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4. Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty, and the like; or
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Deans, please indicate your recommendation and submit the rationale.

Recommendation:
Continuation of the program at the current level of activity

Rationale:
(If you recommend a program for resource development identify all areas for specific development)

The EdD in Education is a strong and growing program, producing a steady supply of graduates for the state and region. Faculty work diligently to involve students in scholarly activity, developing valuable research skills.

The program has a comprehensive assessment system and uses data to inform program and curricular decisions.

Enrollment projections are good as the number of qualified applicants continues to exceed program capacity. The examination of additional major areas has resulted in the addition of the Community College Administration focus. It is expected that the demand for this curricular area will further increase the scope and production of the program.

The EdD in Education is a healthy and viable program, which continues to grow and expand.

Signature of the Dean

Date
Marshall University
Program Review

For purposes of program review, the academic year will begin in summer and end in spring.

Program: Doctor of Education (EdD) ________________________________

College: Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Date of Last Review: Academic Year 2005 - 2006 ______________________

I. Accreditation Information

1. Name of Accrediting Organization
   The Doctor of Education program is housed in the Marshall University Professional Education Unit (PEU). The PEU is fully accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

2. Date of Most Recent Self-Study and Accreditation Visit. October 2012.

3. Accreditation Status: (regular, probationary, etc.) Regular

4. Accrediting Organization’s Report:
   The PEU passed all six NCATE standards for advanced (graduate) programs.

II. CONSISTENCY WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION  Not required to report

III. Adequacy of the Program: Not required to report

5. Curriculum: Not required to report

6. Faculty: Not required to report

7. Students: Not required to report

8. Resources:
   a. Financial: Not required to report
   b. Facilities: Not required to report

9. Assessment Information
Assessment Model

a. The assessment model adopted for this program addresses three broad areas: the program, the faculty, and the candidates' performance. This assessment model has three major components: data/information collection, forming judgments and making decisions. Based on these three components, assessment is defined as a process in which data information are collected and used as a basis for forming judgments which become the basis for decision making. These decisions involve actions related to the program, faculty and candidates. The doctoral faculty meets twice a year to review data and make decisions for improvement of the program.

Program Goals

During the Summer Term 2011, a committee of doctoral faculty developed a set of goals and sub goals for the program which indicate the expectations for graduates. Each program goal identifies outcomes for graduates in the doctoral program. The committee also identified key assessments to measure the goals. The goals and assessments were approved by the entire Doctoral Faculty at the Annual Fall Meeting held on September 22, 2011. The candidate learner outcomes are measurable either quantitatively or qualitatively. Assessments include a range of thinking skills -- synthesizing, analyzing and evaluating, among others.

Program graduates are expected to meet the following candidate outcomes:

Goal 1. Collaboration: Candidates collaborate and interact with faculty through course work, co-teaching, co-publishing and/or co-presenting.
   1a. Effectively collaborate in a professional context; and
   1b. Participate in a community of scholars through mentoring, engaging in collaborative research and maintain a focus on sound educational practices.

Goal 2. Depth of Understanding: Candidates apply and integrate learning experiences and knowledge in the field including current issues, diversity, concepts, and research.
   2a. Acquire and apply content in their discipline/program;
   2b. Read and analyze educational research articles and literature;
   2c. Evaluate quality based on data; and
   2d. Understand major theories/theorists and empirical research and shared knowledge of profession.

Goal 3. Reflection: Candidates evidence reflection, critical thought, and synthesis of material and learning experiences.
   3a. Enhance critical thinking; and
   3b. Put theory into practice.

Goal 4. Scholarship: Candidates exhibit evidence of scholarship in the field through presentations, publications and course work; submission and/or acceptance of publication in a scholarly journal or presentation at a regional or national conference.
4a. Contribute to literature base through publication; and
4b. Present to professional organizations.

Goal 5. Communication: Candidates demonstrate composure, professionalism and poise in writing, speaking, and presentation in a variety of experiences; organize material; demonstrate a working knowledge of multimedia; adapt quickly and smoothly to change.
   5a. Effectively communicate in a professional context; and
   5b. Effectively use verbal, written and technical skills.

Goal 6. Ethical Research: Candidates understand and utilize the research process; analyze and synthesize information and data from course work and collaborative research activities.
   6a. Develop practitioners who are capable researchers;
   6b. Experience in quantitative and qualitative research;
   6c. Demonstrate knowledge of research in the field; and
   6d. Become ethical educators/researchers.

