

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION  
GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT  
ANNUAL REPORT  
FALL 2010**

*Submitted by Dr. Teresa R. Eagle, Program Coordinator  
[t.eagle@marshall.edu](mailto:t.eagle@marshall.edu)*

*Marshall University Graduate College  
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development  
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive  
South Charleston, WV 25303*

### **I. Program's Mission**

The mission of the doctoral program in education is to prepare practitioners to be reflective, ethical educators and researchers who contribute to the field of education. Program faculty are committed to creating a community of scholars through mentoring, engaging in collaborative research, and maintaining a focus on sound educational practices.

Program graduates are expected to:

1. Demonstrate a broad and in-depth knowledge and understanding of the educational field;
2. Demonstrate an in-depth knowledge and understanding of a selected area of emphasis;
3. Demonstrate knowledge and skill as scholars and researchers;
4. Become participants and active contributors in the community of scholars;
5. Become reflective, ethical educators who contribute to best practice in the field of education.

### **II. Student Learning Outcomes**

See attached chart A

### **III. Assessment Activities**

See attached chart B

### **IV. Overview of changes implemented in your program this past year based on results and planned action specified in last year's report.**

Research skills monitoring has continued within the framework of LS 703, Research Design. Seventeen students, new to the program since January, 2010, have completed LS 703 this fall.

The offerings for LS 765, Advanced Research and CI/LS 797, Dissertation Research have been restructured to better meet the needs of our doctoral students. Some students enrolled in 765 prior to identifying a dissertation research topic. These students found little to no value in 765. It was also noted that some students required a semester without coursework to complete their portfolio (qualifying assessment) for admission to candidacy. These two classes are now being offered so that up to three hours of CI/LS 797, Dissertation Research, will be allowed prior to LS 765 with approval of the students' chair. Additionally, students may enroll in 1-12 hours dissertation research each semester, rather than in blocks of 3 hours, to culminate in the minimum requirement of 12 hours dissertation research. These changes have been in effect for one year now. The results have been a more valuable experience in LS 765 (as noted by student evaluations). We are continuing to work on this issue to make the course as valuable as possible in assisting students at the writing stage.

**V. Specify any changes/modification made to your program based specifically on data obtained during Assessment Day Activities.**

Due to the nature of the program, we have not utilized Assessment Day for data collection. We have, however, used our seminar days (one in fall and one in spring), to collect data and determine student needs. As a result of this data collection, we are revising the seminar to better serve the needs of the students who have been admitted to candidacy. Special sessions will be offered specifically to assist them as they are involved in their research. We have also collected data on the use of the EdD degree, and will continue to collect and analyze this information to better advise students and potential students. Perhaps our most valuable change has been in the institution of doctoral graduate faculty meetings separate from the seminars. During these meetings, faculty have had an opportunity to review program policies, discuss issues and concerns. Potential doctoral faculty have had the opportunity to learn more about the program and to explore the role of the doctoral committee chair. As this role has been shown to be critical in the success of the doctoral candidate, stronger doctoral chairs will hopefully provide more support for students in achieving the goals of the program.

**VI. Assistance needed with assessment:**

NA

Chart A

**Marshall University**  
**Assessment of Program’s Student Learning Outcomes for the Doctoral Programs in Education**  
**Fall 2010**

Program’s Student Learning Outcomes	Year evaluated	Assessment Measures (Tools)	Benchmarks	Results	Analysis/ Planned Actions
<p>Students will have an in-depth knowledge and understanding of the educational field.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Coursework</p>	<p>Continuous Enrollment; Successful course completion</p>	<p>75% of students were enrolled in coursework for all three terms of 2010; 81% were enrolled for at least 2 terms</p>	<p>Successful completion of the various benchmarks in the program indicate that students are providing evidence of their knowledge and understanding.</p>
		<p>Portfolio Presentations</p>	<p>Completion of portfolios (admission to candidacy)</p>	<p>16 portfolios were successfully written and defended; portfolios are judged based on a rubric (see attachment) that covers all aspects of the portfolio defense; all areas must be acceptable for passing the defense</p>	<p>The program coordinator will continue to monitor student progress and encourage effective advising to ensure that students maintain progress in the program.</p>
		<p>Dissertation Completion</p>	<p>Dissertation completion</p>	<p>8 students had approved research proposals; approval of the proposal requires the signature of every committee member (see attachment)</p>	<p>To improve advising across the board, doctoral faculty will meet each semester to discuss the program, share ideas and plan for program improvement.</p>

Chart A

Program's Student Learning Outcomes	Year evaluated	Assessment Measures (Tools)	Benchmarks	Results	Analysis/ Planned Actions
				documented by approval by all committee members and electronic publishing of the dissertation; students are required to have an outside proof –reader for grammar and mechanics.	

