



LEADERSHIP STUDIES PROGRAM
2010 Annual Assessment Report
An Educational Leadership Constituent Council
Nationally Recognized Program

CONTENTS

- **Introduction**
- **Mission**
- **Assessment Model**
 - **Explanation Of the Knowledge and Skill Base**
 - **Philosophy for Preparation**
 - **Program Goals and Objectives**
 - **Data Sources**
- **Assessment of Student Outcomes Table**
- **Plans for 2011**
- **Assistance Needed**
- **Appendix A - Program Planning and Assessment Guide**
- **Appendix B - Portfolio Scoring Rubric**
- **Appendix C - Field Experience Rubric Example**

LEADERSHIP STUDIES PROGRAM

***It is the mission of the Leadership Studies Program
to prepare critically reflective practitioners***

(An Educational Leadership Constituent Council nationally recognized program)

GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2010

Submitted by Dr. Michael L. Cunningham, Program Director
mcunningham@marshall.edu

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

INTRODUCTION

Accreditation by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) requires that the Leadership Studies faculty regularly assess and review resulting data to make program refinements. It is important to note that all three of these accrediting bodies have modified their assessment process/methods in the last year. Of particular pertinence to the Leadership Studies program is the change in the ELCC model as it now requires seven assessment instruments that are directly tied to the national standards. Each of these seven assessments must clearly indicate which element of each standard is being addressed, both in the directions to the student and the evaluation rubric

Beyond these requirements the Leadership Studies Program Faculty recognize the value of regular program assessment, are actively engaged in an on-going assessment-feedback-modification loop, and meet regularly to discuss program improvement. In 2010, the faculty met for two complete days in October to review and make curricular and administrative changes based on the performance assessment of its candidates.

I. MISSION

The Leadership Studies faculty are committed to delivering the highest quality

program possible with available resources. The entire faculty meets on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month of the calendar year to focus on program improvement. Additionally, the faculty holds an annual fall planning retreat where all facets of the program are reviewed and appropriate revisions are made. This 2009 meeting was held in October and several changes were suggested. These changes are currently under committee review for feasibility.


II. ASSESSMENT MODEL

The assessment model adopted for the Leadership Studies program focuses on three broad areas: the program, the faculty and candidate performance. This assessment model includes three major components: data/information collection, forming judgments, and making decisions. Based on these three components, assessment is operationally defined as a process in which data/information are collected, used as a consideration in forming judgments, and then becomes the basis for making decisions. These decisions involve actions related to the program, faculty and candidates. The assessment model is depicted graphically in **Figure 1**.

The following characteristics provided the framework used for the development of program assessment:

- It is designed jointly by subject content faculty and school partners;
- It uses professional, national, state, and institutional standards;
- It is embedded in programs and is continuous;
- It is formative and summative
- It uses multiple indicators for success at multiple decision points;
- It uses external sources of information;
- It is reliable and valid;
- It uses criteria to determine levels of accomplishments; and
- It uses outcomes to improve programs.

Figure 1: Flow of Decision Making
ASSESSMENT MODEL



III. OVERVIEW OF CHANGES IMPLEMENTED IN PAST YEARS

The goals of the Leadership Studies program are to provide access to the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for our students' growth and development as school leaders. These goals lie at the heart of our philosophy, which emphasizes knowledge utilization. Whatever the breadth or depth of a given knowledge base, it is likely insufficient to capture the instrumental problems that await administrative practitioners in the field. Providing students multiple opportunities to actualize their knowledge in the field as they acquire it can serve not only the program's goals, but can reduce the discrepancies between the university's understandings and students' needs.

These goals were first re-examined in 1999 when routine reviews undertaken by the faculty revealed a deepening dissatisfaction with the purpose, content, and currency of program requirements. Pursuant to this review, the faculty undertook a comprehensive analysis and revision, grounded in research, theory, and practice, of each element of the curriculum. Subsequent to the major review of goals in 1999, the faculty annually reviews its goals and related progress using data obtained from sources as indicated in this document. As a consequence of the information gathered in these annual reviews, another complete program review was made in 2009 and significant revisions were proposed. In 2010 progress towards those revisions was examined and changes to administrative tasks and processes were developed to improve communication and implementation.

