Survey Statement N = 8	Percent Good or Excellent
Succeed in a job in your field.	100
Deliver a coherent oral presentation.	100
Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field.	100
Determine the most ethically appropriate response to a situation.	100
Understand the major ethical dilemmas in your field.	100
Conduct research to support a position.	100
Develop a coherent written argument.	100

1. Analysis Process:
While the data was received after our May 2018 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2018 meeting. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.

2. Findings:
A. Of all who completed the survey, 100% rated those seven statements at the highest levels of the scale (4 and 5) for evaluating their *preparation* during the program.

Evaluation of Development		
Survey Statement N = 8	% Agree or Strongly Agree	
I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.	100	
I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.	100	
I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.	100	

Responses on a 5-point scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)

B. Of all who completed the survey, 100% rated these three statements at the highest levels of the scale (4 and 5) for evaluating their *development* during the program.

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

(SEE also *Findings* under each SLO)

The direct measures in the Critical Assignments for ED 581, ED 589, and ED 587 show strong student achievement for this Learning Outcome and the average scores from the 2018 graduates exceed the targeted scores. More than half of the students on their Critical Assignment for all three courses earned level 4: *Exceeds Expectations*. On-Site Advisors, who work with the interns in the school setting, also rate graduates at or above the acceptable level. These scores are more targeted to direct observable behaviors. The University Supervisor's ratings are at or above the targeted level and support this Learning Outcome. The On-Site Advisors assessed 50% and higher of the students at level 4 for all three PSEL. The University Supervisor assessed 92% and higher of the students at level 4 for all three PSEL. The GSS survey data is strong confirmation that the students feel that their preparation and development throughout the program was excellent.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The results demonstrate a strong work ethic on the part of our students to exceed expectations in their coursework. Students are engaged in and work on real-world, applicable, and complex issues through the activities and assignments that were designed to prepare them for an administrative position. One of the first courses taken during the summer, ED 581 has students explore the historical development of American education but are given multiple opportunities to reflect upon current issues, such as creating a case study in which they have to create a dilemma involving a situation, practice, or policy within the school that conflicts with the mission of that school and then how they would facilitate that discussion with the stakeholders. ED 589 has students explore challenges of morality facing the Catholic school setting and how to provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical professional behavior among staff and faculty. ED 587 fosters critical thinking surrounding issues of school law and legal issues on equity facing administrators. Students have opportunities to explore how to act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision-making, and practice through an In-Basket activity.

An opportunity to improve relative to the assessment of this outcome is to further explore the PSEL for each of these courses and revisit the syllabus to see if any assignments should be revised or updated to better provide the students with a learning experience targeted for that standard. Each PSEL has indicators for each standard that can be helpful in designing new or revised assignments.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

To further align each of the courses to the PSEL and to connect their coursework to their experiential internship in the school, we will add a reflective piece that they will upload into their Portfolio. This reflection will require them to reflect how the specific course added personal and professional value and to provide evidence from the internship to support how that course prepared them for the internship and how it relates to the specific PSEL.

Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>						
<p>1. Critical Assignments for ED 583 and ED 591 (direct)</p> <p>ED 583 Administration in Schools</p> <p>ED 591 School Finance and Development</p>	<p><u>PSEL Standard #9:</u> <i>Operations & Management</i> Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #10:</u> <i>School Improvement</i> Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p> <p>Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment using a four-column rubric; in which level 3 “Proficient” is the</p>	<p>Collection: Instructors in courses with a Critical Assignment assess the assignment based on the aligned PSEL Standard #2 and then forward the score to the Director of the Catholic School Leadership Program who double scores the assignment. The mean score is the average between the two raters.</p> <p>Population: The scores are from students who completed their internship and their program in the 2017-18 academic year. Critical Assignments would have been completed over their enrollment in the two-year program (2016-2018).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="848 1036 1413 1279"> <thead> <tr> <th>Critical Assignment: PSEL Standards (N=12)</th> <th>Mean Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ED 591: PSEL Standard #9</td> <td>3.79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ED 583: PSEL Standard #10</td> <td>3.83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Unsatisfactory 3 = Meets Expectations 2 = Developing 4 = Exceeds Expectations</p>	Critical Assignment: PSEL Standards (N=12)	Mean Score	ED 591: PSEL Standard #9	3.79	ED 583: PSEL Standard #10	3.83	<p>1. <u>Analysis Process:</u> Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.</p> <p>2. <u>Findings:</u> A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the <i>Meets Expectations</i> level.</p>
Critical Assignment: PSEL Standards (N=12)	Mean Score								
ED 591: PSEL Standard #9	3.79								
ED 583: PSEL Standard #10	3.83								