Goal 7. Practitioners: Candidates pursue professional and scholarly endeavors and thus enhance their learning community.
   7a. Enhance professional education community in our region/state; and
   7b. Use current technology in pursuit of professional and scholarly endeavors.
The following list has been defined as the key assessment tools that will measure candidate outcomes.

**LIST OF ASSESSMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>When the Assessment is Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dissertation</td>
<td>Written document Electronic submission of final document</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete a dissertation will graduate.</td>
<td>Upon completion of candidate’s research for and writing of the dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Portfolio</td>
<td>Written portfolio paper Approval of paper and document – either hard copy or electronic Oral defense of portfolio experiences</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete a portfolio will complete a dissertation.</td>
<td>Upon completion of coursework and residency requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 IRB Process</td>
<td>Approval by the Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who submit proposals for IRB will be granted them</td>
<td>Following the approved prospectus of the candidates’ dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Annual Review of Student Progress</td>
<td>Student review form, approved by advisor/chair</td>
<td>90% of students will complete an annual review of student progress</td>
<td>March of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Post-graduation surveys</td>
<td>Form letter/email</td>
<td>90% of students will complete a post-graduate survey</td>
<td>One year and five years post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pre/Post Research Exam</td>
<td>Multiple choice exam</td>
<td>100% of students will see an increase in the number of correct answers on the Research Knowledge Exam</td>
<td>First and last class of LS 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Oral Dissertation defense</td>
<td>Oral defense of dissertation</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete an oral dissertation will graduate.</td>
<td>Upon completion and acceptance of research and written document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key assessment data are provided at various times throughout the year. Candidates take the Pre-Research Knowledge Exam at the beginning of their entrance into the course. At
the end of the semester the Post-Research Knowledge Exam is given. The Annual Review of Progress is due to the Office of Doctoral Programs by March 1; submission is required for registration for the Summer Term. The remainder of the assessments are completed based upon the individual progress of each candidate. During the Annual Spring 2012 Doctoral Faculty meeting, the faculty also reviewed the assessments. Updates were made to the Annual Review of Progress and the Exit Survey.

Summary of Assessment Data

Key Assessment 1 data reveal that 100% of candidates who completed their dissertations did so successfully and were awarded the doctoral degrees. Since the last 5-year review, 32 candidates have successfully completed their dissertations and received their doctoral degrees (See Figures 2 & 7).

Candidates indicate on the Annual Review of Student Progress the number of scholarly activities they have completed for their portfolio each year. A review of the data for the past four years indicates that 96 activities were completed in 2008, 56 in 2009, 59 in 2010 and 57 in 2011. An anomaly in 2008 as a national conference was held in Charleston, West Virginia, and a large number of candidates presented at this meeting. These scholarly activities are requirements for the candidate’s portfolio. With the exception of 2008, the number of scholarly activities each year has remained about the same at approximately 57 per year. The majority of scholarly activities completed are presentations at national or regional conferences (See Figure 3).

Key Assessment 3 data indicate that 100% of candidates who submitted IRBs have been approved. Approval is often not granted without modifications. Figure 4 provides the year to year breakdown of approvals.

Exit Survey Data from Key Assessment 5 indicate that candidates showed a gradual increase in their commitment to Marshall University’s dispositions: technology, diversity and the profession while showing a significant increase in commitment to the profession (See Figure 5).

Key Assessment 6 Data indicate that candidates enter the doctoral program with a basic knowledge of research skills. After completion of LS 703, candidates scored higher on the Post-research Exam (mean of incorrect answers decreased) See Figure 6.

b. Other Learning and Service Activities: Learning activities are listed above as Scholarly Activities (See Figure 3).

c. Plan for Program Improvement

Using Data for Continuous Progress

Candidate data, gathered through the key assessments, and other data are analyzed to assist in making modifications for continuous progress of the program.
Modifications that have been made in the last four years or are in the process of being evaluated based on student data include:

- **Changes to Marshall University’s Ed. D. website.** Candidates indicated they use the website on a regular basis; however, exit survey data indicate the website was difficult to manipulate and that some forms and information could not be found. The website has been revamped and is user friendly for prospective candidates, candidates, and faculty alike. **TIMELINE: Fall 2012**