The program assessment activities and instruments were examined in relationship to the standards of state and national accrediting bodies to ensure conformity to a universally accepted knowledge base. Because we believe it is knowledge utilization, however, which provides the coherence which sustains a student's program of study, multiple opportunities to actualize the knowledge catalyzed by course work must be available. Thus, in addition to the domain knowledge students accumulate from their course work, procedural knowledge is acquired through a series of field experiences and the identification of a field mentor, an experienced practitioner whom the student respects and whose advice he or she values, who will agree to work collaboratively with him or her. It is the first step in traversing the divide between academic preparation and the world of practice. These realignments, academic and field, were reviewed by both internal and external agencies to ensure a comprehensive curriculum which makes every effort to provide the knowledge and experiences which are essential for successful leadership preparation.

Because the Leadership Studies faculty recognize that our students are working adults who have unique learning needs, we are committed to using a variety of instructional approaches and a variety of assessments – both traditional and performance based. These approaches and assessments are designed to provide coherence to the program, reflected in the student’s presentation of a portfolio as a capstone project which demonstrates the student’s comprehension of and competency with the program’s principles and their interdependence with professional standards and practice.

If it is the gap between theory and practice which undermines the relationship between pre-service preparation and school leadership, it is our hope that the emphasis on knowledge utilization can help to reduce the space and make it easier for students to bridge the divide. The effort to actualize domain knowledge through the redistribution of field experiences and the reflective entries developed in collaboration with mentors and faculty creates multiple opportunities for a discursive relationship between universities and schools and between faculty and students that is encouraging; one in which knowledge of what is useful in the world of practice can be jointly constructed.

In addition to these concerns, maintaining enrollment in an increasingly competitive environment continues to be an issue that must be addressed. In concert with the curricular adjustments being undertaken, the program is moving to an all-online delivery model. The program is in the process of implementing these changes and instituted a partial roll-out in the Fall of 2010.

It is also important to note that beginning in the Fall of 2011 the Leadership Studies program will include the Adult & Technical Education program. This will mean the addition of a Master’s of Science degree with several areas of emphases. The addition of the ATE courses and faculty will bring both challenges and opportunities. The goal will be to grow and develop new opportunities in both programs.

DATA SOURCES

The program collects data for program planning and improvement from several sources:

Annual Reports. The West Virginia Department of Education and NCATE require annual evaluation and progress reports related to program structure, student performance on national exams, and multiple program and student assessment points.

Annual Report and Review of Faculty. Each full-time member is required to submit an annual report of activities and accomplishments. This report addresses the three main areas of faculty responsibility and includes a component requiring the development of a work plan for the following year.

Content Specialization Test Results (PRAXIS II). An increasingly important element of unit/program evaluation efforts is student performance on the West Virginia Board of Education mandated Praxis II test. All students admitted to professional education programs in West Virginia after September 1, 1985, must pass a test in their area of specialization to be eligible for licensure in West Virginia. Program faculty review test results for any program or course implications. A new Praxis exam was introduced in the second-half of 2010. It is not yet clear what this change will mean for our program and our students.

Course Performance. All Leadership Studies students are monitored in terms of their course performance while in the program. Students are required to maintain a 3.0 GPA or are placed on academic probation. Students must also submit reflective journals and narratives with reflective accounts of 31 field experiences at regular intervals throughout the program. These are monitored by a committee of faculty.

Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC). The EPPAC is the primary external advisory committee for professional education. The group is composed of representatives from each of the 16 counties in the university's service region and includes representatives from each of the role groups for which the unit prepares professional education personnel. Faculty members also serve on the committee, as does a representative from the West Virginia Department of Education. This group reviews and provides recommendations on new programs, program modifications, and results from unit content specialization tests as well as other related issues.

Employer follow-up Studies. A unit level employer follow-up study is conducted annually. Program results from the unit study are shared with all faculty. The

Graduate Program Committee also reviews the results of these studies for possible program implications.

External Agency Evaluation. The Leadership Studies Program is subject to a number of external agency evaluations. All programs are subject to review by the Marshall University Board of Governors every five years. All licensure programs must be reviewed and re-filed with the West Virginia Board of Education every five years. The unit is also subject to reviews by the North Central Association and NCATE. The West Virginia Board of Education and NCATE require annual evaluation reports.

Faculty Merit Review. Funds are made available annually for distribution as merit pay to selected faculty. Faculty are recommended for merit pay by a faculty committee or the dean.

Graduate Follow-Up Studies. Graduate follow-up studies are conducted at the program and institutional levels. The results from these surveys are compiled and made available to all internal and external policy and advisory groups and to faculty within the program. Program faculty review these data for any possible program implications.

Internal Program Review. All unit programs are subject to an internal program review every five years.

Peer Evaluation. All probationary faculty are required to undergo formal peer observation during their probationary period. This process involves completion of a formal observation instrument, which becomes a part of the faculty file.