	<p>acceptable level of student performance.</p> <p><i>Rubric Scale:</i> 1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Developing 3 = Meets Expectations 4 = Exceeds Expectations</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for Critical Assignment Mean Score (N = 12)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Rubric Score Mean Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Course</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ED 591</td> <td>33% (4)</td> <td>67% (8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ED 583</td> <td>17% (2)</td> <td>83% (10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for Critical Assignment Mean Score (N = 12)				Rubric Score Mean Score		Course	3.0	4.0	ED 591	33% (4)	67% (8)	ED 583	17% (2)	83% (10)	<p>B. No individual student received less than a 3.0 on their rubric. ED 583 had the higher percentage (83%) of students earning a 4.0: <i>Exceeds Expectations</i>.</p>
Percentage of Students Proficient or Exemplary for Critical Assignment Mean Score (N = 12)																		
	Rubric Score Mean Score																	
Course	3.0	4.0																
ED 591	33% (4)	67% (8)																
ED 583	17% (2)	83% (10)																
<p>2. On-Site Advisor Evaluation (indirect)</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #9:</u> <i>Operations & Management</i> Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #10:</u> <i>School Improvement</i> Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s</p>	<p>Interns are measured on PSEL Standard #9 and Standard #10 during their internship with a four-column rubric; in which level 3 “<i>Meets Expectations</i>” is the acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> The On-Site Advisor filled out an evaluation of their intern during and at the end of their placement based upon a four-column rubric during the spring 2018 semester.</p> <p><u>Population:</u> The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">On-Site Advisor Evaluation Mean Score Ratings</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N = 12</th> <th>Mean Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PSEL St. #9</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSEL St. #10</td> <td>3.33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Unsatisfactory 3 = Meets Expectations 2 = Developing 4 = Exceeds Expectations</p>	On-Site Advisor Evaluation Mean Score Ratings		N = 12	Mean Score	PSEL St. #9	3.0	PSEL St. #10	3.33	<p>1. <u>Analysis Process:</u> Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.</p> <p>2. <u>Findings:</u> A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the <i>Meets Expectations</i> level.</p>							
On-Site Advisor Evaluation Mean Score Ratings																		
N = 12	Mean Score																	
PSEL St. #9	3.0																	
PSEL St. #10	3.33																	

<p>academic success and well-being.</p>		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percentage of Students Rated as Developing, Proficient, or Exemplary by the On-Site Advisor (N = 12)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Rubric Score Mean Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>PSEL Standard</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>#9</td> <td>17% (2)</td> <td>66% (8)</td> <td>17% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#10</td> <td>8% (1)</td> <td>50% (6)</td> <td>42% (5)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Percentage of Students Rated as Developing, Proficient, or Exemplary by the On-Site Advisor (N = 12)					Rubric Score Mean Score			PSEL Standard	2.0	3.0	4.0	#9	17% (2)	66% (8)	17% (2)	#10	8% (1)	50% (6)	42% (5)	<p>B. Two (2) students, constituting 17%, were assessed as <i>Developing</i> on Standard #9 and one (1) student (8%) as <i>Developing</i> on Standard #10.</p>
Percentage of Students Rated as Developing, Proficient, or Exemplary by the On-Site Advisor (N = 12)																							
	Rubric Score Mean Score																						
PSEL Standard	2.0	3.0	4.0																				
#9	17% (2)	66% (8)	17% (2)																				
#10	8% (1)	50% (6)	42% (5)																				
<p>3. University Supervisor Evaluation (indirect)</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #9:</u> <i>Operations & Management</i> Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p> <p><u>PSEL Standard #10:</u> <i>School Improvement</i> Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.</p>	<p>Interns are measured on PSEL Standard #9 and Standard #10 during their internship with a four-column rubric; in which level 3 “<i>Meets Expectations</i>” is the acceptable level of student performance.</p> <p>1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Developing 3 = Meets Expectations 4 = Exceeds Expectations</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> The University Supervisor filled out an evaluation of their intern during their placement based upon a four-column rubric during the spring 2018 semester.</p> <p><u>Population:</u> The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">MU University Supervisor Mean Score Ratings</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N = 12</th> <th>Mean Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PSEL St. #9</td> <td>3.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSEL St. #10</td> <td>3.42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MU University Supervisor Mean Score Ratings		N = 12	Mean Score	PSEL St. #9	3.42	PSEL St. #10	3.42	<p>1. <u>Analysis Process:</u> Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.</p> <p>2. <u>Findings:</u> A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the <i>Meets Expectations</i> level.</p>												
MU University Supervisor Mean Score Ratings																							
N = 12	Mean Score																						
PSEL St. #9	3.42																						
PSEL St. #10	3.42																						

