

**Graduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Summary for Building Leadership - October, 2015**

**A. Masters Degree in Educational Leadership and Administration
(and/or Building License Candidates)**

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

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

B. Outcome Reporting

Student Learning Outcomes

A total of six Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) are being used to assess the Masters program in Educational Leadership to meet the requirements of the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC's) accreditation and review process. These outcomes reflect the first six Standards for School Leaders, created by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and used as a framework for school leadership licensure by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE is being replaced by the Council of Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP). Each of the first six standards includes an assessment of the application of knowledge, performances, and dispositions through a portfolio process that includes artifacts demonstrating application to real settings. The seventh outcome (Internship for Learning) integrates all six SLO's (or content areas guiding the program) and is not included in this report. This outcome is part of the assessment process for KSDE/NCATE/CAEP.

The MS degree in Educational Leadership provides experiences that ensure educational leaders will acquire knowledge, establish beliefs, and develop skills in the following areas: Vision for Learning, Culture for Learning, Management for Learning, Community for Learning, Ethics for Learning, Context for Learning and Internship for Learning.

- Student Learning Outcome One focuses on Vision for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- Student Learning Outcome Two focuses on Culture for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- Student Learning Outcome Three focuses on Management for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
- Student Learning Outcome Four focuses on Community for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
- Student Learning Outcome Five focuses on Ethics for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
- Student Learning Outcome Six focuses on Context for Learning. This outcome promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Assessment Method(s)

Direct Measurement

Learning outcomes will be assessed through two components of the MS exam (portfolio) that is completed by all degree-seeking students during the final semester of enrollment. The first component consists of artifacts to demonstrate leadership knowledge, skills and attitudes related to the standard. The second component to be used for assessment is a narrative summarizing students' evidence of knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to these standards. The third assessment is the self-assessment instrument for each of the SLOs and only the final year-end rating is being reported.

Each SLO has three assessments conducted at the end of the program with materials submitted by the student in a comprehensive portfolio. The first assessment for each SLO is a review of a showcased artifact selected by the student to portray his or her best attainment of that standard. The second assessment uses evidence provided in a narrative articulating knowledge (supported by theory), skills (examples of specific activities and development levels), and dispositions (attitudes desired in the field) developed during the program and a rating for each standard/outcome is determined by evaluating faculty instructors.

Indirect Measurement

The third assessment is a self-assessment completed by all students rating their progress in acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes related to the standards. The self-assessment instrument is a matrix using four levels of attainment in the areas of knowledge, performances, and dispositions for each of the six standards. The program assessment team records the final attainment levels and degree of perceived growth for each MS student/candidate preparing the exam portfolio. Totals for the whole group will be calculated and reported by percents according to the attainment levels.

Additional Program Evaluation

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

Student Sample and Reporting Process

All students/candidates completing a degree and submitting a portfolio for the MS exam are included in the program assessment process. Students are expected to perform at a Level 3 – Proficient level, with an understanding that a few students may be at Level 2 (Basic level) based on their leadership experiences and years in education. Scores from the rubrics are compiled for the academic year and then reported by the total group. The three measures are used at the end of each year to assess students/candidates completing the portfolio and degree. Data from each semester in one academic year are compiled, analyzed, and reported to EDLEA faculty in the fall of the following academic year to assist with program development and improvement targets. In general, the program has learned that few if any students receive the lowest rating on the assessments. If/when that does occur, the program faculty work with the student to provide additional experiences that lead to a revision sufficient to earning a passing rating (of level 2 or higher.) High percentages in the upper levels of the scoring system are likely explained by the MS being almost entirely delivered now in a leadership academy model where participants are selected by the sponsoring school districts. These students are already considered informal school leaders and have more leadership experiences than traditional students who enroll individually without a formal selection process.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Assessment Data and Process

The MS program in Educational Leadership at KSU is highly successful. All candidates are exiting with the necessary knowledge and skills required of an entry-level school administrator as evidenced by assessment data and the majority of candidates with developed competencies beyond the basic level. At the same time, the data emphasize that program success is a function of a purposeful, responsive, and viable curriculum and assessment system. Consequently, the data indicate a need to continue what is

working well (i.e., using data throughout the candidates' experiences to inform the program and to guide individual growth).

The Faculty of Educational Leadership continuously considers ways the program can continue to improve. These target goals include:

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

Program Improvements

The Faculty of Educational Leadership has taken the following actions and appropriate revisions to continuously implement and improve program results and student success as a response to assessment results:

- Increase understanding and improve inter-rater reliability on project and rubric assessments
- Meaningful data disaggregation and analysis of selected variables identified by faculty through review of annual data as well as through responsive planning to address leadership preparation standards and changing needs of local schools/districts
- Disaggregation of data by meaningful characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, length of time in the program, etc.) to address any identification of underrepresented populations in program enrollment
- Consideration of areas such as academic writing, research/assessment, special populations, evaluation and leading purposeful improvement discussions, etc., are topics emerging in practice and important to include in course content
- Continued expansion of district leadership academies (small district, new partner districts) and cohorts, including communication of program goals/objectives and an integrated curriculum, for traditional track students not in member leadership academies
- Development of a clear process to collect and analyze program data by department faculty (leadership academies and traditional track courses)
- Continue to achieve excellence in instruction through various delivery formats (on-line, blended, face-to-face)

Future Plans

The Faculty of Educational Leadership continues to consider ways the masters program can improve. Plans consist of revising assessment rubrics as new KSDE, ISLLC, NELP, and CAEP standards verify a clear direction for program clarifications and revising course offerings, course syllabi, and content for the Building Leadership Program. This plan consists of an annual process whereby: (a) course and curriculum revisions are considered to align objectives to changes in specific standards. Such course and curriculum revision incorporates the latest research on effective preparation for school leaders and anticipated needs in the profession and course offerings in general. Current assessments may require revision to more accurately align with emerging standards related to state and national leadership preparation. When assessments are revised, professional learning activities for faculty development in understanding rating goals and inter-rater reliability are planned. In addition, faculty research projects in the area of assessments for leadership preparation programs can prove beneficial.

Summary of this Report

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University offers a Masters degree/license option for students pursuing an opportunity to increase their knowledge and skills in educational leadership through capstone district/university partnership leadership academies as well as through traditional high quality courses utilizing skillful approaches in instructional delivery. Annual review of

data reveals high achievement levels across leadership preparation and state standards and as rated by students. Department faculty strive to maintain the highest level of instructional excellence and service to each student through on-going dialogue to target and improve all program models and respond to the changing and diverse needs of school level leadership.