Describe Annual Assessment Plans

AY2017

The assessment plan for undergraduate programs will continue to focus on a redesign of the Secondary Teacher Education Program of studies. This redesign includes the implementation of the STEP (Secondary Teacher Expanded Practice) program at Emporia High School and Emporia Middle School. The program offers increased Phase I student-contact time for pre-service teacher candidates, providing them with hands-on interaction and planning and implementing lesson plans for small group, one-on-one, and large group activities in the Emporia public schools. The STEP program is somewhat in a similar format to the PDS (Professional Development School) partnership to enhance the preparation of secondary teachers for success in the classroom. STEP students are evaluated using a pre- and post-test micro-teach rubric aligned with the INTASC standards. In addition, a new student teacher observation instrument is in the pilot stage. The new observation instrument is closely aligned with the KSDE Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) document used to evaluate teachers in many districts across Kansas. The graduate programs faculty have made updates to existing Educational Administration (Building) comprehensive exams to better align the exams with the current KSDE assessment standards. In addition, the practicum research project outcomes have been aligned with similar standards. Graduate faculty continue to prepare students for Praxis Licensure exams in an effort to maintain our stellar record of nearly 100% of our graduates passing the Building and District Level Praxis Licensure Exams over the past several years.

AY2016

The assessment plan for the undergraduate programs is decentralized as secondary education bachelor of science in education programs are a part of the program level assessments for each respective departmental major. These programs are very similar for bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, and bachelor of science in education programs. The differences in the curriculums are typically a couple of courses. The bachelor of science in education major programs are structured and assessed as required by the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE). These KSDE reports reside in each of the respective program assessment areas for Art, Biology, Business, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, English, ESOL, Foreign Language-Spanish, Health, History and Government, Journalism, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Physics, Psychology, and Speech/Theater. Licensure testing for Principles of Learning and Teaching and content area exams are reported to KSDE as the percentage of graduates who successfully complete licensure exam requirements. There are six undergraduate courses which make up the instructional curriculum for the department and these courses are assessed accordingly (see attached course listings evidence document). The graduate programs are designed to prepare personnel to assume leadership roles as lead teachers, building-leadership team members, coordinators, supervisors, principals, superintendents, and other central office personnel. The curricula for the graduate programs are delivered almost entirely by department faculty. The assessments for the graduate programs are aligned with KSDE licensure requirements to prepare students with the content knowledge and skills to successfully complete licensure. This includes the assessment of MS in Education Administration District-level Leadership and Building-level Leadership; MS in Curriculum and Instruction with concentrations in Curriculum Leadership, Effective Practitioner, and National Board Certification; and Master of Education in Teaching via two options, Alternate
Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps

AY 2017

There were multiple strategies employed as a result of the assessment practices across the major programs. Some of these strategies include creating and implementing new summative assessment instruments more specifically designed to measure candidate's achievement of program learning outcomes with an increased emphasis on aspects of technology, research data, and education of diverse populations within the framework of curriculum development (theory and practice), revisions in Practicum were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity, a comprehensive exam was implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates, courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas, and throughout the 2014-2017 time frame, practicum (field experience) activities were realigned and revised to add specific field experience in diversity, specific district demographics, and a greater range of experiences within the area of special education. The reports and data files are contained in the file libraries for the specific programs.

AY 2016

The curriculum mapping exercises were effective in helping the department to identify some possible areas to improve student learning and to narrow assessment priorities for the upcoming year. These findings along with the revision of the standards for licensure programs by the KSDE will both serve to inform assessment efforts for the 2017 academic year. Our basic assessment plan has not changed from 2015.

AY 2015

Assessment of both undergraduate and graduate programs is ongoing. ESU is in the process of navigating the transition from NCATE to CAEP. In addition, the Kansas Department of Education is in the process of updating program standards at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is anticipated that these changes are being implemented into the KSDE assessments and will become a part of the overall assessment programs for this upcoming fall 2015. Besides the changes that are in progress, there will be some additional changes related to these CAEP and KSDE transitions. Reports for next year will be reflective of what transpires.

