

**ANNUAL REPORT FOR EDUCATION SPECIALIST PROGRAM  
(ED.S) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT (2010-2011)**

**A. PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

**1. Purpose and Primary Target Population.**

The Ed.S is a degree program for experienced, post-masters candidates seeking to enhance and advance their professional knowledge and applications in selected specialist disciplines such as Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, Reading /Literacy, Counseling and Adult/Community and Technical College Studies (ATE). The Ed.S is an "umbrella" degree which allows students to continue to develop core/foundation skills at the post-master's level and to pursue advanced study in the selected specialist area. In some cases, the degree may qualify one for horizontal and vertical movement in an existing professional career, for advanced salary classifications within the K-12 education sector, for acquiring new positions within a given specialist discipline or to be concurrently enrolled in the Ed.D program. Others may simply pursue the program as a means of personal and professional accomplishment as life-long learners notwithstanding any specific career objectives.

GSEPD Mission Statements: The mission of the Graduate School of Education and Professional Development is to meet the academic needs of educators and other professional personnel in the area of human services. The College provides education and services for a society that is open, complex, demanding, and evolving with an array of degree and professional development programs, continuing education opportunities and services designed to address the needs of the adult learner. Generally, students served are mid-career professionals committed to continuing their career and professional development within the state, region or local community. The mission of the GSEPD relates to several elements of the mission of Marshall University, including but not limited to: providing affordable, high quality graduate education appropriate for the state and the region; providing services and resources to promote student learning, retention, and academic success; fostering outreach service activities; making instruction available throughout Marshall's service area using all appropriate modes of delivery; promoting economic development through research, collaboration, and technological innovations; and educating a citizenry capable of living and working effectively in a global environment.

**2. Program Goals/Objectives.**

- a. Perceive a disposition for personal and professional productivity and continued growth as a life-long learner in the chosen specialist discipline. (Area of Emphasis)
- b. Use existing and emerging technologies to organize and conduct research and to enhance related research products/productivity. (CORE)

- c. Up-date to a current, in-depth knowledge base of concepts and principles in the chosen specialist discipline. (Relates to Area of Emphasis)
- d. Prepare a formal, written product of an educational issue or problem, demonstrating the ability to synthesize and integrate core and content knowledge (Capstone).
- e. Incorporate ethical and moral standards in designing and conducting educational research or related investigative activities with a diversity of human subjects. (Relates to Core and Capstone)
- f. Develop proficiency in technical/research writing for preparing relevant products, reports or other forms of output in the specialist discipline. (Core)

### 3. Program Viability and Necessity.

The requirements for the C& I and Educational Leadership options have approximately a 90% overlap with the requirements for these same programs in the doctoral program. These include courses in the Core and Areas of Emphasis Consequently, these two options in the Ed.S are more viable and do show relatively greater enrollments compared to the options for Counseling, Reading and Adult/technical Education. However, credit hour production is relatively consistent among the areas of emphasis, with the exception of Reading/Literacy. Requirements for the Ed.S programs and related credit hour production can be seen in Appendices B and C.

## **B. PROGRAM ADMISSIONS.**

### 1. Applicants.

All program applicants must meet the admission requirements of the Marshall University Graduate College. The Education Specialist degree is available to applicants who hold a Masters degree from a regionally accredited college or university. Between 2010-2011, records indicate that 7 Ed.S candidates were admitted to the Program and completed the initial pre-assessment of essential professional competencies. However, these figures are somewhat deflated by the fact that some candidates do not immediately return the assessment survey. Inspection of files for Ed.S candidates recently admitted, (e. g, to the C&I option) for Spring/Fall 2011 found 10 cases lacking copies of the completed surveys. This suggests that the count of new admissions for 2010-2011 is understated. The program will monitor this more closely in the future to ensure a more reliable count of admissions. Currently there are 40 +candidates in the C&I area of emphasis, excluding concurrent doctoral candidates.

### 2. Demographics.

The Ed. S Program draws its candidates primarily from the southeastern and southwestern regions of the state, although several matriculate from the borders of Kentucky and Ohio. An international student hails from Vietnam, who completed initial graduate study at MU in Huntington. The great majority are experienced classroom teachers or school/county administrators in the K-12 school system. Others come from various work backgrounds: health/ hospital,

community social agencies, business, theological, government, and community college and adult technical education settings. A portion of these candidates will transition to the doctoral program.

Candidates have completed academic training and credentials at various colleges and universities in West Virginia including Marshall U., Marshall University Graduate College, West Virginia State, WVU, WVIT, Bluefield State, Glenville State, University of Charleston and Salem University. Others have brought credentials ,e.g., from Michigan State University, Aquinas College, Alice Lloyd, National University, Potsdam University and Pikeville College. These credentials place candidates among the 39% of “white collar workers” in the state and among 17% of a group of WV residents with bachelor’s degrees or higher. There is a good gender mix in the program with a slightly greater portion of females choosing the Curriculum and Instruction and Reading/Literacy options and a greater portion of males choosing the Educational Leadership option.

A cursory check of Ed.S program files for Curriculum and Instruction (40) found the gender mix to be about equal (F22/M18). As noted previously a great many of the doctoral candidates also opt for the Ed.S along the way. Interestingly, the current gender mix in the doctoral program is 34/103 favoring females (77%).

