

College of Education and Affiliated Programs

Annual Assessment Report

For Administrative Services II Program

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2007-08 academic year. During that year, the College of Education and Affiliated Programs engaged in extensive efforts to refine and extend their assessment system. In many cases, data collected starting in Fall 2008 and beyond will look substantially different from the data being presented in this report.

Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?

The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program is designed to fulfill the theme of the College of Education – Teaching for Life-Long Learning, Professional Growth, and Social Responsibility. In addition, the program is structured to incorporate the College mission to foster a learning and teaching community committed to educational excellence that focuses on 1) promoting student growth, 2) preparing socially responsible leaders, 3) valuing diversity, 4) developing collaboration, 5) promoting school improvement, and 6) engaging in research, scholarly activity and ongoing evaluation. Both the theme and mission provide the scaffolding of the professional program intent to provide candidates with practical and challenging experiences in order to meet the expectations outlined in the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs.

The Professional Administrative Services candidates are practicing administrators. Most were teachers for several years before becoming educational leaders in administrative capacities. Having been exposed to various leadership theories during their preliminary preparation programs, they must now translate their knowledge into the day-to-day real world of leadership. They must acquire the necessary tools, strategies, and methods to lead multiple followers to guide their schools toward excellence. The professional program builds on the basic course foundations of the preliminary program, but maintains a stronger practical application component. To facilitate this emphasis and to maintain a seamless connection to preliminary credential coursework, the program is also designed and structurally and conceptually grounded in the six California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSELs).

There are two faculty members and usually a cohort of 15-20 candidates who follow an organizational sequence of the following courses: EDAD 640 Mentoring and Professional Development for the New Administrator, EDAD 658 Organizational Development Culture, and Change, EDAD 659 Organizational Governance, Politics, and Policy, and EDAD 692 Administrator Portfolio Development and Exhibition.

Table 1 shows the student learning outcomes and signature assignments. Table 2 indicates that 16 students applied to the program during 2007-08. Table 3 shows the number of students who completed certification. Table 4 shows the number of faculty.

Table 1
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

SLOs	Outcome 1: Develop a shared vision of learning that is supported by the school community.	Outcome 2: Advocate, and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	Outcome 3: Manage the organization, operations, and resources to foster a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	Outcome 4: Collaborate with families and community members, respond to diverse community needs, and mobilize community resources.	Outcome 5: Model a personal code of ethics and develop professional leadership capacity.	Outcome 6: Understand, respond and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
Signature Assignment(s)	Professional dev plan, Portfolio presentation	Professional dev plan, Action research project, Portfolio presentation	Professional dev plan, Action research project, Portfolio presentation	Professional dev plan, Case study, Portfolio presentation	Professional dev plan, Portfolio presentation	Professional dev plan, Case study, portfolio presentation
National Standards	I School Vision of Learning	II Student Learning and Professional Growth	III Organizational Management for Student Learning	IV Collaboration with Families and Community	V Professional Development	VI Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understanding
State Standards	Standard 10 (CPSEL)	Standard 11 (CPSEL)	Standard 12 (CPSEL)	Standard 13 (CPSEL)	Standard 14 (CPSEL)	Standard 15 (CPSEL)
Conceptual Framework	Promotes Growth	School Improvement	Service and Collaboration	Values Diversity	Prepares Leaders	Prepares Leaders
NCATE Elements	Student Learning	Student Learning	Knowledge and Skills - Other	Knowledge and Skills - Other	Professional Dispositions	Knowledge and Skills - Other

Table 2
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 1		
	Admission to Program		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
	#	#	#
TOTAL¹	16	16	16

¹ Totals include combined figures for Master's and Advanced Credential Programs.

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 2
	Advancement to Culminating Experience
	#
Other (Advanced Credential Programs Only)	16

Table 4
Faculty Profile 2007-08²

Status	Number
Full-time TT	1
Full-time Lecturer	0
Part-time Lecturer	1
Total:	2

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

There are two faculty members in the program. They both discussed the results reported here. See the attached minutes.

Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:
 - a. Candidate Performance Data: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

Signature assignments were completed in each course in the program. Instructors gave students the assignments, guided their work, and used a rubric to complete an evaluation. The signature assignments for each course follow:

EDAD 640

Students write a Professional Development Plan with three individual performance goals.

² Figures in this table are the same for Tier 1 and Tier 2.

EDAD 658

Students develop a plan for an “Organization Development/Action Research Study” to improve school culture.

EDAD 659

Students write a case study about school engagement with the community.

EDAD 692

Students complete a portfolio exhibition and notebook of accomplishments in attaining professional goals.

Table 6 shows the results for each assignment.