Program Review Indicators

- Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2014
- Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2015
- Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2016

Program Name: Curriculum/Instruction - MS

Summary of Program Assessments

AY 2017

The Curriculum and Instruction Masters Program at Emporia State University is designed to reflect every aspect of the Teachers College Conceptual Framework. The Teachers College Conceptual Framework reflects the philosophy that for educators to help all students learn, they must have a command of content, critical ideas and skills, and the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and learn from their practice so that it continually improves.

The candidates preparing to be curricular leaders are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as
leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Program assessments include the C&I Master’s Degree Comprehensive Assessment, the Written Assessment (Journal) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, the Mentor/Supervisor Assessment (Checklist) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, and the Completion of Coursework in ED820 Curriculum Leadership: Models and Strategies. These program assessments are, and have been, approved within the unit assessment system. The assessment practices for the Curriculum and Instruction MS follow the KSDE reporting guidelines and reports and data files are submitted on an annual basis.

Recently, an analysis of the Comprehensive Exam was used to create and implement a new summative assessment (Analysis and Achievement of Learning Outcomes) which was designed to more specifically measure candidate’s achievement of program learning outcomes. Based on the continuing analysis of the data, faculty continues to believe that candidate performance on this assessment has strengthened candidate accountability. In particular, this assessment added emphasis on aspects of technology, research data, and education of diverse populations within the framework of curriculum development (theory and practice). This supports the theoretical framework of the college regarding application of interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, effective practice, response to uncertainty and change, and self-reflection.

Files supporting assessment efforts are included in the file library.
The candidates preparing for building leadership (principal, assistant principal, or other building level leader as indicated by KSDE), are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) the importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state Praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys; the following changes have been made to the Building Level Leadership program. Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements. 1) Revisions in Practicum were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity. These changes were made to better prepare candidates to successfully complete scenarios presented on the Praxis exam. Feedback from candidates indicated a need for this change. 2) Comprehensive Exam has been implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates. This assessment was added to assess whether candidates completing the building level program leave with the skills necessary to work with student and staff in the current century. 3) Courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Feedback during Focus reviews, dialogue with students during the practicum experience, and exit surveys keeps the emphasis on current skills necessary for success in the field.

Curriculum Map

TTC-SL-ED ADMINISTRATION BUILDING-MS

Reports and Other Evidence Documents

2015 Academic Year

- Educational Administration District Licensure Evidence Information 2012-2014
- Assessment_4_Data_Table_EA888_for_2014_Fall_EA_District

2017 Academic Year

- Assessment 1 Data Table - Praxis
- Assessment 2 Data Table
- Assessment 2 Rubric
- Assessment 3 Data Table
- Assessment 4 Ethical Leadership Data Table
- Assessment 4 Rubric
- Assessment 5 Comp Exam Data Table
- Assessment 5 Comp Exam Scoring Rubric
- Assessment 6 & 7 Practicum Leadership Project Rubric
- Assessment 6 Data Table
- Building Leadership KSDE Report 2016-17 09-09-17
- Building Leadership Practicum Project
- EA 896 GÇô EA 897 Activity Rubric
- Practicum Project Data Table
- Practicum Project Proposal Rubric
Program Name: Education Administration District Licensure

Summary of Program Assessments
AY 2017

The candidates preparing to be a leader at the district level within the administrative profession are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) the importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys the following changes have been made to the District Level Leadership program.

Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements.

The KSDE District Level Program Report and Standards were revised and applied 2015 as changed by KSDE.

EA District Level courses and practicum changes include but are not limited to: a) activity involving KSDE Annual Reports and due dates, b) required district level central office candidates to attend one state level conference, c) require district level special education candidates to attend one state or tri-state special education conference, d) encourage candidates to become members of administrator and special education professional organizations, e) provide information on negotiation teacher and administrator contracts as well as become knowledgeable of the negotiation process, and f) provide more group discussion and individual projects within the courses and practicum. In addition, the discussion of 'diversity' was identified as being taught within EA885, EA888, EA997/998 District Practicums, and ER752.