### 3. Scores on admission tests.

Appendix A shows GPA data and the entry scores on the GRE verbal and quantitative sections for Ed.S and Ed.D candidates for 2010-2011. As illustrated, 19 candidates were admitted with an average undergraduate GPA of 3.53. Verbal mean scores ranged from 380 to 690 while quantitative scores ranged between 510 and 540. Combined verbal and quantitative mean scores ranged from a low of 890 to a high of 1230. These averages exceeded, e.g., a low of 722 and a high of 1005 for similar data from 2009-2010.

## **C. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY.**

### 1. Course Sections delivered.

Appendix B notes the number of course sections for the *Core* portion of the program delivered between the Summer,2010 and Spring, 2011 terms. These sections accounted for 183 enrollees and 549 student credit hours produced. Appendix C shows the same kind of data for courses in the *Areas of Emphasis*. For the same periods, there were 14 sections of specialty courses delivered, which accounted for 163 enrollees and 489 student credit hours produced. In all, the Program delivered 32 sections, with 346 enrollees and 1038 student credit hours produced.

### 2. Enrollment. (Seat count and headcount).

These data are included in Appendices B and C.

### 3. Student Credit Hours Generated.

These data are included in Appendices B and C.

### 4. Cohorts.

The areas of emphasis in Curriculum and Instruction and Leadership Studies were offered at Braxton County Middle School to a cohort of dually enrolled (Ed.S/Ed.D) candidates. Three candidates from the Flatwoods Doctoral Cohort group (central West Virginia) were concurrently enrolled in the ED.D and Ed.S Programs during the evaluation period. A number of Adult and Technical Education courses are listed as off-campus and are further identified in M.U. B.E.R.T. as MUMAIN and STW.

### 5. Third party Contracts.

There were no formal agreements with other institutions during this review period.

### 6. Graduates and Program Completers.

There were 7 graduates in the Ed.S program between 2010- 2011, compiling an overall grade point average of 3.85. Comparatively, there were 11 graduates in the Ed.S for 2009-2010, with a combined grade point average of 3.86. It is believed that the current number of graduates is deflated somewhat because there are those who concurrently enroll in the ED.D program, who complete both programs ( course requirements are very similar) but who have not applied for graduation in the Ed.S Program. A cursory review of graduation data for the C&I and Leadership doctoral options shows 8 candidates who graduated between 2009-2011 but who did not apply for the Ed.S. Degree. This has been informally reviewed in the unit and future plans will be made to orient and advise new doctoral candidates about the Ed.S option.

### 7. Collaborative Programs.

There were no collaborative programs during 2010-2011

## **D. TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION/UTILIZATION.**

### 1. Curriculum Integration.

Courses in the Ed.S program utilize various kinds of instructional technology resources to delivery course objectives and content and for candidates to prepare assignments. Examples of these include the following from courses in the Core and Areas of Emphasis requirements.

#### a. Core Requirements:

1) CIEC 700 (Technology and Curriculum). In this course candidates identify and discuss current issues with technology and education; research and write about technology related topics (and processes) influencing education; using technology to conduct and organize research and enhance research related products; and create and evaluate technology products that enhance professional activities. CIEC 700 is offered as a "t" course.

2) EDF-679 (Problem Report). In this capstone experience, candidates prepare a detailed proposal for executing action research at a school/agency level related to their content emphasis. A major purpose is to further develop and enhance their understanding and application of research design processes in professional practice. In part, candidates prepare a comprehensive review of scholarly research literature by organizing and conducting online database searches using university resources and those on the world Internet, including Google, Dog Pile, Info tract, Wilson Web and ERIC. Although no formal text is required, an online research methodology text is available with an extensive table of contents and information about research variables, methodology, sampling theory and statistical operations (Trochin,2006).

3) EDF-625 (Qualitative Research Methods). In this course three technological products are utilized for instruction: Word, Power Point Presentation and Softchalk. Softchalk software enables one to produce professional documents with full navigation capacity within the document. Students are expected to use Word to submit their assignments and post discussion questions. For presentations, students are required to use Power Point or Prezi.

4) C&I- 677 (Writing for Publication). Portions of the content are delivered via online instruction by investigating websites that address writing and publishing. Written drafts are revised and refined in online group discussion forums.

b. Area of Emphasis Requirements:

1) CIRG 700 (Composing in Multimedia Environments). In this course candidates are taught about composing in multimedia environments and parts of the associated research project are accomplished collaboratively on WIKI. Candidates also present research findings via Power Point.

2) CIRG 701 (Reading Seminar) is a Blackboard course with its associated instructional and management technical tools.

2. Technology-based course delivery.

- a. "T" Courses: EDF 679; CEIC 700; CI 677; EDF 625
- b. "e" Courses: CIRG 701 and CIRG 700
- c. The majority of courses in Ed.S options are on-site delivery.

**E. FACULTY.**

1. Status (Recruitment/ Retention).

There is no "resident" faculty for this program. Courses offered in the Ed.S are staffed primarily by full-time, tenured and tenure track faculty who are assigned to teach in the program areas related to each available specialization. During 2010-2011, 44 identifiable sections were related to Core and Areas of Emphasis in the Ed.S. These sections accounted for approximately 161

enrollments .Courses were taught primarily by full-time faculty with several courses delivered by part-time faculty. The faculty, listed by specialization, included the following:

- a. Curriculum and Instruction: Nega Debela, Samuel Securo, Jr, Lisa Heaton, Fran Simone ; Ron Childress, and Sue Hollandsworth.
- b. Adult and Technical Education and Community and Technical College Studies: Howard Gordon, Kelli Mayes, Lee Olson, Nancy Person ,Feon Smith and Laura Wyant.
- c. Counseling: Lisa Burton, Harry Dyer David Hermon; Bob Rubenstein, Bob Smith.
- d. Leadership Studies: Mike Cunningham, Dennis Anderson, Teresa Eagle, Mary-Harris -John, Louis Watts and Linda Spatig.
- e. Reading/Literacy Education: Barbara Obyrne and Terrence Stange.