- **Enhanced research content.** The syllabus was realigned several times to better align the course content with the test items. The faculty, however, is not content with making additional changes to the syllabus as there are questions about the nature of the test. A thorough reexamination of the course objectives has been suggested, and the faculty is planning this for the 2012-13 academic year. Following this review, a new assessment model will be developed to provide a more accurate reflection of student performance. **TIMELINE: Spring 2013**

- **Publications and presentations.** Student data indicate the strength of this component to the overall program. Therefore, the publications and presentations requirements will remain a component of the portfolio, the qualifying assessment. **TIMELINE: Continuous**

- **A new cohort with changes.** Data from a previous cohort of EdD students indicate that the cohort was an efficient learning delivery mode. Data further show, however, changes in site and dates would add to the effectiveness of the program. Changes were made at the beginning of the new cohort in Fall 2011. **TIMELINE: Fall 2011**

- **Exit surveys and Post-graduate surveys.** The doctoral faculty reviewed the format and determined that modifications needed to be made to obtain information needed. Beginning in Spring 2013, candidates will include the name of the employer, addresses, immediate supervisor, phone and emails which will assist the faculty in assessing the employment status of the candidates. Based upon recommendations from the candidates, the exit surveys will also be available via Survey Monkey. **TIMELINE: Spring 2013**

- **Career Opportunities.** Candidate data from Exit Surveys indicate that graduates need information regarding career and employment opportunities provided to them during their years as a candidate. The Office of Doctoral Programs will post employment opportunities on the Doctoral website. **TIMELINE: Fall 2012**
d. Graduate Satisfaction: Exit surveys also measure candidate satisfaction, and the majority of the candidates strongly agreed or agreed with the quality of help they received from the faculty, quality of instruction, and the program.

- The faculty. Data indicate doctoral graduates are satisfied with the faculty. Data improved beginning in 2008. At that time, Marshall University was no longer a partner with West Virginia University for the doctoral program. On 48 questions that address faculty satisfaction on the Exit Survey, graduates indicate they agree or strongly agree with facets of faculty satisfaction including: accessibility, knowledge, and assistance with dissertation, among others.

- The program. Data indicate doctoral graduates are satisfied with the program and the quality of instruction. The 2009 graduates showed 100% approval on 13 items on the Exit Survey which addressed instruction/program satisfaction in 2009. Satisfaction has continued to be high. Candidates indicate the program could be strengthened by adding career and job placement components.

e. Attached are the previous five years of evaluations of your assessment reports provided by the Office of Assessment (See Appendix IX).

10. Previous Reviews:

At its meeting of April 13, 2006, the Marshall University Board of Governors recommended that the Doctor of Education (EdD) Program continue at its current level of activity.

11. Identify weaknesses and deficiencies noted in the last program review and provide information regarding the status of improvements implemented or accomplished.

In its review, submitted in academic year 2005 – 2006, the Doctor of Education Program reported the following weaknesses:

- Inadequate support for faculty and student research.
- Inadequate support for graduate assistants.
- Non-competitive faculty salaries.

Inadequate support for faculty and student research:

The GSEPD has set aside funding for faculty and doctoral students to conduct research and present their findings at national conferences. Faculty members have been given a maximum or $2000 per presentation event to cover expenses (if accepted to present and the Professional Development Request is approved by MU) while candidates have the opportunity to receive up to $500 for expenses at a national conference. While other
monetary funding is not available for candidates to conduct research, faculty support is always available. Faculty has opportunities to apply for grant funding.

**Inadequate support for graduate assistants:**
Unfortunately, inadequate support for graduate assistants is still a weakness. The number of graduate assistants has decreased. Furthermore, fewer waivers are available to doctoral students now than during the last review.

**Non-competitive salaries:**
Salaries remain the major negative factor in recruiting and retaining faculty. Currently there are doctoral level faculty members whose salaries are less than $40,000 per year. In comparison, during the 2009-2010 school year, first-year public school teachers with no classroom experience and a bachelor's degree earned $30,187, while a 25-year veteran who held a doctorate earned $51,533 a year. [http://www.ehow.com/info_7752440_west-teacher-salary-pay-scale.html#ixzz280TTGeb4](http://www.ehow.com/info_7752440_west-teacher-salary-pay-scale.html#ixzz280TTGeb4). For Marshall University to be able to maintain its credibility as a university with practicing educators as professors, the salary issue is critical.

