SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report (Due October 1, 2023)

Program Name (no acronyms): Educational Leadership   Department:

Degree or Certificate Level: Ed.D.   College/School: School of Education

Date (Month/Year): August 2023   Assessment Contact: Jody Wood

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2022-2023

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2022

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? Yes

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.): The educational leadership doctorate leads to superintendent certification by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in Missouri. We are obligated to align course learning outcomes to the Missouri Superintendent Standards and to include a field-based internship within the program.

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

SLO #1

Graduates will apply discipline-based literature to educational administration practices.

SLO #2

Graduates will apply evidence-based practices in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration.

SLO #3

Graduates will articulate arguments or explanations about evidence-based practice in leadership, communication, legal, financial curriculum/instruction/assessment/ and management in educational leadership.

SLO #4

Graduates will propose and conduct research related to educational leadership practices emphasizing professional integrity in the field.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

The artifacts of student learning used to determine student achievement of SLO3 were student doctoral projects and their team and individual oral examinations.

The EdD doctoral project is a team based project in which students identify and address a problem of practice in educational leadership at the district or system level. Students work in teams of 2, 3, or 4 persons throughout the duration of their program to address the identified problem using either a problem based learning, a policy analysis, or a product development methodology. The culminating final project report (and accompanying product, if applicable), the team oral examination, and individual students' Individual Analysis Reports and individual oral examinations are the artifacts used for this cycle.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**
   What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The team doctoral project report, the team oral examination, the Individual Analysis Reports and the individual oral examinations were evaluated using rubrics created by the faculty in 2021-2022 and updated in the fall of 2022. Those rubrics are attached.

Individual and team reports and oral exams were separately scored by the three faculty members participating on each student's committee. The rubric categories were "Exceeds Expectations" (scored a 3); "Meets Expectations" (cored a 2) and "Approaching Expectations" (scored a 1).

Faculty also reviewed qualitative data gathered during the oral examinations, in which students are asked how we can improve the program. Those comments were recorded and analyzed as well.

4. **Data/Results**
   What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The following data summarize the assessment of SLO 3:

	Average	Exceeds	Meets	Approaching
Doctoral Project	2.43	39	51	0
IAR	2.43	164	194	8
Oral Defense	2.61	70	44	0

The data were not disaggregated by modality as the program is uniform across locations and is only offered in person.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**
   What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

Noticings
"Meets" is the standard.
This data does reflect our overall sense of the EdD project performance. They generally were strong and better than "meets". And, there were times the individual performance on a team was approaching rather than meets in areas.

From our discussion of the book list: Higher education focuses on the past. Our students will be leading in the future.

Strengths
Our team project approach pulls people across the finish line.
Doing a team project is as difficult if not more so than doing it on your own
Data here and also students' qualitative comments review a strenth in teaching to SLO3. They know the content.

Improvements
Explicitly communicate a gradual release of responsibility to teams regarding project completion
Provide examples of exemplar projects - use same examplars across faculty
Provide models to teams of problem statement papers during their second fall semester
Consider a seminar or workshop on problem statement development in October of students' second year
Let's do some faculty PD on Ignatian values and pedagogy. Then discuss how to embed in our courses
John will send his video for the Ignite seminar. Also we will read Pope Francis, Why he leads the way he does .
Father Brian Massengale: Racial Justice in the Catholic Church. Read both books and watch the video over the summer and then discuss in the fall
We need to advocate with the Dean's Office for PD $$ for books and conferences
Book List: We agree we still should have it. Purpose is the foundational canon of literature about educational leadership.
Determine which courses/faculty will explicity teach / require the reading of which of the 10 books
Regarding the 10 books: we either need to teach it better or get rid of it.
An author: David Culberhouse. Karen T reads his work all the time but he doesn't publish books.
Bob V. will organize the faculty's work on the book list; Karen will co-lead

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings**
   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Faculty met on May 11, 2023, for 3 hours, to evaluate the above data and generate the noticings, strengths, and improvements documented above.