## 2. Part-time faculty utilization.

Three additional part-time faculty taught courses for the GSEPD including two adjuncts (Ed.D) and one holding the rank of Professor Emeritus (Ed.D).

## 3. Advisee load by faculty.

Each area of emphasis in the in the Ed.S Program has a designated advisor who does the advising for those enrolled and active in their program. Enrollments are relatively small in the specialty areas and the number of advisees is likewise small. The largest area of emphasis is Curriculum and Instruction with approximately 40 candidates on the active roster, followed by Leadership Studies. All other areas have significantly fewer numbers of candidates which does not require an advising load distribution. In most cases the chair of the area program acts as the advisor, although in C&I a faculty member has that responsibility.

## 4. Research and Scholarly Activity.

Faculty includes 25 full- time members who have taught in the Ed.S program over the past two years, the great majority of whom have the earned doctorate. These include one full-time member from the College of Education and Human Services and the remainder from the GSEPD. All but one of these holds the doctorate in their respective specialization. Three additional part-time faculty taught courses for the GSEPD including two adjuncts (2 Ed.D) and one holding the rank of Professor Emeritus (Ed.D). Faculty are teaching courses comparable to their degrees and are able to demonstrate efforts to stay current in their fields and enhance their teaching through participation in professional development activities and by attending conferences. Faculty are actively involved in professional organizations, presenting at conferences, writing for publication, and community service and are recipients of grants/contracts and honors and awards. Faculty participate in various professional development activities sponsored on campus (e.g., Technology's Users Group, Campus –Conversations, and CITI Human Research Subjects Training) and various online programs e.g., personal and emotional adjustment for college students, prevention of sexual harassment, and tomorrows teachers.

## 5. Student Course Evaluation Summary.

Aggregate student evaluation of faculty data is maintained for all advanced programs in the GSEPD, including the Ed.S and doctoral programs. Data are collected via a course evaluation instrument designed with 22 items keyed to a 5 point numerical rating scale (1= strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3= Neutral; 4= Agree; and 5= Strongly Agree). Data are reported as mean scores for each item. Data from the fall, 2010 aggregate show an overall mean score of

4.52 (range of 4.37 to 4.70) and 4.44 (range of 4.33 to 4.68). For the fall aggregate, the greatest mean scores occurred for items regarding "*instructor treated me fairly*" (4.70); "*following the syllabus*" (4.68); "*treating students with respect*" (4.68); and "*supportive in academic situations*" (4.62). For the spring, 2011 aggregate the greatest mean scores occurred for "*following syllabus*" (4.60) and "*instructor treated me fairly*" (4.62). These are fairly similar and appear to be aspects perceived to be performed well by the faculty. Another item pointing to the effectiveness of the faculty is "*becoming more competent as a result of this course*", which resulted in an overall mean score of 4.50.

Although relative, the lowest ratings in 2010 and 2011 occurred for "*using class time well*". This is an interesting result given that some of these evaluations likely were completed by those enrolled in online courses. Nevertheless, the data, overall, do indicate that students perceive faculty instruction and treatment in a positive manner. Additionally, during these two assessment periods, there were no items rated lesser than "4" or below the average.

## **F. PROGRAM INFORMATION.**

### 1. SPA (NCATE accreditation status).

The Ed.S is part of Marshall University's Professional Education Unit Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The most recent NCATE review occurred in October 2004. The 2004 review resulted in the PEU receiving "regular" continuing accreditation. A copy of the NCATE report is on file in Marshall University's Office of Academic Affairs. The next Accreditation visit will occur fall 2012.

### 2. NCA-HCL Status.

The Ed.S Program, like all other programs at MU, is under the accreditation umbrella of the North Central Association/Higher Learning Commission, an independent corporation and one of two commission members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The Higher Learning Commission accredits degree-granting post-secondary educational institutions in the North Central region. The most recent accreditation was granted in 2004.

### 3. WVDE approval status.

The Ed.S is not a teacher certification program in WV.

## **G. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND ASSESSMENT.**

### 1. Graduates.

Focusing on the unifying conceptual framework, "*Preparing the Experienced Professional*", the Professional education unit's advanced programs seek to develop and enhance the capabilities for functioning in a variety of specialized professional roles, within diverse cultural and social contexts and to obtain the related knowledge and skills to practice professionally as life-long learners. These abilities and dispositions are fairly evident in the self-rating survey described below.

Portions of the conceptual framework are assessed when candidates are admitted to the Ed.S Program and complete the *Candidate Assessment Survey*, a self-rating of nine professional

competencies keyed to a five-point rating scale. Status ratings include choices as “developing”, “emerging”, “basic”, “proficient” and “exemplary”. These competencies are “post tested” when candidates graduate from their programs to determine the level of change and growth. Data for those who entered and were pretested in 2010-2011 is summarized in Appendix D for 7 new candidates. The results show the assessment of knowledge base is near “proficient, with an overall mean score of 3.99, with communication and professional growth and development averaging 4.2. Technology and cultural diversity scores are identical (3.8) and special needs is the relatively lowest category. Importantly, knowledge base and critical thinking are at the 4.0 level and indicate that candidates perceive to be coming in with an effective content knowledge base and related critical thinking abilities. Too, social development, at the 4.0 level, indicates a good mental set for effective social interaction and behavior. A copy of *Candidate Assessment Survey* is found in Appendix E.

