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Graduate Program Assessment Report
Academic Year: 2015 – 16

Program: Educational Administration
Assessment Coordinator: Donald E. Larsen, Ph.D.

Program Mission:
Mentoring and Developing Educational Leaders

Program Student Learning Goals:

• A program of study and support activities leading to certification as a P-12 principal
• A program of study and support activities leading to certification as a public school superintendent
• A program of study and support activities leading to a Masters in Educational Administration

Program Student Learning Objectives:

For Resident Principal and Master in Educational Administration:

5.A. A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by leading the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by school/program and community stakeholders;
5.B A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by leading through advocating, nurturing, and sustaining district/school/program cultures and coherent instructional programs that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
5.C A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
5.D A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5.E A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
5.F A school or program administrator is an educational leader who has the knowledge, skills, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure the success of each student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.

For Superintendent Program:
Standard 1 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is created, shared, and supported by the internal and external education community.

Standard 2 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and maintaining a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and the professional growth of staff.

Standard 3 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the district's organization, operations, and resources to support safe, efficient, and effective learning environments.

Standard 4 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members in order to respond to diverse interests and needs to mobilize community resources.

Standard 5 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Standard 7 The candidate is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by working effectively with the school district's board of directors to recommend appropriate policies and effectively lead and manage the district consistently with the Board's policies.

**Please respond to the following:**

1. Describe the level of faculty participation on this assessment.

   All core faculty participated

2. Describe the frequency of evaluating the program SLOs.

   Twice in each five year cycle.

3. How are the assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts?

   The educational administration programs strategic plan is built around the assessments identified in the formal assessment plan.
**Student Learning Objectives Assessed This Year:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>SLOs Assessed</th>
<th>Results and Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: assessment of written thesis by thesis committee</td>
<td>(list the numbers from above)</td>
<td>Example: Faculty evaluated early thesis drafts using a common rubric. Results indicate that 70% of the students are writing at an adequate level for demonstrating mastery of approaches to data analysis. In response, the 502 course will have a greater focus on nonparametric statistics using data from previous theses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assessments for EDAD 552</td>
<td>State Standards 5A and 5B</td>
<td>100% of program completers demonstrate proficiency with the common portfolio assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assessments for EDAD 647</td>
<td>State Standard 5G</td>
<td>100% of program completers demonstrate proficiency with the common portfolio assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvements Implemented Since Last Report:**

1. Developed and aligned common performance tasks in accordance with state standards
2. Aligned common performance tasks within each course in the residency principal program and the Masters in educational administration program
3. Obtained federal site approval for Tacoma from the Department of Education
4. Changed the superintendent’s program admissions process from once a year to quarterly
5. Moved from paper portfolios to using canvas and electronic copies of portfolios
6. Neither the GRE nor the MAT is required, but are optional for admission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Faculty Participation</strong></td>
<td>Broad faculty participation</td>
<td>Select faculty participation with departmental discussion.</td>
<td>Select faculty participation.</td>
<td>Minimal faculty participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency and Meaningfulness of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>1. All degree or program SLOs assessed twice in a 5-year cycle corresponding with the Graduate Council program review schedule. 2. Assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>1. All degree or program SLOs assessed at least once in a 5-year cycle corresponding with the Graduate Council program review schedule. 2. Assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>Some SLOs not assessed, but selected SLO assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>Some SLOs not assessed, and elected SLO assessments not meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>1. SLO assessment includes meaningful direct measures with threshold designations. 2. Indirect measures meaningfully supplement direct measures.</td>
<td>SLO assessment includes 1 meaningful direct measure for each outcome.</td>
<td>SLO assessment includes direct measures but they are not sufficiently meaningful.</td>
<td>No direct measures of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting Results</strong></td>
<td>Reported results detail meaningful conclusions sufficient to support data-informed and measurable improvements.</td>
<td>Reported results permit actionable improvements but in a manner that is inferential rather than measurable.</td>
<td>Reported results are not sufficiently specific or meaningful to permit data-informed improvements.</td>
<td>No results reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage of Implementation of the Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Improvement is fully implemented; program is prepared to evaluate the effect of the improvement upon student achievement.</td>
<td>Improvement is largely implemented (e.g., proposed curriculum change was approved by the department/college and sent to the Graduate Council/ACC).</td>
<td>Program has a plan for implementing the improvement.</td>
<td>Program has no plan for implementing the improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>