		Percentage of Students Rated as Developing, Proficient, or Exemplary by University Supervisor (N = 12)				<p>B. The same one (1) student (8%) earned a level 2: <i>Developing</i> on both Standard #9 and #10. Half of the students (50%) of the students earned level 4: <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> for both Standard #9 and #10.</p>
					Rubric Score Mean Score	
		PSEL Standard	2.0	3.0	4.0	
		#9	8% (1)	42% (5)	50% (6)	
		#10	8% (1)	42% (5)	50% (6)	
		COMPARISON between On-Site Advisor, University Supervisor Evaluations, and Self-Assessment (N = 12)				
		PSEL Standard	On-Site Advisor Mean Score	University Supervisor Mean Score	Self Assessment Mean Score	
		# 9	3.0	3.42	3.36	
		# 10	3.33	3.42	3.33	

4. Dispositions Ratings by On-Site Advisor and University Supervisor (indirect)

Interns are rated on thirty-one observational dispositions during their internship in ED 593 on a four column rubric; in which “*Meets Expectations*” is the acceptable level of each observable disposition. Three dispositional statements have been selected for this Student Learning Outcome. The rating

Rubric
4 - Exceeds Expectations
3 - Meets Expectations
2 - Developing
1 – Unsatisfactory

Collection: The On-Site Advisors and University Supervisor filled out a Dispositions evaluation of their intern during their placement based upon a four-column rubric during the spring 2018 semester.

Population: The students assessed on this evaluation are those who completed their internship during ED 593 during the spring 2018 semester.

Dispositional Observed Performance Statement: Student intern: Demonstrates	On-Site Advisor Mean Score N = 12	University Supervisor Mean Score N = 12	Self-Assessment Mean Score N = 9
Initiative and Responsibility	3.71	3.83	3.70
4.0 Rating	67% (8)	92% (1)	78% (7)
3.0 Rating	33% (4)	0 (0%)	22% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	8% (1)	0% (0)
Problem-Analysis Skills	3.41	3.75	3.44
4.0 Rating	42% (5)	83% (10)	56% (5)
3.0 Rating	58% (7)	8% (1)	33% (3)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	8% (1)	11% (1)
Decision-Making Skills	3.33	3.58	3.33
4.0 Rating	33% (4)	67% (8)	56% (5)
3.0 Rating	67% (8)	25% (3)	22% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	8% (1)	22% (2)

1. Analysis Process:
Data was presented at the May 2018 department meeting for review and analysis. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.

2. Findings:
A. The mean for all 12 students was at or above the *Meets Expectations* level for the three dispositional statements, except for the same (1) student (8%).
B. The On-Site Advisor, University Supervisor, and students rated *Initiative and Responsibility* with at the highest mean levels and the highest number assessed at level 4: *Exceeds Expectations*. The lowest mean scores across all three groups was in *Decision-Making Skills*.

5. 2017-18 Graduating Student Survey (indirect)

Survey conducted by Academic Affairs aggregates statements into the percentage students responded “Good or Excellent” for each provided statement. We have chosen six survey statements.

Collection/Population: “Attached are the results for your department(s) from the 2017-2018 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), as well as the overall report. This survey was sent to students who graduated in December 2017 and May 2018, as well as students who will graduate in August 2018.”

Evaluation of Preparation	
Survey Statement N = 8	Percent Good or Excellent
Work as part of an effective team.	100
Lead a team.	100
Manage time effectively.	100
Use technology effectively in a workplace environment.	100
Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.	100
Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.	100

Responses on a 5 point scale: 1(Poor) to 5 (Excellent)

1. Analysis Process:
While the data was received after our May 2018 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2018 meeting. The Director of the CSLP program, in collaboration with the ED department chair and Assessment Coordinator, completed the interpretation of data.

2. Findings:
Of all who completed the survey, 100% rated those six statements at the *highest* levels of the scale (4 and 5) when assessing the *preparation*, they received from this program.

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

(SEE also *Findings* under each SLO)

Direct measure results indicate that students exceeded the targeted goals in ED 583 and ED 591 for this Learning Outcome and the average scores from the 2018 graduates. The syllabus for each of these courses (ED 583 & ED 591) is focused on developing candidates' ability to demonstrate appropriate and effective instructional and budget planning processes and leadership strategies that impact the curriculum and assessment of all students as indicated by the data. The Critical Assignments (Direct Measures) for both courses were targeted for an aggregated mean of level 3: "Meets Expectations" out of 4. For both Standard #9 and #10, the aggregated mean for ED 583 and ED 591 was 3.42 and had the same percentage distribution. In addition, qualitative data analysis of the candidates' Progress Reports, On-site Advisor Evaluations, and University Supervisor Evaluations indicates a strong perception of the students' ability to demonstrate effective instructional and budget planning processes and leadership strategies. For PSEL #9 and #10, with a targeted goal of level 3: "Meets Expectations," the On-site Advisors' ratings ranged from 2.00– 4.00 with a mean of 3.0 on Standard #9 and with a mean of 3.33 on Standard #10. The University Supervisor Evaluations and the Portfolio Evaluations at the end of the program also show that students are highly motivated and engaged in effective instructional and budget planning processes and leadership strategies with a targeted goal of level 3: "Meets Expectations," the student scores ranged from 2.00-4.0, with a mean of 3.42 on both Standard #9 and #10. The GSS survey data is strong confirmation that the students feel that their preparation and development throughout the program was excellent.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