In all, these results indicate that candidates perceive to have an effective knowledge base related to the conceptual framework based on the overall rating noted previously. Candidates perceive to be fairly competent about their professional abilities and bring in a good background from which to forge into their advanced studies and to relate to the theme of the “educational specialist”. It is noted that the small sample size (7) limits these generalizations, which will need to be validated when additional data are collected and aggregated for future assessments. However, the GSEPD does conduct periodic formal follow-up of graduates several years after graduation and the most recent report includes 172 graduates for 2008-2010.

The follow-up assessment is keyed to the essential concepts found in the Unit’s conceptual framework which are nearly identical to those described above. Respondents to the follow-up were graduates of the various MA programs in the GSEPD (e.g., Counseling, Elementary Education, Leadership Studies, Special Education, Reading and School Psychology). Although these are not advanced graduate programs, the results are interesting to put beside those in the Ed.S program. All nine categories for MA respondents averaged less than 4.0 (range of 3.14 to 3.69). Ed.S graduates averaged 4 or better for nine of the categories (range of 4.0 to 4.19), while four categories averaged less than 4 (range of 3.6-3.90). The lowest rating (3.67) for Ed.S was for “*special needs*” which was the same for the MA cadre (3.17). This item also refers to working with youngsters in the “least restrictive environment”. Historically, this been a controversial aspect for classroom teachers regarding their roles for “seamlessly” including special needs youngsters.

Overall, those coming into advanced graduate programs may perceive a slightly greater sense of the abilities related to the conceptual framework. Again the sample size for the Ed.S is quite small and future aggregate data would need to confirm such an outcome.

## 2. Faculty.

Faculty has assessed the conceptual framework throughout 2010-2011 as the unit heightened its preparation for an NCATE accreditation visit in the Fall, 2012. Faculty participated in NCATE meetings held by the academic dean where standards and assessments were reviewed and discussed. A conceptual framework faculty committee was established to review and to make recommendations about revising the model and its components, particularly for the nine competencies noted previously. Additionally, existing key assessments were reviewed and related to overall program goals and competencies while also identifying new directions for assessment of standards.

Faculty in the GSEPD was assigned to various ad hoc committees such as faculty qualifications, assessment of standards, professional knowledge and disposition, diversity and governance and resources. The work of the committees carried on through 2010-2011 as the unit identified the key assessments for each of the standards. A college wide steering committee of key faculty and administrators expedited the process. As a result, the essential materials/resources for communicating information about the model were redesigned and enhanced. A specific committee of faculty from the GSEPD was established to review the conceptual framework, including the overall model, its goals and objectives and related academic knowledge base. The committee met several times throughout 2010 and 2011 and filed a final report of its recommendations with the Dean of GSEPD. A copy of the report is found in Appendix F.

### 3. Students

As noted previously students are assessed upon entrance into the Ed.S program and again at exit by completing the *Candidate Self-Assessment Survey*. These data are summarized overall above in Part G. These competencies focus upon a variety of conceptual framework entities such as gaining advanced content knowledge, current technological know-how and applications, understanding human endeavor and diversity, communicating and interacting with a wide range of constituencies and becoming independent, life-long learners and practitioners. Again, the related data for this outcome is found in Appendix D.

## **H. EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP.**

The Ed.S Program does not specifically prepare candidates for initial job placements. These candidates enter the program from various professional employment contexts, the majority of which are experienced and tenured public school, K-12 professional personnel. As noted previously, the completion of the program is often about increasing one's salary status on advanced pay scales that award annual increases for advanced graduate course completion. Additionally, many of the candidates are concurrently enrolled in the doctoral program for curriculum and instruction and leadership studies at MUGC.

## **I. CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE**

Program goals and student learning outcomes are the bases for program assessment. These are outlined below and each is or will be matched with key assessment techniques. The goals and objectives were recently revised for the program and include the following:

- a. Perceive a disposition for personal and professional productivity and continued growth as a life-long learner in the chosen specialist discipline. (Area of Emphasis)**
- b. Use existing and emerging technologies to organize and conduct research and to enhance related research knowledge and productivity. (Core)**
- c. Up-date to a current, in-depth knowledge base of concepts and principles in the chosen specialist discipline. (Area of Emphasis)**
- d. Prepare a formal, written research product of an educational issue or problem, demonstrating the ability to synthesize and integrate core and content knowledge. (Core)**

**e. Incorporate ethical and moral standards in designing and conducting educational research or related investigative activities with a diversity of human subjects. (Core and Capstone)**

**f. Develop proficiency in technical/research writing for preparing relevant products, reports or other forms of output in the specialist discipline. (Core)**

For this review, a key assessment is related to the *goal of organizing and conducting research to enhance related knowledge and applications*. The goal, in part, is assessed by the *Research Knowledge Base Exam*, a pencil and paper measure. It is designed to assess candidates' basic knowledge, comprehension and applications of basic behavioral research, including, e.g., kinds of research, variables, data scales, sampling, rules (ethics) of research, causality and design methodology. The exam consists of 33 objective test items keyed to a 4-point choice format and is situated as a requirement in LS-703 (Survey Research).