Additional clarifications and revisions were made relating to the practicum activities as well as including specific elements relating to special education and diversity.

Courses were reviewed to ensure that the new and revised state standards and Praxis content data are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Assessments #1, #2, #4, and #5 were used to shape curriculum content within the program. In addition, biannual focus review assessment feedback, exit survey data, and comments from those completing the state assessment were used in and during each review.

From the 2016-2017 EA Focus review the following changes were made or topics stressed

- add curriculum and an activity dealing with administrators as change agents, add a discussion activity relating to interpreting and applying research findings, continue and maintain collaborative activities and discussion, and stress the need for administrators to work on skills needed in multiethnic settings as well as when working with 'at risk' students.

Throughout the 2014-2017 time frame, practicum (field experience) activities were realigned and revised to add specific field experience in diversity, specific district demographics, and a greater range of experiences within the area of special education. The KSDE report and evidence files are located in the file library.
Program Name: Instructional Leadership MS

Summary of Program Assessments
This program has been discontinued as per the Kansas Board of Regents policy.

Program Name: Master of Education in Teaching

Summary of Program Assessments
AY 2017

Based on the most recent KSDE report, all assessments are aligned with departmental program standards, and Kansas Standards. The findings support that we are doing an excellent job meeting the State Standards in the Master of Education in Teaching Program (MEd) but there is room for improvement in the Comprehensive Examination (Part I & II subsections). During (2015-2016) two assessments of the comprehensive exam reported unsatisfactory ratings 1 for classroom management and 2 for authentic assessment.

The data indicates that 100% of all 2013-2016 program completers scored “Exemplary” in content based assessment. This is exceptional and faculty should be commended for their instructional efforts. All 40 candidates during the 2013-2016 reporting periods earned between a 4.0 and 3.5 grade point average in the identified core courses with a 4.0 being an ‘A’ and 3.5 being a ‘B+’ and rated as “exemplary”. This is evidence that all students are “Exemplary” in their content knowledge to effectively design, manage, align and evaluate instruction. Additionally, 100% of completers during the 2013 – 2016 reporting period scored “Exemplary” on the final course project for ED886, Designing Instructional Programs used to measure candidate’s ability to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction. This data indicates that all students are “Exemplary” in their ability to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction.

Additionally, the data shows that program completers have demonstrated “exemplary” and “proficient” achievement in obtaining the identified skills and knowledge of an understanding of classroom management and creating a positive climate; in ability to understand and apply authentic assessment to improve student learning; and in inclusion of diversity in teaching and learning.
Future goals are to 1) continue providing high quality instruction for “Exemplary” learning and to achieve a minimum of “Proficient” learning in all identified assessments, 2) invite a panel of completers (approximately 6 to 8) to participate in a department program focus review bi-annually to discuss program strengths and areas for improvement, 3) review the comprehensive examination directions and make changes to improve clarity and mainstream for concision, 4) have students experience a problem solving scenario in one of their courses to help prepare them for section I on the comprehensive exam since 4 of the 2013-2014 and 7 of the 2014-2015 completers scored in the “Proficient” rating, and 2 of the 2015-2016 candidates scored unsatisfactory, requiring a rewrite), 5) have instructors review with students the comprehensive examination in one of the core courses taken the same semester they write the exam to provide clarity for directions, discuss expectations and address questions, and 6) provide faculty with scoring training to increase inter-rater reliability for the comprehensive examination.
Program Name: Restricted Program Alternate Route

Summary of Program Assessments
FY 2017

The major finding from the evidence is that we are doing an excellent job meeting the State Standards but there is room for improvement in some areas. One strength is the interns’ content knowledge with 100%
passing the Praxis II content test (Standards #1 & 7: Content Knowledge) and 100% passing the Principles of Learning and Teaching test with 86% average demonstrating their knowledge of learning and teaching (Standard #2: How Individuals Learn and Standard #3 Development Levels). Teaching the lesson (94%) incorporates several standards and professionalism fulfilling Standards 9 & 10 (93.8%); these are the two categories showing high rating from mentors and supervisors. In addition, these students did outstanding work on their Teacher Work Samples (93.98% average) and on the course plans they developed with a 98.2% average (Standards #3 & #7: Instructional Planning).