12. **Current Strengths/Weaknesses:**

**Strengths:** The quality of the faculty in the GSEPD Doctoral Program are indeed, one of its strengths. Doctoral faculty readily serve as chairs and as members on candidates’ committees.

Candidates indicated on their exit surveys that they agreed or strongly agreed with the quality of the program, instruction, and the assistance from their faculty.

**Weaknesses:** The average age of the Leadership Studies doctoral faculty is 62.5 years old, and recruiting for experienced well-qualified faculty will be a challenge.

Inadequate support for graduate assistants is still a concern. Waivers are few for students who are not Marshall University employees. The positions funded and supported by the university are valuable, but limit the ability of the program to compete with similar institutions.

IV. **Viability of the Program:** Not required to report

1. **Articulation Agreements:** Not required to report

2. **Off-Campus Classes:** Not required to report

3. **Online Courses:** Not required to report

4. **Service Courses:** Not required to report

5. **Program Course Enrollment:** Not required to report
6. **Program Enrollment:**

The program has continued to show growth. During the past five years, enrollment has increased from 121 to 132 total enrollees (an increase of 9%). During 2011-12, a statewide recruitment tour was held for a new cohort which began in Fall 2012. Twenty candidates were admitted into the cohort which meets on the South Charleston Campus during non-traditional hours (Saturday mornings and afternoons).

The Marshall EdD candidates and/or the graduates are the best recruiters for the program. Many of the potential candidates who have indicated an interest in the program have been referred by others.

Candidates may enroll in either the Leadership or Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Emphasis. While C&I is an all-encompassing program that allows for specializations at either the public school or higher education level, candidates determine their program of study based upon their needs, experiences and occupational plans.

The Leadership Studies Emphasis allows candidates to make decisions regarding: Higher Education Administration, Community College Administration or Public School Administration. All candidates also complete an area of emphasis (minor) of nine or more hours and a research component of 19 hours plus 12 dissertation hours.

Over the past five years, Marshall University’s EdD program has produced 48 EdD Graduates, many of whom serve in leadership and curriculum roles at both the public school and higher education/community college levels (See Appendix VI).

7. **Trends in enrollment:**

The trend line data indicate the highest year of enrollment in the EdD program was 2011-12. At that time GSEPD had conducted a state-wide recruitment tour for a doctoral cohort which began in Fall 2011 (See Figure 1).

8. **Enrollment Projections:** Not required to report

IV. **Necessity of the Program:**

1. **Advisory Committee:** Not required to report.

2. **Graduates**

Presently 90% of the doctoral graduates are working in the field or a closely related field. The majority of our graduates are employed by public school systems, community colleges and universities. One graduate in a related field has an educational consulting business. Marshall has not been collecting data on the salary ranges for our graduates (See Appendix VIII).
3. **Job Placement:** Marshall’s Doctoral of Education Program can account for 90% of its graduates. Of the 41 graduates, all but three are employed in the field or a related field (one of those is retired). Many of the candidates enter the program as working professionals. Graduates may want to update their careers with their terminal degree; therefore, the program plans to initiate career planning. The website will begin in Fall 2012 adding resources for career development. At the Fall 2012 meeting an action plan will be reviewed for a more formal approach to job placement.

V. **RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT** Not required to report
Appendices
Appendix I—Required/Elective Course Work—Not required to report
Appendix II—Faculty Data Sheets—Not required
Appendix IIa—Teacher Assistant Data Sheet—Not required
Appendix VI—Program Course enrollment: EdD—Not required