In ED 583, the students' engagement with leadership strategies and introduction to budget planning prepares students for a more deliberate use of leadership theories as they apply these and engage in developing a full budget and 5-year plan as part of ED 591. In both courses, the student interaction on the Discussion Board is an added program strength in that all students give evidence of these qualities as they work through various topics and issues for discussion. Though the scores are significantly high, the courses should continue to offer opportunities through Case Studies for students to demonstrate and develop these qualities.

An opportunity to improve relative to the assessment of this outcome is to further explore the PSEL for each of these courses and revisit the syllabus to see if any assignments should be revised or updated to better provide the students with a learning experience targeted for that standard. Each PSEL has indicators for each standard that can be helpful in designing new or revised assignments.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

To further align each of the courses to the PSEL and to connect their coursework to their experiential internship in the school, we will add a reflective piece that they will upload into their Portfolio. This reflection will require them to reflect how the specific course added personal and professional value and to provide evidence from the internship to support how that course prepared them for the internship and how it relates to the specific PSEL.

Curriculum Map

These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

GRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: Administration and Supervision (M.Ed. with PK-12 Licensure in Administration)

Year: 2017-18

Graduates will:	Program Outcome	Critical Reading¹	Written Communication	Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use Resource Materials
	1. Develop, advocate and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high quality education by acting ethically through equitable and culturally-responsive practices to promote student academic success and well-being	X	X	X	X	X
	2. Develop supportive, inclusive and rigorous learning communities through coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote student academic success and well-being	X	X	X	X	X
	3. Develop and engage a network of learning community stakeholders in meaningful and reciprocal ways to promote student academic success and well-being	X	X	X	X	X
	4. Act as agents of continuous school improvement to promote student academic success and well-being	X	X	X	X	X

Curriculum Map:

¹ Graduate program competencies derived from GSC Committee Requirements for New Graduate Programs: "Achieving this criteria may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

1. Course content that is increasingly more complex and rigorous than UG courses (course objectives, learning activities, outcome expectations, etc.)
2. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in reading critically.
3. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in writing clearly.
4. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in arguing persuasively.
5. Coursework that produces graduates competent in identifying, investigating, and applying theory and principles of the discipline to new ideas, problems, and materials.
6. Competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study and in the use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources for data.
7. A capstone or final integrative activity that demonstrates achievement of graduate-level knowledge and application of the theory and principles of the discipline"

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Reading ¹		Written Communication		Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument		Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline		Scholarly Presentation and Use of Resource Materials	
	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
ED 581	F	O,PR,P,E,OT	F	OT, PR,P,E	F	O, OT, PR	F	PR,P,E,O, OT	F	PR, P, O
ED 582	F	O,PR,P,E,OT	F	OT, PR,P,E	F	O, OT, PR	F	PR,P,E,O, OT,	F	PR, P, O
ED 583	A	OT, P,E	A	OT, P,E	A	OT, P, PR	F	OT, PR, P, E	A	PR,P
ED 584	A	OT,PR, P	A	OT, PR,P,E	A	OT, P, PR	A	OT, PR, P, E	A	PR, P
ED 586	M	OT, P,E	M	OT, P,E	M	OT, P, PR	M	OT, PR, P, E	M	PR, P
ED 587	A	OT,PR, P,E	A	OT, PR,P,E	A	OT, P, PR	A	OT, PR, P, E	A	PR,P
ED 588	M	O,OT,PR,P,E	M	OT, PR,P,E	M	O, OT, PR	M	PR,P,E,O, OT	M	PR, P, O
ED 589	M	O,OT,PR, P,E	M	OT, PR,P,E	M	O, OT, PR	M	PR,P,E,O, OT	M	PR, P, O
ED 591	A	OT,PR, P,E	A	OT, PR,P,E	A	OT, PR, P	A	OT, PR, P, E	A	PR, P
ED 592	M	OT,PR, P	M	OT, PR,P,E	M	OT, PR, P	M	OT, PR, P, E	M	PR, P
ED 593	M	I, OT, P	M	I, OT, P	M	I, OT, P	M	I, OT, P	M	I, OT, P

Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

OT = CASE STUDIES, DISCUSSION BOARD, PORTFOLIO