   B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	● Course content	● Course sequence
	● Teaching techniques	● New courses
	● Improvements in technology	● Deletion of courses
	● Prerequisites	● Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	● Student learning outcomes	● Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
	● Artifacts of student learning	● Data collection methods
	● Evaluation process	● Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

1. The faculty will engage in reading and professional development around Ignatian pedagogy
2. The faculty is organizing to re-evaluate the readings list expected of students during the program, specifically to ensure greater diversity of authors' perspectives and to ensure better currency, even as we want to hold on to the "classics" in educational leadership theory.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes**
   A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years **as a result of previous assessment data**?

   The prior year, our team used the same procedure (doctoral projects, and team and individual oral examinations, evaluated using faculty created rubrics) to analyze SLO 4. As a result of that work in the previous year, we updated the EdD Handbook and made changes to the expectations for students' writing in their Individual Analysis Reports.

   B. How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

   FAculty used the same method for assessing progress on SLO4: rubric-evaluated doctoral projects and oral examinations

   At our meeting this May 11, 2023, we also looked at two years of trend data for SLO4 and were affirmed to see the positive trend reported in Item C below.

   C. What were the findings of the assessment?

2022	Average	Exceeds	Meets	Below
Doctoral Project	2.46	13	15	0
IAR	2.38	63	102	0
2023	Average	Exceeds	Meets	Below
Doctoral Project	2.49	67	69	0
IAR	2.58	351	242	5

   D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Faculty will continue to use the rubrics created in future years as we have found these are an effective vehicle for articulating quality expectations and for evaluating program outcomes.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.

Ed.D. Assessment Notes 2021 - 2022

Schedule

<u>August 2021</u> - Collaborative faculty meeting to review foundational principles of Ed.D. program design and team project expectations

<u>September 2021</u> -
- Create an action plan to implement the 2021 - 2022 Program Assessment Cycle; analyzing SLO #4 using Team Projects and IAR
- Begin work on scoring guide to measure SLOs using IARs and projects as artifacts

<u>October, November 2021</u>
- Discuss EdD projects, especially PBL approaches
- Closing the loop from 2019-2020 and 2020-2021comps and course assignments data: share "big ideas"/theoretical constructs from each course

<u>December/January 2022</u> - Distribute, deploy, and train on rubrics and scoring processes; agree on data collection processes

<u>Spring 2022</u> (Season of oral exam) - faculty advisors and committee members utilize rubrics and report data (strengths and weaknesses regarding SLO #4) in Google Form, which will be distributed by Jaime.

<u>May/June 2022</u> - Faculty will analyze consolidated data for strengths and weaknesses in SLO #4 and determine needed improvements in pedagogy, curriculum, or assessments.

Ed.D. Assessment Notes 2022 - 2023

Schedule
Focus: SLO 3

<u>August 2022</u>
Faculty meeting to review revisions to EdD Handbook based on May 2022 Assessment Plan work and discuss the year's plan.

<u>September, October, November 2022</u>
Faculty meetings to collaborate around content of coursework, update syllabi:
- Curriculum, HR, PD&TE: Tichy, Hall, Wood, Vogelaar
- Foundations, Topics, Ethics, SDA, SCR/Politics: Lyon, James, Jahnke, Welborn

Outcomes:
- September: share Syllabi, update course outcomes and materials
- October: evaluate course content for equity
- November: share and update assessments and rubrics

MA Curriculum Planning: Hall, Jahnke, and Vogelaar will meet separately to discuss the MA courses: Principalship I, Principalship II, Curriculum, and PD/PE

<u>December, 2022 – April 2023</u>
Review revisions to rubrics based on Spring 2022 pilot.
Implement revised rubrics during oral exam season, this time to close the loop on SLO 4 and use for SLO3

<u>May 2023</u> – Faculty meeting to analyze data for strengths and weaknesses in SLO3 and determine needed improvements.