Appendix III
Entrance Abilities of Past Five Years of Graduates: EdD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Undergraduate GPA</th>
<th>Mean GRE Verbal</th>
<th>Mean GRE Quantitative</th>
<th>Miller Analogies Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>5 (Leadership) 7 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.50, 3.44</td>
<td>440.00 (n = 2), 520.00 (n = 5)</td>
<td>500.00 (n = 2), 532.00 (n = 5)</td>
<td>59.33 (n = 3), 52.33 (n = 3), 413.50 (new, n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2 (Leadership) 4 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>2.81, ---</td>
<td>360.00 (n = 1), 440.00 (n = 3)</td>
<td>260.00 (n = 1), 424.33 (n = 3)</td>
<td>404.00 (new, n = 1), 62.00 (n = 1), 412.00 (new; n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>5 (Leadership) 5 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>4.00, 3.66</td>
<td>430.00 (n = 3), 480.00 (n = 3)</td>
<td>426.67 (n = 3), 396.67 (n = 3)</td>
<td>56.00 (n = 1), 432.33 (new, n = 3), 56.50 (n = 2), 422.00 (new, n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0 (Leadership) 8 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.06, ---</td>
<td>456.67 (n = 3), ---</td>
<td>466.67 (n = 3), ---</td>
<td>51.00 (n = 1), 429.71 (new, n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>6 (Leadership) 6 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.54, 3.50</td>
<td>400.00 (n = 3), 482.50 (n = 4)</td>
<td>476.67 (n = 3), 502.50 (n = 4)</td>
<td>52.67 (n = 3), 416.33 (new, n = 3), 52.50 (n = 2), 422.75 (new, n = 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix IV

Exit Abilities of Past Five Years of Graduates: EdD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>Licensure Exam Results</th>
<th>Certification Test Results</th>
<th>Other Standardized Exam Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>5 (Leadership) 7 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2 (Leadership) 4 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>5 (Leadership) 5 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0 (Leadership) 8 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>6 (Leadership) 6 (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix V

## Assessment Summary

### Marshall University

### Assessment of the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes

5 year summary

---

**Component Area/Program/Discipline:** Doctor of Education (EdD)

---

## Program Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program’s Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures (Tools)</th>
<th>Standards/Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Analysis</th>
<th>Action Taken to improve the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Written document</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete a dissertation will graduate.</td>
<td>100% of doctoral candidates who completed their dissertations graduated with an EdD degree</td>
<td>The faculty will continue to be supportive. Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic submission of final document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Written portfolio paper</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete a portfolio will complete a dissertation.</td>
<td>The program is just beginning to gather these data. Presently, 100% of candidates who defend their portfolios defend successfully. Not all candidates, however, complete their dissertations.</td>
<td>Faculty will continue to be supportive. The timeline for completion of the dissertation has been decreased from four to five years. Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of paper and document – either hard copy or electronic Oral defense of portfolio experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Process</td>
<td>Approval by the Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who submit proposals for IRB will be granted them</td>
<td>100% of doctoral candidates who submitted proposals for IRB received IRB status sometimes after modifications to their proposals</td>
<td>The program provides training on the IRB process and will continue to do so. Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Review of Student Progress</th>
<th>Student review form, approved by advisor/chair</th>
<th>90% of students will complete an annual review of student progress</th>
<th>In the last two years, candidates’ enrollment for the next semester has been tied to return of the annual review by March 1. Annual Review Form reviewed Spring 2012. Revisions will be implemented Spring 2013. Reviews will be available on Survey Monkey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduation surveys</td>
<td>Form letter/email</td>
<td>90% of students will complete a post-graduate survey</td>
<td>Within the last two years, surveys have been distributed following completed of the dissertation. Surveys will be sent out one year following completion of the degree also and will include job and employer information. Doctoral Faculty will review revisions. Fall 2011 Annual Meeting. If approved changes will be implemented for Spring 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post Research Exam</td>
<td>Multiple choice exam</td>
<td>100% of students will see an increase in the number of correct answers on the Research Knowledge Exam</td>
<td>In the past four years, candidates entered the program with basic research knowledge. They increased their research knowledge however by answering more questions correctly. Syllabus has been updated. Faculty are reviewing the assessment. Plans are in place to make modifications to the assessment by Spring 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Dissertation defense</td>
<td>Oral defense of dissertation</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students who complete an oral dissertation will graduate.</td>
<td>100% of doctoral candidates who complete the oral dissertation graduate with an EdD degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VII
### Program Enrollment: EdD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Curriculum &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Curriculum &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Curriculum &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Curriculum &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education (EdD): Curriculum &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principalship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total of Students Enrolled in the</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduates of the program</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Trend Line for Total Enrollment and Program Graduates: Doctor of Education (EdD)
Figure 2. Key Assessment 1, Completed Dissertations

- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008

Completed Dissertations
Figure 3, Key Assessments 2 & 4, Scholarly Activities for Portfolio

*A professional conference was hosted in Charleston, WV*
Figure 4.

Key Assessment 3,
IRB Approval

2011
2010
2009
2008

IRB Approval
Figure 5.