The weakest area according to the mentors and supervisors was managing the classroom (89%). The Teacher Work Sample indicated the lowest area was Factor 7, Reflection and Self-Evaluation (86.45%). A low scoring area on the PLT test was Category V. Analysis of Instruction. These two factors indicate interns need to improve in self-reflection and evaluation of their instruction.

Examination of the data indicates the areas that could improve candidate performance and strengthen the program are to work with interns on self-reflection since that was a low score on both the clinical experience and the Teacher Work Sample. Our supervisors and mentors will be asked to check for this and emphasize the importance; it will also be addressed at seminars and in ED 893 Internship I. Managing the classroom was the lowest percentage for clinical experience, so our seminars will continue to have sessions on classroom management with scenarios for interns to enact. We will enlist the help of Principals, Mentors and Instructional Coaches for those interns who need more assistance in classroom management. A discussion with the instructor for ED 879 Classroom Management resulted in additional ideas for that class. We also added a seminar workshop on technology in the classroom as that was another area that needed more emphasis and instruction. Changes made are an addition to the Designing Instructional Programs Course to included more assignments with Common Core Standards and student reflection on their assignments. A new instructor was hired for the Designing Instructional Programs Course; this is a person who has been working in the field and will bring new expertise into the course. A session on Common Core Standards was added to the seminars. A longer session on the Teacher Work Sample was conducted and two sessions using technology were added to the seminars. Feedback from the interns indicated 92.3% were “Extremely Satisfied” with the program and 100% would recommend it to others. One student felt the program was not the best fit personally but would recommend it to others. At the end of their internship the interns suggested what they felt was lacking or areas they need more training. The following are their number one requests: more training for the Teacher Work Sample and the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam, and classroom management strategies. All the Principals except one were very enthused about the caliber of interns and indicated they would hire an alternate route intern again. One school that didn't renew an intern's contract indicated they would hire another alternate route intern even though this one didn't work out.

A small number of Principals indicated there were some classroom management issues but most said there was improvement throughout the year. The mentors felt is was a positive experience with very little difference from supervising a student teacher. All the mentors said they would supervise an alternate route intern again. overall, the program is strong and we will continue to make improvements based on the data collected.
Feedback on Assessments

Academic Year 2017

This past academic year was a very productive year as the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) reports and the data supporting the assessments and findings were completed for submission during the summer of 2017. The amount and quality of assessments and related reporting for the department as a whole were very impressive. After reviewing all of the reports and the supporting data files, it is shown that the department faculty continue to educate students at very high levels of competency. The vast majority of all students are scoring exemplary on both course embedded assessments and licensure exams.

The few areas where some room for improvement were discovered as outcomes of comprehensive assessment practices were addressed and integrated into future year change strategies. The changes to the way that data are collected by supervising teachers and evaluators using the survey tool in baseline has maximized the value of the inputs and evaluations and has created efficiency's in the summative analyses processes. The curricular changes to improve comprehensive exam performance for completers will benefit the successes of the graduates. As will, an extended emphasis placed on applied practices in classroom management experiences. The adaptive changes to enable students to refine their skills to self-reflect and evaluate their own instruction will also greatly benefit future educators. Finally, the additional emphasis on technology use and understanding of diversity will strengthen the curriculum across all majors. The ways in which you triangulate your assessment data (Teacher Work Samples, Praxis Test Scores, Student Focus Groups, Evaluator Feedback, and Faculty Discussions) is a departmental strength! Continue to encourage your faculty to participate and share expertise in assessment practices, you have developed a very comprehensive strategy in maintaining high quality and currency in the respective fields. Keep up the good work!

Academic Year 2016

The School Leadership department is in a state of transition as it adapts to new standards by the KSDE. The assessment plans in place for these certification, licensure, and degree programs are solid. The curriculum maps may identify some areas where assessments can be prioritized and of course those change
strategies to align assessment with both KSDE and CAEP standards will be important as well. It is anticipated that AY 2017 will be a year of changes in assessment please attach all data files and other documents as they become available. It will be important to ensure that assessments at the course level continue to occur during the transitions. The work being done is good, keep up the continuous assessment planning!