Performance Assessment. All students completing licensure programs in West Virginia must successfully complete a performance assessment prior to being recommended for licensure. These performance assessments are administered as part of the clinical or field-based experience and are retained as part of the students' permanent files.

PRAXIS II Administration and Supervision Test: Students completing the Leadership Studies Program who are being recommended for certification, must achieve a passing score on the appropriate Praxis II Test.

Program Faculty Review. Program faculty periodically undertake reviews of individual programs or parts of programs. These studies often result in recommendations for program modification that are acted on by the Graduate Program Committee and the West Virginia Department of Education if it is a change in a certification program.

Special Studies. The Graduate Program Committee, the Office of the Dean, or others as appropriate, conduct special studies as needs arise. Examples of such studies have included a review of program admissions requirements and a study of clinical and field-based procedures.

Student Evaluation of Faculty. Institutional policy requires that students evaluate all courses.

Beginning assessment. Student Survey - Students are surveyed at the beginning of the program as a part of the course that is a pre-requisite for the remainder of the courses in the program. Information gathered is compared with that derived from the final course to provide faculty with data for program decision making.

Final Portfolio Presentation. Students present their portfolios to the program faculty as an exit project for the program. This presentation is used by faculty to provide a comprehensive assessment of the students' abilities and as a source of information for program evaluation and change.

Marshall University Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level

Component Area/Program/Discipline: Leadership Studies

Date: October 2010

Component / Course / Program Level					
Student Outcome	Persons Responsible	Assessment Tool	Standards Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
The graduates of the Leadership Studies program will be able to demonstrate an understanding of and the capability to identify contexts; develop with others a vision and purpose;	Leadership Studies Program Director & Faculty	National Praxis II Exam	West Virginia Cut Score	Ninety six percent (96%) of candidates passed the Praxis II national examination.	Decision: None required
		Reflective Writings Assessment using rubric	Maintain acceptable first-effort pass rates	65% of self-reflective essays were evaluated as acceptable or better on the first effort	Decision: Students need to be more aware of assignment standards and of essay expectations. Action: 1. The rubrics and guiding writings for students were revised again .

<p>use information; frame problems; exercise leadership processes to achieve common goals; and act ethically within the education community</p> <p>The graduates of the Leadership Studies program will be able to demonstrate an understanding of, and the capability to, identify contexts; develop with others a vision and purpose; use information; frame problems; exercise leadership processes to achieve common goals; and act ethically within the education community</p>	<p>Leadership Studies Program Director & Faculty</p>	<p>Faculty evaluations of Portfolio Defense using Rubric</p>	<p>Maintain overall means that reflect at least an "acceptable" level on the rubric</p>	<p>The faculty evaluations of candidates for two semesters ranged from 2.76 - 3.46.</p>	<p>Decision: 2.0 is minimally acceptable level. Changes in the LS 685 course will be designed to address this issue</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

III. PLANS FOR THE CURRENT YEAR 2010-11


The Leadership Studies faculty's annual two-day planning retreat in October resulted in the formation of several work groups to carry out revisions to the program. One of the major issues is the assurance that assessment tools are working and the data are being appropriately collected.

IV ASSISTANCE NEEDED

Continued financial support for salaries, faculty development, recruitment of students, and operations is essential. Leadership Studies faculty salaries remain uncompetitive with those of leaders working at any level in school districts, both locally and nationally. With the faculty vacancy currently open, finding qualified and experienced faculty will be very difficult as our starting salary is approximately 56% of that of school leaders working outside of higher education. Additionally, Marshall University salaries for Leadership Studies faculty are not competitive with other institutions of higher education, even within West Virginia.

Competition from online, private schools and West Virginia's university-converted four year schools continue to provide concern. Since some of these programs are not accredited, the competition is often very unfair. Enrollment numbers in Marshall's Leadership Studies program are being maintained, however, mostly due to the reputation the high-quality program offered at MU.

Clerical support for the ATE program will need to be continued as there are over 400 students enrolled in ATE courses on an average semester.



