College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Annual Assessment Report
For Administrative Services I 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 (general goals, how these connect to the college conceptual framework, enrollment, and number of faculty). Describe any program changes since your last CED Annual Report?

   The vision of the Educational Administration Program is to empower educational leaders to develop the courage, compassion, competence, and commitment necessary to improve the world of schooling for the 21st century. No matter what position an individual holds within an educational organization, all energies should be directed toward maximizing the academic achievement of ALL students served.

   The philosophy of the program is an extension of the College of Education Conceptual Framework. The program promotes the development of skills in organizational and political leadership and systemic change, the development of constructivist and culturally responsive leadership and an ethic of justice and caring. Preliminary level courses provide a balanced approach that not only exposes candidates to contemporary educational theories but allows for practical application in contemporary settings. The intent is to develop leaders with multiple perspectives who initiate and manage change, tackle social justice issues and who will help schools to meet challenges of a diverse and ever-changing environment.

   The Masters in Education combined with the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential assess candidate competencies based on skills and dispositions outlined in the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Standards-based Preliminary and Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Programs. The standards are based on the National Interstate School Licensure Leadership Consortium (ISLLC) guidelines and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSEL) standards that were adapted and adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). These standards function as the source of the program knowledge base, skills and dispositions to be mastered. They also function as the student learning outcomes listed below.

   Students take the following courses: Leadership, Organizational Management, and, Legal Aspects of Education: Implications and Applications for School Leadership, Fiscal Resources in Educational Administration, Human Resources in Educational Administration, Urban and Community Leadership, Curriculum, Program Development and Evaluation, Instructional Leadership and Assessment , as well as Field Experience in Educational Administration, and either Masters Research Study or Masters Thesis. They also choose from the following electives: Intellectual Foundations of

Educational Reform, 19th Century to Present, Education & Diversity: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, Language and Educational Policies, Research Methods in Education, and Qualitative Research Methods.

Table 1 shows the student learning outcomes and signature assignments. Table 2 indicates that 44 students matriculated, of 69 applicants to the program, during 2007-08. Table 3 shows that 13 students advanced to the stage of working on their research project, while Table 4 shows the number of students who received their degree or certification. Table 5 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.	Outcome 7: Demonstrate ability to utilize and apply research skills to solve a school or district based problem.
Signature Assign- ment	Dev portfolio	Dev portfolio, Team curriculum analysis, critique of school planning proc	Dev portfolio, Interview/ field research project	Dev portfolio, Urban school study	Dev portfolio, field exp plan	Dev portfolio, Case analysis	Dev portfolio, Research masters study or thesis
National Standards	I School Vision of Learning	II Student Learning and Professional Growth	III Organizational Management for Student Learning	IV Collaboratn with Families and Community	V Professional Developmt	VI Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understdng	n/a
State Standards	Standard 10 (CPSEL)	Standard 11 (CPSEL)	Standard 12 (CPSEL)	Standard 13 (CPSEL)	Standard 14 (CPSEL)	Standard 15 (CPSEL)	n/a
Concept- ual Frame- work	Promotes Growth	School Improvmnt	Service and Collaboration	Values Diversity	Prepares Leaders	Prepares Leaders	Research and Evaluation
NCATE Elements	Student Learning	Student Learning	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Professional Dispositions	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Knowledge and Skills- Other

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

	Transition Point 1		
	Admission to Program		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
	#	#	#
TOTAL[1]	69	52	44

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

	Transition Point 2
	Advancement to Culminating Experience
	#
Thesis (698)[2]	1
Comps[3]	0
Project (695)[4]	13
Other (Advanced Credential Programs Only)	0

---

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

[2] This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

[3] This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination in Fall 2007, Spring 2008, or Summer 2008. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

[4] This is data on students who were conducting culminating projects during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 3
	Exit
	#
Degree	15
Credential[5]	18 (Preliminary) 19 (Advanced)

Table 5
Faculty Profile 2007-08[6]

Status	Number
Full-time TT	2
Full-time Lecturer	-
Part-time Lecturer	8
Total:	10

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. (Maps to campus criteria for assessment reports)

    One full-time and three part-time faculty members discussed the results of this report (Minutes attached). The other full-time faculty member submitted the attached answers to the Discussion Guide questions. All faculty members were invited to participate and complete a Discussion Guide.

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).

---

[5] Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2007, Fall 2007, and Spring 2008.

[6] Figures in this table are the same for Tier I and Tier 2.

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 541: Students use assessments and class handouts to write a reflective paper on their leadership. They identify strengths, weaknesses, and natural tendencies.
- EDAD 544: This assignment requires: 1) a summary of a legal case, 2) an analysis of its implications, and 3) the development of an implementation plan.
- EDAD 647A: Students complete an interview/field research assignment to describe what a principal needs to know and be able to do regarding budget development.
- EDAD 647B: Students prepare a written report and presentation that investigates human resources issues.
- EDAD 649: Students write a paper to consider some of the issues that impact the learning of students in poverty.
- EDAD 677A: Students choose a curriculum and write a paper to provide an analysis of curriculum.
- EDAD 677B: Students provide a written critique of one school's annual improvement planning process.
- EDAD 680: Students prepare a portfolio that documents their learning related to each of the six CCTC standards.
- EDAD 695: Students prepare a culminating research study.