**Key Assessment 5, Exit Survey Data**

- Commitment to Technology
- Commitment to Diversity
- Commitment to the Profession
- Commitment to P12 Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.

Key Assessment 6, Pre-Post Research Knowledge Exam, Mean of Incorrect Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.

Key Assessment 7, Completed Oral Defenses

- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008

Completed Oral Defenses
## Appendix VIII
### Job and Graduate School Placement Rates: EdD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of graduates employed in major field</th>
<th># of graduates employed in related fields</th>
<th># of graduates employed outside field</th>
<th># of graduates accepted to further graduate study</th>
<th># of graduates not accounted for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five –Year Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.

Doctoral Graduates Exit Survey Results 2007-11
Satisfaction with Program

- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Figure 9.

Doctoral Graduates Exit Survey Results 2007-11
Satisfaction with Faculty

- Agree
- Strongly Agree

2007 2008 2009 2010 2011
Appendix IX
Assessment Letters

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
www.marshall.edu
Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 21, 2012

Dr. Cynthia Kolsun, Program Coordinator
Doctoral Program in Education
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Dear Cynthia:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdD Program’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. I have included the scoring rubric we used to evaluate your assessment report in a separate document.

You appear to have an excellent assessment plan and have written a nicely organized and easily readable report. I recommend greater specificity with benchmarks (at what level on each rubric trait do you expect students to perform) and reporting of results against these benchmarks.

Although your program is not participating in the University’s Open Pathways Demonstration Project, it will be helpful if it becomes familiar with the rationale behind this project. The project’s steering committee will be happy to provide more feedback to the program regarding this. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, GSEP

One John Marshall Drive • Huntington, West Virginia 25755-2203 • Tel 304/696-2200 • Fax 304/696-2261
A State University of West Virginia • An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer
Dr. Teresa R. Eagle, Dean  
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Dear Teresa:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdD Program’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports was sent to you in April, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that the rubric is still relatively new and is continuing to be revised. At this time, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

I think that, due to the nature of this advanced degree, it is difficult to evaluate using our rubric. To complete this program, students must write and defend a doctoral dissertation. In doing so, they must use all of the higher levels of thinking articulated in this rubric. You are using complementary measures throughout the program to gauge student learning. I’m concerned, however, by your using successful completion of a set of courses as a measure of the first outcome. Although you can argue that this measure is appropriate, you can only do so because the outcome “demonstrate in-depth understanding of the education field,” is so broad. However, even for this, I think you should be able to point to performance on specific assessment measures that students complete during these classes and give the specific results of student performance on those measures. Finally, I recommend that you report results of the portfolio assessment in terms of student performance on rubric trait (collaboration, depth of understanding, reflection, etc.).

Please refer to the rubric you received in April for more detailed comments from Graduate Council reviewers. During the academic year 2011 – 2012, I plan to meet with all programs to assist with further development of assessment plans and look forward to meeting with you. I will be in touch at the end of the summer about scheduling. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment
Dr. Teresa R. Eagle, Dean
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Dear Teresa:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdD Program's assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

I realize that, at the doctoral level, course completion suggests that students are succeeding in the program. However, course completion is not a recognized assessment measure. I would recommend analyzing what learning experiences students must master to complete the courses and how these are assessed. Then, match assessments to outcomes. The same is true for portfolios. A portfolio is an excellent assessment, but how do you determine that the portfolios meet standards? Is there an assessment rubric used for this purpose? If so, you should report outcomes of these assessments rather than simply saying that students' portfolios were approved. It also would be a good idea to develop a generic dissertation assessment rubric. Successful publication and presentation of scholarly work is an acceptable assessment, but results would be more meaningful if you reported that 17 student research articles out of X number submitted were accepted for publication.

Please see the attached rubric. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment
Office of Assessment & Program Review

April 5, 2009

Dr. Teresa Eagle, Program Director
EdD Program
GSEPD

Dear Teresa:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdD's assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric for the first time this year and, as you will see, it has changed considerably from the ones used in previous years. It raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment considerably and, since it was not shared with programs before this assessment cycle, I'm not comfortable using it to give programs a formal rating this year. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this new rubric.

Your report provides strong evidence that you have are carefully considering both direct and indirect assessment data to make significant positive changes in your program.

Please see the attached rubric and letter to Deans, Chairs, and Faculty detailing general suggestions for an effective assessment program. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Rudy Pauley, Dean, GSEPD