APPENDIX A

PROGRAM PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT GUIDE

DATA	ANALYSIS/JUDGEMENT	DECISION/ACTION REQUIRED
<p>A. Program Admissions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicants 2. Admits 3. Demographics 4. Average GRE/MAT scores 5. Other 	<p>Aug 2009 – Aug 2010</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 151 applicants 2. 127 admitted (84%) 3. Top four geographical areas counties are Kanawha, Cabell, and Putnam counties in West Virginia and the state of Ohio. 4. Average UGPA=3.08; Average MAT=389; Average GRE=432/ Quantitative and 450 Verbal 5. Exceed unit averages on admission test 	<p>A cohort group in Huntington continues and a new cohort in Clay is in the discussion stage.</p>
<p>B. Program Productivity (Current year and trends)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course sections 2. Enrollment (Seat count) 3. Student credit hours 4. Cohorts (# and status) 5. Third party contracts 6. Graduates (by level and county of residence) 7. Collaborative Programs 8. Clinical Experiences/Field Placements 9. Other 	<p>Course Sections: Number of course sections has been relatively consistent over the last three years when compared by semesters .</p> <p>Enrollment: Enrollment increased slightly from 2001 to 2002, then decreased from 2002 to 2003. The decrease in masters degree student enrollments has leveled off in 2010</p> <p>Student Credit Hours: Student credit hours which had previously decreased have leveled off due to increasing enrollments in non-degree programs.</p> <p>Cohorts: RESA II</p> <p>Third Party Contracts: WV Center for Prof. Dev. , Kanawha County Schools</p> <p>Graduates: Degree productivity has leveled off after a decline spanning several years.</p> <p>Clinical Experiences/Field Placements: Students do field experiences throughout their programs with the identified mentor. Generally, this occurs within the student's district. Experiences are distributed across the PK-12 environment.</p>	<p>Enrollments have stabilized and new cohort groups could be promising source of additional students, but there is new competition from on-line programs.</p>

DATA	ANALYSIS/JUDGEMENT	DECISION/ACTION REQUIRED
<p>D. Faculty</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status (Retention/Recruitment) 2. Part-Time Faculty Utilization 3. Advisee Load by Faculty 4. Research and Scholarly Activity 5. Faculty Development 6. Student Course Evaluation Summary 7. Research/Grant Activity 8. Other 	<p>Status: Of eight faculty positions, four are full professors, one is an associate and one is an assistant professor. Five are tenured and two positions are vacant and under search. All Leadership Studies faculty member hold a terminal degree in the field.</p> <p>Student Course Evaluation Summary: While all course evaluations are generally high, fall semester evaluations tend to be slightly lower, with the lowest ranking in "My instructor is well prepared and organized," and "The assignments are relevant to course objectives. "</p> <p>Leadership Studies faculty evaluation means consistently fall significantly above the college means.</p> <p>Research and Scholarly Activity: Five faculty hold Marshall University doctoral faculty status and one holds graduate faculty status.</p> <p>Other: Program faculty have an average of 11 years in public school, six years in public school administration and 24 years in higher education.</p>	<p>Recruit highly qualified faculty.</p> <p>Encourage university support for increasing financial attractiveness of positions. Continue to support portfolio process at doctoral level to promote faculty scholarship and research.</p>

DATA	ANALYSIS/JUDGEMENT	DECISION/ACTION REQUIRED
<p>E. Program Approval Information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SPA (NCATE) Accreditation Status 2. NCA - HLC Status 3. WVDE Approval Status 4. BOG/HEPC Review Status 5. Other 	<p>SPA: The program received national recognition from ELLC in 2002.</p> <p>NCA: The program was reviewed by the HLC in January 2001 and was fully approved.</p> <p>WVDE Approval Status: The program is fully approved by the West Virginia Department of Education with certifications in Principalship, Supervisor of Instruction and Superintendent.</p>	<p>Program faculty have been diligent in examining the program and seeking validation thru program approval. Critical reflection must continue to ensure that the program continues to meet the needs of candidates.</p> <p>Work at the state level to deal with non-NCATE certification programs.</p>
<p>F. Employer Follow-Up</p>	<p>Survey of Superintendents indicated general approval of MA program graduates.</p>	<p>Focus groups with County Superintendents will be held this winter.</p>
<p>G. Candidate Performance (Presentation and summary of candidate performance assessment data from past year); PRAXIS data included where available</p>	<p>Candidate performance is assessed with the following data:</p> <p>Quantitative: Grades, Praxis score, scaled self-perception scores, reflective writing assessments, Portfolio symposium, evaluations, and student self-assessment and field experience.</p> <p>Qualitative: Reflective writing, student self-perception and evaluation of program, portfolio evaluations.</p> <p>Grades: Over 90% of candidates grades were "A" with a range over four semesters of 90. 3%-94. 1%. Those grades are consistent with the PRAXIS pass rates.</p> <p>Praxis: No reliable Praxis data is currently available</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program needs current Praxis data in usable formats.