Eight candidates were pretested on the exam at the beginning of the course (August, 2010) and post tested in December, 2010. Pre to post differences were calculated to determine the level of change between the two periods. Scores were reported as the *number of incorrect choices*. The mean number of incorrect choices on the pretest was 6.81 compared to 4.36 on the posttest. These data were further analyzed for significance with a Paired Samples t- test. Results, overall, showed that candidates did significantly better on the posttest ( $p .000$ ), with an effect size of .44, which is marginally acceptable. However, these results are limited due to the small sample sizes. The tabled data for the analysis is found in Appendix G.

Described previously, a key assessment for the program is the *Candidate Self-Assessment Survey* (Appendix E), which is designed to self-evaluate a set of 9 professional competencies related to advance graduate study. Candidates assess their perceptions of these traits at entry to the program and again at exit. Assessment of the competencies is keyed to a five point numerical rating scale: 1= "developing"; 2= "emerging"; 3= "basic"; 4= "proficient" and 5= "exemplary".

From 2010 to 2011, 7 new Ed.S candidates completed the pretest phase. Results in Appendix D show candidates to be at "proficiency" or slightly beyond for five of the abilities, with greater scores related to their professional growth and development and for communication. Four of the abilities are slightly less than proficient, including pre-technology, growth and development, cultural diversity and special needs, the relatively lowest score. In effect candidates entering the program do perceive to be fairly grounded in these professional abilities and it appears that they bring in a reasonably good professional base to undergird their advanced studies. However, it is noted that the small sample size limits these generalizations, which will need to be validated with larger aggregates of future assessment data.

An important area of competency for today's specialty educators and administrators is facility with *instructional technology* processes and related applications in their professional contexts. Likewise technology competence and application is an important objective in the Program. Candidates complete an assessment of this particular ability at entrance as part of their overall assessment using the *Candidate Self Evaluation* tool. That ability reads, in part, as *understanding and applying technology in their respective content area of emphasis*. A break out of the data for this item was made from the aforementioned survey and aggregated to obtain preliminary information regarding the level of candidate's perceptions.

Initially the data were examined overall for Ed.S candidates between 2008 and 2011 (n21) and then examined again for those entering between 2010-2011 (n7). Table 1 shows a crosstab of pre-technology mean scores and year of admission. These results show a mean of 3.8 for the 21 candidates, meaning something slightly less than "proficient". For those entering in 2010-2011, a mean score of 3.7, was derived, again something slightly less than "proficient". Those entering in 2011 (n2) showed a mean score of 4.0 (proficient). Overall these scores are on the lower edge of proficiency at entry. However, the limitation of the small sample sizes is recognized and five-year aggregated data with adequate sample sizes will be a more valid measurement.

**Table 1. ED.S Pre-Technology Mean Scores, 2008-2011**

Pre-Technology			
Admission Year	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
2008	3.0000	1	.
2009	4.0000	13	.57735
2010	3.4000	5	.54772
2011	4.0000	2	.00000
Total	3.8095	21	.60159

Interestingly, a random sample of 5 % of scores from the *post-technology* data base between 2005 and 2011 (n, 18) shows a mean score of 4.33. This outcome meets the expectation of an increase from pre to post nearing "exemplary" at program completion. To corroborate the latter, an additional random sample of 20% (n, 62) of the data was analyzed. That result showed a mean score of 4.26 for post-technology. These results (Tables 2 and 3) would seem to indicate a progression of technology enhancement as candidates complete various requirements moving toward graduation. Hopefully this kind of trend will be replicated with the current sample when aggregated with subsequent samples for the five year review.

**Table 2 ED.S Post-Technology Mean Scores, 5% Sample**

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Post-Technology	18	4.33	.766
Valid N (Listwise)	18		

**Table 3 ED.S Post-Technology Mean Scores, 20% Sample**

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Post-Technology	62	4.26	.598
Valid N (Listwise)	62		

## **J. DATA ANALYSIS/SUMMARY STATEMENT of RESULTS.**

The assessment data and related information gathered for this review show that the program is continuing to grow, although slowly. The program draws its clients primarily from southern West Virginia, although a recent doctoral cohort was formed with clients from various central parts of the state. Candidates are primarily public school teachers and related personnel. Others include school administrators, community college personnel, hospital professionals and personnel from

social and behavioral agencies. There is a good gender and social mix with candidates having academic and experiential credentials from within and outside West Virginia.

The program is viable; student credit hour production is fairly strong. Numbers of graduates are modest over the past two years but may be related to a number of doctoral candidates who simultaneously complete the program, but who do not file for graduation. Technology integration is evident throughout the various course requirements, including the production of various research assignment products. The great majority of courses are delivered on site which affords an optimal level of interaction and collaboration between candidates and faculty.

Key assessments indicate that candidates are reasonably knowledgeable about research design and related applications; have positive perceptions about essential competencies related to the conceptual framework and to advanced study in their respective content specialty areas. Data also show that candidates have a slightly less than proficient perception of their facility related to instructional technology processes.

### **K. PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR.**

There are several key assessments planned for future reviews. Currently a "*dispositions*" *assessment survey* is being piloted to obtain data related to the goal of a *disposition for personal and professional productivity and continued growth as a life-long learner*. The assessment is designed to assess several outcomes, including professional commitment, meeting the needs of all students, enhancing communication and interpersonal skills, the importance and use of technology and related data gathering. Items are keyed to a numerical rating scale (1-5), with qualitative descriptors to guide self-ratings by respondents. A copy is found in Appendix H. Another key assessment (*Problem Report Assessment*) will assess a program goal related to preparing a formal, written research product for an educational issue or problem. The goal is related to the research activity required in the final capstone course for the Ed.S Program: "Problem Report". Candidates' propose and design a research investigation or project related to their specialty discipline and the assessment is directed to a series of related cumulative tasks toward completion of the project. A copy of the assessment drafted for C &I candidates is included in Appendix I.