Table 6
SLO data on benchmark assignments

SLO	Benchmark Assignment	Exceeds Expectations (4) 07-08	Meets Expectations (3) 07-08	Meets Some Expectations (2) 07-08	Does Not Meet Expectations (1) 07-08
1-6	EDAD 640 Professional Development Plan N = 16	100 %			
2&3	EDAD 658 Organizational Development Action Research Project N= 16	100%			
4&6	EDAD 659 Case Study N = 16	100%			
1	EDAD 692 Administrative Portfolio N=16	100%			

- b. Program Effectiveness Data: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

Students were given a survey to evaluate the program. It consisted of multiple choice and open ended items to complete at the conclusion of their final portfolio presentation in January.

Table 7
Candidate Exit Survey Results

Rate the quality of the following courses	High degree or excellent	Very valuable or strong	Adequate	Needs revising or poor
EDAD 640 Mentoring and Professional Development Planning for the New Administrator	13	1		
EDAD 658 Organizational Development, Culture, and Change	13	1		
EDAD 659 Educational Governance, Policy, and Politics	6	7		1
EDAD 692 Administrative Portfolio Development and Exhibition	6	5	1	1

Table 8
Candidate Exit Survey-Standards

Rate the extent to which the standard was met.	Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Somewhat well
1. Develop a shared vision of learning that is supported by the school community	10	5	2	
2. Advocate, and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	9	6	1	1
3. Manage the organization, operations, and resources to foster a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	9	6	1	1

Rate the extent to which the standard was met.	Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Somewhat well
4. Collaborate with families and community members, respond to diverse community needs, and mobilize community resources.	6	7	1	3
5. Model a personal code of ethics and develop professional leadership capacity.	11	2	3	1
6. Understand, respond and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	10	5	1	1

4. **Complementary Data:**

While instructors were pleased with student performance, they shared worries about small enrollment numbers.

Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

Program Strengths

1. Signature assignment data from 07-08 indicate that candidates exceeded or met expectations for all six SLO's.
2. Fifteen candidates indicated that four of the six standards were met extremely well or very well.
3. Thirteen or more of the candidates rated three of the courses as excellent or strong.
4. Overall, the instructors were pleased with the performance of the students as indicated by the signature assignment results.

Areas for improvement

- 1) Rubric scores need to be reported more precisely to make gradations of difference in student performance. Using the data based on student grades provides us with limited information to make program improvement decisions. To gather more specific data on how students are performing on the benchmark assignments, we need to use the rubrics that we recently have created.
- 2) The ratings for EDAD 692 in which students present their portfolios were lower than for the other classes.
- 3) SLO 4 Collaborate with families and community members, respond to diverse community needs, and mobilize community resources and SLO 5 Model a personal code of ethics and develop professional leadership capacity were rated lower than other standards.

4) The 07 class reported here had an enrollment of 16, but the 08 class (not reported here and scheduled to finish in January 09) had only six students.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

We have not previously engaged in systematic discussions about candidate performance on signature assignments. We look forward to ongoing discussions around these data and to comparing student performance from year to year based on modifications made.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5.

Based on the data reported and our analysis of these findings, the following program changes are warranted:

1. Faculty will track student performance data on benchmark assignments using rubrics to provide a more detailed analysis of areas where students are successful and where they struggle.
2. Faculty will meet in the spring and fall to monitor student performance.
3. The format for portfolio presentations in EDAD 692 is being revised to involve mentors and be conducted on school sites.
4. We discussed ways that ethics might be addressed in both 658 and 659.
5. Enrollment should be increased to 20-25 students. One approach would be to contract with a school district for a cohort of students. Proposals have also been developed to give doctoral credit for 658 and 659 to draw more students and to increase the rigor of the program.

EDAD Tier II Assessment Meeting

December 16, 2008

AS 238

Attendance: Frank Tyrrell, Charles Slater

Charlie thanked Frank for his work in designing the 658 rubric. He then reviewed the new procedures of scoring signature assignments with the rubric and assigning scores of 1, 2, 3, 4 by student ID number. We will also need an exemplar for each rubric level and permission slips signed by students.

We then reviewed the rubrics for our classes.

We discussed the Data Discussion Guide questions:

Student Learning

1. How satisfied are you with the overall performance of students on the signature assignment?
2. On what criteria or sub-skills do students seem to be doing *particularly well*?
3. On what criteria or sub-skills do students seem to be *struggling*?
4. How do findings on this outcome compare to past results on the outcome?
5. What are the areas of particular concern where you would like to see student performance improve?

Instrument Utility

1. Did the signature assignment and/or rubric you used give you the information you were seeking?
2. Do you want to make any revisions to the signature assignment and/or rubric, or the assessment process?

Concerns

Enrollment

There were only six students in the Tier II program this fall after an enrollment of 16 last year. California State University Dominguez Hills offers a program and recently the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) started a program for Long Beach USD administrators in Program Improvement Schools. It is funded by Long Beach USD, and students receive time off work to attend classes.

The small class size at CSULB gave an opportunity for individual attention and seminar discussion, but the class lacked the dynamic energy of a larger class. Overall, the instructors were pleased with the performance of the students as indicated by the signature assignment results.

Plans

There was some discussion of adding a group dynamics section to 659. We discussed ways that ethics might be addressed in both 658 and 659.