Chart B

<p>Students will have an in-depth knowledge of their selected areas of emphasis.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Coursework</p> <p>Portfolio Presentations</p> <p>Dissertation Completion</p>	<p>Continuous Enrollment Successful course completion</p> <p>Completion of portfolios (admission to candidacy)</p> <p>Prospectus approval</p> <p>Dissertation completion</p>	<p>137 Students were enrolled; 9 completed coursework</p> <p>16 Students completed their portfolios and were admitted to candidacy; knowledge of the area of emphasis is documented on the portfolio rubric</p> <p>8 Prospectus approvals</p> <p>8 Dissertations completed</p>	<p>Since the area of emphasis is an integral part of the program, knowledge of the area of emphasis is required for students to successfully complete each benchmark.</p> <p>Advising for new students in selecting their areas of emphasis will be continued.</p>
<p>Students will produce quality research and scholarly work.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Research Knowledge Base Assessment</p> <p>Annual Review of Student progress covering March 2009-March 2010</p>	<p>Successful completion of initial research coursework</p> <p>Publication of research articles</p> <p>Presentations in scholarly venues</p>	<p>17 Students completed LS 703, Research Design</p> <p>7 research articles by students were published</p> <p>19 student presentations in scholarly venues</p>	<p>With the production of scholarly work a requirement for the portfolio, students and faculty have become very aware of opportunities.</p> <p>We will make an effort to update conference opportunities more often. With the sometimes prohibitive cost of travel, we will be encouraging students to strongly consider the publication option.</p>



## Annual Review of Individual Student Progress

**Doctoral Student:** Print out this form and fill in any relevant information from the preceding year. BE SURE TO UPDATE CONTACT INFORMATION AND INFORMATION ABOUT PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS. Bring your completed copy to review with your chair or advisor at the spring Doctoral Student/Faculty Seminar. If you are unable to attend the seminar, this is to be reviewed with your chair or advisor **no later than two weeks** after the spring seminar. This process is to be completely **annually**.

**Doctoral Chair/Advisor:** After you have conferenced with your students, submit these forms to the Office of Doctoral Programs in Education. You should submit a review form for each of the students you chair each year.

**Doctoral Student** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair/Advisor** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_ **Address** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone** \_\_\_\_\_ **E-mail** \_\_\_\_\_  
*Home Work Cell*

**Title/Place of Employment** \_\_\_\_\_

	Check off Achievements this year	Comments/Notes (include date if known)
	Committee Approval	
	Program Approval	
	Portfolio Plan	
	Portfolio Presentation	
	Admission to Candidacy	
	Prospectus	
	Publications and/or Submissions (include Journal Title, Date, Issue, Title, Co-author(s))	
	Presentations (include Association, Title, City, State, Date, Co-presenter(s))	
	Teaching Opportunities (include class name, number, semester and co-teacher if any)	

Please use the back of this form if additional space is needed.

**DOCTORAL ADMISSION TO CANDIDACY**

*Marshall University*

*Graduate School of Education & Professional Development*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Student ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

Doctoral Student's Name

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

The above named student, who is a matriculant for the Ed.D. degree with a major in the area of \_\_\_\_\_ and an area of emphasis of \_\_\_\_\_, has satisfactorily completed the admission to candidacy qualifying assessment.

The Committee recommends that the matriculant be admitted to formal candidacy.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Committee Chairperson**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Doctoral Student**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Program Coordinator**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dean – GSEPD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

Marshall University Doctoral Portfolio Rubric (5-31-05)

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<b>Collaboration</b>	Insufficient evidence of faculty collaboration or infrequent collaboration. Evidence provided is not applicable to the portfolio rationale or doctoral experience.	Demonstrates collaboration with faculty, which might revolve around one in-depth experience or smaller, more frequent experiences. Collaborative experiences are applicable to the portfolio rationale.	Clear evidence of extensive collaboration and interaction with faculty through multiple experiences. Demonstrates initiative in collaboration with peers and professional organizations.
<b>Depth of Understanding</b>	Insufficient evidence of understanding or knowledge of the field. Limited integration of learning experiences.	Demonstrates an understanding of the major tenets of the field and an integration of the learning experiences. Evidence of knowledge of the current issues, concepts, and research in the field.	Clear evidence of application and integration of learning experiences and knowledge of the field. Demonstrates self-evaluation of understanding and its integration into the field.
<b>Reflection</b>	Insufficient reflection or connection of the portfolio experiences. Portfolio work or learning has not occurred over time.	Demonstrates evidence of reflection, critical thought, and learning over time in the development and rationale of the portfolio experiences.	Clear evidence of the synthesis of material into one meaningful piece. Reflection is in-depth and demonstrates a clear connection between the doctoral program experiences and professional growth/development.
<b>Scholarship</b>	Insufficient evidence of attempts to submit work for publication or presentation at the state, regional, or national level. Lack of involvement in the scholarly activities (a bystander).	Demonstrates an integrated and synthesized knowledge of the field through course work, presentations, and publications. Evidence of involvement in scholarly activities. Submission of work for publication or presentation.	Clear evidence of scholarship in the field through presentation, publications, and course work. Work has been accepted for publication in scholarly journals or presentation at regional or national conferences.
<b>Communication</b>	Insufficient clarity, organization, or presentation in written and /or oral communication. Little evidence of composure, professionalism, or poise. Inability to adapt to changes. Limited working knowledge of multimedia. Inappropriate mechanics, grammatical errors, and/or lack of adherence to APA editorial guidelines.	Demonstrates composure, professionalism, and poise in writing, speaking, and presentation in a variety of experiences. Demonstrates organization and flow of the material. Demonstrates of a basic working knowledge of multimedia. Demonstrates use of appropriate mechanics, grammar, and APA editorial guidelines.	Clear, fluent, and effective presentation of thoughts. Creative application through a range of multimedia options. Demonstrates self confidence and awareness of audience involvement and feedback. Adapts quickly and smoothly to changes. Work is free from grammatical errors.
<b>Research</b>	Insufficient evidence of the utilization or understanding of the research process.	Demonstrates an understanding of the research process through the analysis and synthesis of information and/or data from course work, collaborative research activities, etc.	Utilization of the research process through a variety of projects that is highly organized and thorough. Research process has been incorporated outside of the classroom.

General Comments on back page → → → →