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 541 Developmental Portfolio N = 46	98 %	2%		
1-6	EDAD 680 Field Experience Portfolio N= 27	100%			
2	EDAD 677A Team Curriculum Analysis N = 43	93%	7%		

2	EDAD 677B Critique of School Planning Process N=43	93%	7%		
3	EDAD 647A Interview Field Research Project N= 32	100%			
4	EDAD 649 Urban School Study N= 36	67%	33%		
5	EDAD 647B Field Experience Plan N=33	76%	24%		
6	EDAD 544 Case Analysis N=34	56%	44%		
7	EDAD 695 Research Study N=5	100%			
7	EDAD 698 Thesis N=2	100%			

Table 7
Exit Portfolio

	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Meets Some Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Unable to score (0)
Exit Portfolio N= 14	100%				

 b. <u>Program Effectiveness Data</u>: 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.

 Upon exit, 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. The results below are combined for December, June, and September.

Table 8
Candidate Exit Survey Results-Courses (Administered June, September, December 2008)

Rate the quality of the following courses	High degree or excellent	Very valuable or strong	Adequate	Needs revising or poor
EDAD 541 Leadership, Organizational Management, and Ethics	13	1		
EDAD 544 Legal Aspects of Education: Implications and Applications for School Leadership	13	1		
EDAD 647A Fiscal Resources in Educational Administration	6	7		1
EDAD 647 B Human Resources in Educational Administration	6	5	1	1
EDAD 649 Urban Schools and the Community: Social, Political and Policy Issues	6	2	4	2
EDAD 677A Curriculum, Program Development, and Evaluation	7	2	4	1
EDAD 677B Instructional Leadership and Assessment	9	3	1	2
EDAD 680 Field Experience	8	1		
EDAD 695 Research Study	7			
EDAD 698 Masters Thesis	2			

Table 9
Candidate Exit Survey-Standards

Rate the extent to which the standard was met.	Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well
1. Develop a shared vision of learning that is supported by the school community	11	8	
2. Advocate, and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	12	2	
3. Manage the organization, operations, and resources to foster a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	14	5	
4. Collaborate with families and community members, respond to diverse community needs, and mobilize community resources.	10	3	1
5. Model a personal code of ethics and develop professional leadership capacity.	12	2	

6. Understand, respond and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	14		

4. **Complementary Data:** During the data meetings, instructors expressed some concerns about students' writing abilities. The minutes to the data discussion meeting are attached.

   N/a

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. Candidates indicated that five of the six standards were met extremely well or very well. The standard of collaborating with families and community members had one rating of moderately well.
   3. Candidates rated five courses as excellent or strong.
   4. Instructors indicated that there are students who write very well and produce work that helps both novice and sophisticated readers to learn new ideas. Students are also especially good at working in teams to give presentations that use technology to engage their classmates. They have a high level of spirit and provide inspiration that the field needs to grow.

   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. Instructors were particularly concerned about the quality of student of writing: grammar, spelling, writing conventions, and completeness of thought. One challenge is how to write research reports. Some students use the informal first person "I." Students are sometimes shocked when their writing is graded as inadequate. They assume that because they are in the program, they have no academic deficiencies. We may need to develop common standards for the writing we expect of students and give it more emphasis.
   3. Six candidates rated EDAD 649 and five candidates rated EDAD677A as adequate or needs revising.
   4. There are ten adjunct professors and only two full-time professors in EDAD. It is difficult to communicate on a regular basis.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings regarding: a) candidate performance and, b) program effectiveness?

   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. A search committee is seeking three additional full-time faculty members to support the program.

EDAD Tier I Assessment Meeting Minutes
December 16, 2008
AS 238

Attendance: Sparkle Peterson, Frank Tyrrell, Claudia Kreis, Damita Meyers-Miller, Charles Slater

Charlie gave a demonstration of Elluminate. When you go to the link, you are prompted to download Java. Damita purchased a headset to use the program but was unable to access it from her school because the computer would not download Java. The program has much potential for future communication, but it will be important to test accessibility from each site.

Charlie thanked instructors for their work in designing rubrics. 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.
Instructors reviewed the rubrics for their 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

Writing
Instructors were particularly concerned about the quality of student of writing: grammar, spelling, writing conventions, and completeness of thought. One challenge is how to write research reports. Some students use the informal first person "I." Students are sometimes shocked when their writing is graded as inadequate. They assume that because they are in the program, they have no academic deficiencies.

We may need to develop common standards for the writing we expect of students and give it more emphasis.

In EDAD 680 students write in their journals, write reflections, and develop their portfolios. They are excited when they make connections and learn what a principal really does, that the principal works extremely hard and balances many tasks at once.

Reading
Students need to read more in order to be able to speak intelligently about the field of education. There is a common framework and language that they should understand. They need to be aware of journals in the field and professional conferences such as ASCD. The instructor has a responsibility to help students develop the knowledge base that we sometimes take for granted.

Sometimes they just want to hurry up and finish the task. Of course, they are under pressure from school work where they have only recently mastered the craft of teaching. They have family obligations and assignments in other classes.

Strengths
There are students who write very well and produce work that helps both novice and sophisticated readers to learn new ideas. Students are also especially good at working in teams to give presentations that use technology to engage their classmates. They have a high level of spirit and provide inspiration that the field needs to grow.