A third assessment planned is for candidates to complete an *on line assessment* of their knowledge and understanding of ethical and legal principles of selecting and using human subjects in research investigations. This assessment relates to a program goal for *incorporating ethical and moral standards in designing and conducting educational research with a diversity of human subjects*. The online assessment is sponsored by the MU IRB and Office of Research Integrity. It consists of nine modules that are assessed by a series of multiple choice questions with various research scenarios. The assessment is a standardized tool developed and managed by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative, Miami University. Data for candidates will be aggregated for future reporting periods.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

Entry GPA and GRE Verbal and Quantitative Scores for Ed.S and Ed.D Candidates, 2010-2011.

ED.S/ED.D Programs	TOTAL	NUM with GRE	GRE V MEAN	GREQ MEAN	GPA
ED.S Specialist ,New ,Summer,'10	2	0	-	-	-
ED.S Specialist, New, Fall,'10	6	2	500	465	3.64
ED.S Specialist, New, Spr. ,'11	3	2	420	500	3.68
Total	11	4	460	483	3.72
ED.D (Leadership St.)New, Fall,'10	2	0	-	-	3.33
" " Spr. '11	4	1	380	510	3.88
Total	6	1	380	510	3.77
ED.D (C& I) New, Fall, '10	1	1	690	540	3.91
" " Spr. '11	1	-	--	-	2.51
Total	2	1	690	540	3.21

### Appendix B

Number of Course Sections and Student Credit Hours Delivered in Ed.S Core, 2010-2011

Alpha/Course Number	Summer 2010	Fall, 2010	Spring 2011	SCHR's*
CI 677	---	---	18	54
CI 680	13	7	13	99
CI 701	10	---	---	30
CI 702	10	---	---	30
CI 703	---	---	---	---
CI 706	17	---	---	51
CIEC 700	---	---	---	---
EDF 617	---	---	---	---
EDF 618	---	---	---	---
EDF 625	---	21	7	84
EDF 626	---	---	9	27
LS 711	11	---	---	33
LS 703	---	18	10	84
Hum 604	---	9	---	27
EDF 679	1	5	4	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>549 *</b>

**Appendix C**  
**Number of Sections, Enrollments and SCH's in Required Courses in Areas of**  
**Emphasis, Ed.S Program, 2010-2011**

Areas of Emphasis/Courses	Summer	Fall	Spring		SCH's*
	2010	2010	2011	Total	
<b>COUNSELING:</b>					
Coun 742 Issues Prof	----	----	----		
Coun 746 Systems/ Int	----	----	----		
Coun 755 Models/Sup	5	----	----	5	15
Coun 760 Special Topics	10	17	14	41	123
<b>CURRICULUM/INSTR:</b>					
C & I 701	10	----	----	10	30
C& I 702	10	----	----	10	30
C& I 703	----	11	----	11	33
C &I 704	----	8	16	24	72
<b>LEADERSHIP STUDIES:</b>					
LS 710	----	12	----	12	36
LS 760	----	15	24	39	117
LS 740/745	----	----	----		
LS 720	----	9	----	9	27
<b>READING/LIT.</b>					
CIRG 701	----	----	----		
CIRG 702	----	2	----	2	4
CIRG 704	----	----	----		
CIRG 707					(487*)

\*Student Credit Hours

**Appendix D**

**Ed.S Mean Scores for Professional Abilities, 2010-2011**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-Knowledge Base	7	3.00	5.00	4.0000	.66667
Pre-Critical Thinking	7	3.00	5.00	4.0952	.76842
Pre-Social Development	7	3.00	5.00	4.0952	.62488
Pre-Technology	7	3.00	5.00	3.8095	.60159
Pre-Growth/Development	7	3.00	5.00	3.9524	.74001
Pre-Special Needs	7	2.00	5.00	3.6667	.85635
Pre-Cultural/Diversity		2.00	5.00	3.8095	.9281
Pre-Communication	7	3.00	5.00	4.1429	.72703
Pre-Professional Growth and Development	7	3.00	5.00	4.1905	.81358
Overall mean Score				3.999	

**Appendix E**  
**Marshal University Graduate School of Education and Professional Development**  
**Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education Programs**  
 Candidate Self-Assessment of Professional Characteristics  
 Please complete this survey and submit it with your Plan of Study

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree Seeking: Elementary Education  
Secondary Education

Area of Emphasis: \_\_\_\_\_ MUID: \_\_\_\_\_

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

The Graduate School of Education and Professional Development has a Conceptual Framework that provides a shared vision for preparing the experienced professional as specialist. We are committed to: 1) dispositions that support this framework, including the commitment to acquire and use knowledge on behalf of P-12 students, 2) diversity and the preparation of educational personnel who help all students learn, 3) integration of technology to enhance candidate and student learning, and 4) aligning professional and state standards with candidate proficiencies expected by the program. To that end, we would like you to rate yourself on the candidate outcomes that have been adopted to guide the development of the program. You will be asked to do this at the beginning of your program and again at the end. If you have additional comments about your progress in the program, you may use the back of this form.