**Academic Year 2015**

The assessments required by the Kansas Department of Education direct the curricula and drive improvement strategies for all of the programs in the School Leadership department. There are some opportunities that may exist for assessing various individual courses within the curriculum that are not included in the KSDE assessments. These may be some of the first courses a student completes in the program. In studying patterns of student success within courses taught by department faculty, there were not any indications that problematic courses existed. Other things to consider for assessment would include course sequencing and advising strategies. With the graduate programs being online, it will be important to spend adequate time providing faculty professional development opportunities as the electronic delivery mediums and the ways in which students learn continue to evolve quickly. It is acknowledged that faculty must stay abreast of the changes that occur related to required licensure exams, as students' performances are tracked as part of the KSDE reporting. Overall, the assessment program is sound, and the program is serving as a change agent. It's assumed that new results will be forthcoming once the new KSDE and CAEP standards are applied and I'm looking forward to reviewing them.

**Feedback Reports and Rubrics Files**

![Feedback Reports and Rubrics Files](ext:pdf)

**JK_GRADES ANALYSIS FOR ED LEADERSHIP 8-11-15**

**Responsible Roles:** Department Chair (Stiffler, Daniel), Associate Professor (Morton, John), Director OPUS (Hall, Shannon), Professor (Albrecht, Nancy), Professor (Bland, Paul), Associate Dean (Brewer, Joan), Administrative Assistant (Stevens, Darcy), Professor (Church, Ed), Professor (Will, Jerry ), Associate Professor (Limpert, Kirsten)

**Related Items**

**Curriculum and Instruction MS**

**Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting**

The Curriculum and Instruction Masters will use ED 895 student practicum journal samples identified by course faculty as a capstone course used to score to the C&I Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student activities and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the C&I graduate in planning and implementing curriculum and instruction in the school setting.

Summary 2018

**TTC-SL-CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION-MS**

**Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting**

Curriculum and Instruction will use ED 820, ED 837, ED 887 work samples identified by course faculty to score to the C&I Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student work and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the C&I graduate in planning and implementing curriculum and instruction in the school setting.
Summary 2018

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting

Curriculum and Instruction will use ED 833, ED 805, ED 879 work samples identified by course faculty to score to the C&I Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student work and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the C&I graduate in planning and implementing curriculum and instruction in the school setting.

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting

Curriculum and Instruction will use ED 535, ER 752, work samples identified by course faculty to score to the C&I Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student work and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the C&I graduate in planning and implementing curriculum and instruction in the school setting.

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting

Responsible Roles: Department Chair (Stiffler, Daniel)

Master in Education - Teaching

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting

The Master of Education in Teaching will use Option 1: ED 893/894 Restricted License Internship I and II samples OR ED 890 (Advanced Student Teaching samples) identified by course faculty as the capstone used to score to the MEd Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. Or, Option 2 will use: ED 888 Practicum/Action Research as the capstone used to score to the MEd Learning Objectives. These courses include student activities, observations and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the MEd graduate in the school setting.

Summary 2018

TTC-SL-MASTER OF EDUCATION IN TEACHING-MED

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting

The Master of Education in Teaching will use ED 886, ED 887, and ED 879 work samples identified by course faculty to score to the MEd Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum
Map. These courses include student activities, observations and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the MEd graduate in the school setting.

Summary 2018

**Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting**
The Master of Education in Teaching will use SD 550 (or SD 864), EA 773 (or PY 722), and ED 833 work samples identified by course faculty to score to the MEd Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student activities, observations and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the MEd graduate in the school setting.

Summary 2019

**Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting**
The Master of Education in Teaching will use SC 719, ED 535, and ER 752 work samples identified by course faculty to score to the MEd Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map. These courses include student activities, observations and experiences, and recognize content knowledge, skills, and qualities regarded as important to the MEd graduate in the school setting.

Summary 2020

**Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting**

**Responsible Roles:** Department Chair (Stiffler, Daniel)