DATA	ANALYSIS/JUDGEMENT	DECISION/ACTION REQUIRED
<p>H Student self-perception of skill scores on pre-post program instrument.</p>	<p>Scaled Self-Perception Scores: On 1-5, (low to high) Likert Scale the candidates' self-perception of skill confidence post-mean scores ranged from 4.02 to 5.1. Every Delta mean was positive with a range of increase of .35 - 2.09. It should be noted that the items with a narrow increase had a high pre-mean. The areas of greatest growth (more than 2.00) were again strategic planning using data, facilities planning, scheduling, understanding how the social fabric of the larger community influences the educational enterprise, and school law.</p> <p>Reflective Writings Assessment: The range for percentage of candidates who satisfactorily completed the reflective essays on the first attempt ranges from 75% (Integrity) to 93% (Vision).</p>	<p>Decision: Faculty need to revisit changing success rates to look for causality.</p> <p>Action: 1. Changes are being made in the revised program to address these issues</p>

DATA	ANALYSIS/JUDGEMENT	DECISION/ACTION REQUIRED
H Continued	<p>Portfolio Symposium Evaluations: The faculty evaluations of candidates for two semesters ranged from 1.95 - 3.82. The mean rating was 2.89. Those assessments related to ELCC standards are strong and reflect the alignment of program and standards. Our primary area of concern is improving the Praxis scores, especially in the areas of Determining Educational Needs, Development of Staff and Program Evaluation, and Individual and Group Leadership Skills. Our analysis of the portfolio presentation evaluation shows that qualitative and quantitative data are inconsistent and that the quantitative data are insufficient for providing candidate feedback.</p>	<p>Decision: Students should be provided with clearer instructions, earlier in their program.</p> <p>Action: Move to new orientation process with new program revisions</p>

APPENDIX B PORTFOLIO SCORING RUBRIC

Assessment Area	Exceptional	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Portfolio Entries	Entries are of exceptional quality, representing exemplary graduate level work.	Entries meet program expectations for graduate work and are of acceptable quality.	Entries do not meet program expectations for graduate work and are of poor quality.
Knowledge and application of ISLLC standards.	Course entries provide evidence of comprehensive knowledge and application of the ISLLC standards.	Course entries provide evidence of basic knowledge and application of the ISLLC standards.	Course entries do not provide sufficient evidence of recognition of ISLLC standards.
Integration of LS priorities	Portfolio provides evidence of a high degree of insight regarding the interdependence of the LS priorities and professional practice.	Portfolio provides evidence of understanding regarding the interdependence of the LS priorities and professional practice.	Portfolio shows no evidence of recognition of the interdependence of the LS priorities and professional practice.
Personal/ Professional	Portfolio demonstrates sustained reflection and critical thought. Capstone project addresses how portfolio contributed to professional/ personal growth.	Portfolio demonstrates some evidence of reflection and critical thought. Capstone project addresses process of portfolio development.	Portfolio reflects little evidence of reflection or critical thought. Capstone project does not address either the process of portfolio development or reasons for inclusion of entries.
Use of technology	Portfolio is enhanced by creative application of a range of multimedia links/options.	Connections between and among portfolio entries are made clear through logical use of multimedia links/options.	Multimedia links/options are confusing or absent resulting in a portfolio of discrete entries.

All degree students follow a planned program of study and must maintain a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0.

APPENDIX C

Sample Rubric for Field Experience: Analysis of School Data Use

Assessment Area	A (Acceptable)	B (Acceptable)	Unacceptable
Analysis of school data use	The analysis is conducted in a manner which exhibits a thorough knowledge and understanding of the uses of multiple measures including types of data and their relationships to each other and to the purposes of the data collection. The analysis shows a deep understanding of the purpose and challenges of using data in a school setting. The students shows initiative by consulting and citing additional sources and by displaying work in an innovative fashion	The analysis is conducted in a manner which demonstrates an understanding of the four types of data, how to put data together, and how to communicate data. The paper meets the assignment criteria and demonstrates an understanding of the purpose of the experience.	The field experience does not meet the assignment criteria and shows little evidence of an understanding of the purpose of the assignment.
Reflection on the field experience	The reflection on the field experience shows an ability to synthesize theory and practice. The impact on student learning and the value of the assignment to a reflective principal practitioner is discussed in depth,	The reflection on the field experience adequately addresses the impact of the experience on the student's learning and on the student's preparation for the principalship.	The reflection shows minimal understanding of theory and practice and there is limited discussion of the impact of the experience on student learning.
Presentation /Mechanics	The documentation of the field experience and the reflection show excellent organizational skills and the ideas are presented cogently and with clarity. No mechanical errors are present.	The documentation of the field experience and the reflection show adequate organizational skills in a clear manner with few mechanical errors.	The documentation of the field experience and the reflection do not conform to the standard for graduate work.