Please read these directions carefully. Completion of this instrument is an admissions requirement. The instrument was designed to gather data on skills and dispositions which the Elementary/Secondary Education Program has identified as important for effective, practicing professionals. As such, you are not expected to have all skills in place as you enter the program. Your responses will allow the program to make modifications and adjustments based upon identified student needs. The instrument will not be used to evaluate you in any manner but is used strictly as an information gathering tool. Thank you for your assistance in providing us with this valuable information.

**Please provide ratings of your performance for each of the nine personal characteristics. Please use the definitions provided below as you consider your rating for each item.**

<b><u>DEVELOPMENTAL</u></b>	<b><u>EMERGING</u></b>	<b><u>BASIC</u></b>	<b><u>PROFICIENT</u></b>	<b><u>EXEMPLARY</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·participate when required</li> <li>·my priority is on my classroom only</li> <li>·not aware of my professional roles/responsibilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·belong/participate occasionally</li> <li>·occasionally involved with school-wide programs/projects</li> <li>·aware of my roles/responsibilities but find them somewhat unrealistic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·belong to one or more professional organizations</li> <li>·participate as much as those around me in school improvement activities</li> <li>·carry out all roles and responsibilities as required or described</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·participate actively in one or more professional organization</li> <li>·take leadership roles in school improvement activities</li> <li>·actively model the roles and responsibilities of my position</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·participate actively in one or more professional organizations and actively seek professional development activities</li> <li>·enjoy initiating and taking leadership roles in professional development activities - strongly believe in and model my professional roles and responsibilities at all times</li> </ul>

( Appendix E scale continues on following page )



1. **Knowledge Base:** *Experienced professionals as specialists understand and apply the current knowledge base in a specialization.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

2. **Critical Thinking:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate skills in research methodology, problem solving, and critical thinking.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

3. **Social Settings:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to function effectively within the social settings of the school/agency, community, and society as a whole.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

4. **Technology:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate a basic understanding of the application of technology in an area of specialization.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

5. **Human Growth and Development:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate a basic understanding of human growth and development and apply this knowledge in an area of specialization.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

6. **Special Needs:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate a basic understanding of students with special needs and the ability to provide assistance within the least restrictive environment.*

7. **Cultural Pluralism/Diversity:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate an understanding of cultural pluralism/diversity (including special needs) and the related implications for curriculum and instruction.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

8. **Communication:** *Experienced professionals as specialists communicate effectively with a wide variety of constituent groups including school/agency personnel, policy makers, parents, and other community members.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

9. **Professional Growth:** *Experienced professionals as specialists demonstrate self-direction as an independent, self-confident professional with a commitment to continued professional growth and development and life-long learning.*

Candidate Self-Rating (please circle): Developmental Emerging Basic Proficient Exemplary

## Appendix F

### Report on Conceptual Framework Review.

Comments on Conceptual Framework.

1. Is the Pro Edu Unit accurately described on the handout? “What, who is the PDU, specifically?”
2. Are all clients “students” in programs?
3. Chart , p. 43,, can’t read –and is it accurate in regard to PEU ?
4. References on Conceptual Framework-update.
5. Is P-12 notation still relevant? (I saw Pre-K, on some State Dept. literature)
6. Up-date knowledge base for Specialty Programs.
7. Will the same knowledge bases be used here and in Hunt.?
8. Check catalog references—2003—is probably out of date.
9. “Instructional practices” phrase is used throughout—some programs may be “professional practices”, e.g., Counseling, school Psychology).
10. References p. 17, update—these are very minimal—and three of the 5, refer to undergraduate.
11. p. 14, Dispositions—not everyone is a “student”—might be “clients”—
12. p.14., “CF has been integrated throughout the programs”. How so?
13. A common,” scripted” description of the CF be situated visibly in all course syllabi—and to include the dispositions, and the nine assessment outcomes. Highlight the one or two assessment outcomes most associated with the content in the course—and where feasible, indicate specific assessments in the course that would relate to verifying these outcomes—and collect that data—and maintain it.
14. The packet is noted as “2004”—need to update—that page—
15. Phrase-“student learning” is used throughout—some programs focus on clients—
16. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills update to CF—to include the language.  
Feb. 2010.

## Appendix G

### Data Analysis for Research Knowledge Base Exam, LS-703

#### Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest Score	6.81	36	4.341	.724
	Posttest Score	4.36	36	3.818	.636

#### Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest Score - Posttest Score	2.444	2.699	.450	1.531	3.358	5.435	35	.000

**APPENDIX H**  
**Ed.D./Ed.S Candidate Self-Assessment**

**Pilot Survey**

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

**Circle your major area: C&I Higher Ed. Admin. Public School Admin. Community College Admin.**

Please rate yourself on each of the following competencies:

1. I am committed to my profession. I am aware of and meet the ethical and practice standards of my profession. I participate in professional organizations and provide high-quality instruction.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

2. I am committed to meeting the needs of students and serve as an advocate for them. I work to promote system level change to better meet the needs of the students.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

3. I am committed to diversity. I realize the essential worth of all people and the energy and wealth of ideas and experience that can be gained through diversity. I realize that good professional practice requires skills in assessment, classroom management, effective principles of teaching and decision-making. I also work to increase the tolerance and respect of all individuals regardless of gender, disability, racial and ethnic identity, social and economic status, sexual orientation and religion.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

4. I am aware of the importance of technology as a tool as well as the ethical and practical considerations of its use. I use technology to increase efficiency in my work and success of services to students.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

5. I use excellent communication skills. I am a good listener, utilize active listening techniques, and display empathy. I clearly communicate my ideas and complex information orally and in writing to diverse audiences, students, administrators, other professionals and the community.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

6. I display strong interpersonal skills. I am warm, empathetic, and compassionate. I relate to a broad variety of individuals and form productive professional relationships. I function effectively as a member of a multidisciplinary team.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

7. I am reliable. I can be depended upon to meet my professional obligations in a timely manner. I display initiative and leadership on the job.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

8. I use my data gathering skills to make decisions related to monitoring progress across academic and social domains.

Developing	Emerging	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix I

**DRAFT EDF 679: Problem Report**

**Ed.S Program**

**Candidate Name:**

**Date:**

### Scoring Rubric for Tasks Associated with the Problem Report.

#### Task One: Nature and Scope of the Topic.

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Selected research Topic relates to an issue or need in the chosen content specialization.                               | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Described the dependent variable (s) or outcome measures(s).  |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Described the independent variable(s), including its factors.   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. A Rationale described the importance of the research problem, including who would be interested in the results and why. |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
- 

#### **Scoring Key: Task One.**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4 | Item is specifically and substantially addressed and described.  |
| 3 | Item specifically addressed and correctly described for the greater part; one or two minor omissions and/or generalizations. |
| 2 | Item was generally addressed; lacked details; had several or more omissions.   |
| 1 | Item was very generally described and lacked most of the details needed.   |
| 0 | Item not submitted.  |

#### **Task Two: Introduction Narrative.**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The Introduction organizes the Statement of the Problem, Hypotheses, Main Research Questions and Ethical considerations.                                   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Provided background information to the give reader a good understanding of the research issue and relationship of the variables.                           |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Hypotheses, statement of the problem, title and main research question are consistent in regard to the variables, subjects and direction of the research.  |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. A narrated Introduction is organized in specific terms with no quotations <i>or listings</i> , written in the student's words, and in the length required. |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

#### **Scoring Key: Task Two.**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4 | Item is specifically and substantially addressed and described.  |
| 3 | Item specifically addressed and correctly described for the greater part; one or two minor omissions and/or generalizations. |
| 2 | Item was generally addressed; lacked details; had several or more omissions.   |
| 1 | Item was very generally described and lacked most of the details needed.   |
| 0 | Item not submitted   |

#### **Task Three: Outline of Review of Related Literature.**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Major categories or sub-topics of the review are outlined.                     | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Major categories or sub-topics for the review are relevant to the topic/issue. |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Examples of article topics are germane to the sub-topic categories.            |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Scoring Key: Task Three.**

- 4 Item is specifically and substantially addressed and described.  
 3 Item specifically addressed and correctly described for the greater part; one or two minor omissions or generalizations.  
 2 Item was generally addressed; lacked details; had several or more omissions.  
 1 Item was very generally described and lacked most of the details needed.  
 0 Item not submitted

**Task Four: Research Article Selection and Summaries.**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Identified four primary, full-text research articles relevant to any of the sub-topic areas.                                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Selected research articles from scholarly, research-based sources.   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Research articles are cited in appropriate APA Reference format.   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Summarized articles per the major elements: purpose, subjects, kind of data collected data analysis and results/conclusions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Scoring Key: Task Four.**

- 4 Item is completely and substantially addressed and described.  
 3 Item was substantially described for the greater part; with a few minor omissions and/or generalizations.  
 2 Item was generally addressed, incomplete; lacked details/ and or/several or more omissions.  
 1 Item is very generally addressed and incomplete for the greater part; has major omissions and /or generalizations  
 0 Item not submitted.
- 

**Task Five: Research Methods**

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Identified the type of quantitative research, including the groupings.                | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Identified the population, including its anticipated numbers.                         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Identified the sample and its numbers, including respective groupings.                | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Described what happened to the subjects or what they did in the in the investigation. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Explained the type of random or nonrandom sampling techniques chosen.                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Identified the kind of data collected, including its scale of measurement.            | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Named and described the technique(s) or tools for collecting data.                    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Provided reliability information for data collection tools.                           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Chose appropriate descriptive techniques for data analysis.                           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Chose appropriate inferential techniques for data analysis, when applicable.         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Scoring Key: Task Five.**

- 4 Item is completely and substantially addressed and described.  
 3 Item was substantially described for the greater part; with a few minor omissions and/or generalizations.  
 2 Item was generally addressed, incomplete; lacked details/ and or/several or more omissions.  
 1 Item is very generally addressed and incomplete for the greater part; has major omissions and /or generalizations  
 0 Item not submitted.
-

**Task Six: Ethical Research Considerations.**

1. Provisions for ensuring the privacy of research participants.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Procedures for securing and maintaining confidentiality of records.	0	1	2	3	4
3. The protection of research subjects from physical or psychological harm.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Obtaining various permission levels needed (parent, participant or agency).	0	1	2	3	4

**Scoring Key: Task Six.**

4	Item is completely and substantially addressed and described.
3	Item was substantially described for the greater part; with a few minor omissions and/or generalizations.
2	Item was generally addressed, incomplete; lacked details/ and or/several or more omissions.
1	Item is very generally addressed and incomplete for the greater part; has major omissions and /or generalizations
0	Item not submitted.

---

**Task Seven: IRB CITI, Human Subjects Protection.**

Candidate has completed respective modules for CITI training in behavioral and social sciences at 80% criterion.

1. Yes                       2. No

Comments: