

Assessing Student Outcomes in the School of Education: Educational Leadership Program

Report prepared by: R. Lee Smith with Randy Davies

Current Assessment contacts: R. Lee Smith, Associate Dean or Karen Clark, Assistant Dean.

Educational goals for Students: Students in the School of Education are measured according to faculty developed standards. The School of Education faculty has conceptualized their standards around the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and standards of various professional associations. The current study was intended to measure program satisfaction and curricular quality as determined by program graduates who are currently employed in the field of education and had completed the educational leadership program.

The standards for this program are from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and are published in a document titled: *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership For Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors* (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002). These standards are directly quoted below:

Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.

Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff..

Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Source: (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002 p2-16).

Method: The assessment project described in this brief summary assessed program satisfaction of alumni (program completers) of the Educational Leadership Program in the School of Education. A questionnaire was utilized to measure the student's perceptions of the degree and quality leading to attainment of these goals. All student people who had completed the program within the last five years were sent surveys. The questionnaire was developed through analysis of the goals of the programs and elements of standards as explained in the above referenced document.

The survey was constructed to measure the first six standards. Content analysis was conducted by the co-investigators and graduate students to ensure that all potential items were correctly aligned with the pertinent standards. The content analysis provided direct input on item revision, deletion, or addition as warranted. A content analysis was conducted by the research team to ensure that all potential items were correctly aligned with the pertinent standards.. A working version of the revised survey was then drafted and the program coordinator reviewed the document. A Likert scale was utilized as the response format. The Likert scale used an 8-point scale with three anchors and two intermediate continuums. The anchors provided clear points of reference for respondents of where *unsatisfactory*, *satisfactory*, and *exceptional* ratings occurred on the scale. The scale included intermediate continuums to encourage better discrimination for respondents' ratings in the *developing (4 and below)* and *proficient (5 or above)* categories. The Likert scale presentation on the surveys included visual cues that both assisted respondents in making accurate ratings as well as providing finer discrimination for the participants. The questionnaire is available from the author of this report.

Results: Eighty-two surveys were sent to alumni from cohort 4 through cohort 8 of the educational leadership program. Twenty surveys were returned as undeliverable or as having an incorrect address. Of the remaining 62 surveys 10 were returned – an effective response rate of 18%. Four respondents indicated that they worked at suburban school locations, 4 at urban locations, 1 at a rural location, and 1 at a urban-suburban location. Seven indicated that they worked at public schools and three were from faith based schools. Four respondents were vice principals or assistant principals, 3 were principals, 1 was a teacher, and 2 were at district central offices in curriculum areas. Four of the surveys were returned by people from middle schools, two from elementary schools, 1 from middle and high school combined school, 1 from a preschool through 8th grade setting, and 2 from central office settings.

Table One reflects the survey results. The aggregated data indicates that all respondents perceived that the standards were met at level of '5' or above; qualitatively ratings reflected proficient to exceptional descriptors. The item that had the mean that was the lowest was one that indicated students could "utilize data to develop vision and goals." Among items that were rated the highest, according to the mean score were those reflecting that students could "Respect the diverse school community," "View education as key to opportunity, mobility, and self-realization.

Discussion

The use of follow-up data is required by the School of Education's accreditation body: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). As part of a comprehensive system to measure student learning and achievement, the School of Education must systematically measure the application of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of advanced program completers as they apply skills in the field. The development and implementation of the follow-up evaluation is intended to explicitly provide quantitative and qualitative data that measure student outcomes. The current data measures the students' self perception of their knowledge and application of the curricular concepts, knowledge, and taught in the educational leadership program.

In a dynamic and continuous manner, the School of education continues to utilize the developed instrument. The cohort that finished in 2005 has been surveyed and the results will soon be analyzed. Meetings between School of Education administration and program faculty are occurring to discuss improvements and changes to curricular emphases and class projects and assignments. There is a commitment to yearly evaluation of the program candidates (students) through performance evaluation and, also, through evaluation of program completers throughout five years after graduation. These documents and activities are documented to meet the NCATE accreditation standards. In the next five years, the State and NCATE will also begin to evaluate programs on specialty standards that are germane to specific fields and the initial development of the instrument was an important step in this future task.

Budget expenditure in the Assessment Grant: Budget expenditures were used primarily for materials and personnel. Funds were utilized to hold a faculty retreat to that developed initial concepts, needs, and strategies for the School of Education Assessment processes. Additionally, three graduate students worked extensively on the this survey and the follow-up survey for the teacher education program.

**Note: Electronic version to
Assessment c/o Rhonda Culbertson, A246A or rculbert@iusb.edu by December 1, 2005.**

Results of the Follow-up survey of alumni of the Educational Leadership programs

Table 1: Responses from a follow-up survey of alumni of the Educational Leadership Program: Cohorts 4 through 8.

Standard and Item Concept	n	Mean	Median	Mode
<u>Standard #1 : A Vision of Learning</u>				
Communicate vision, mission, and goals	10	6.50	6.50	6
Utilize data to develop vision and goals.	10	4.80	5.00	5
Locate resources for school mission and goals.	10	5.90	6.50	7
Utilize professional means of communication	10	6.10	7.00	7
Reflect on one’s beliefs and practices.	10	6.50	7.00	7
Develop activities to ensure education for all students.	10	5.90	6.50	7
Utilize theories of educational leadership.	10	6.30	6.50	6,7
Promote activities leading to students becoming successful.	10	5.80	6.00	6
<u>Standard #2: School Culture and Instructional Programs</u>				
Offer professional development consistent with vision and goals.	10	6.10	6.00	6
Identify, clarify, and address barriers to student learning.	10	5.50	5.50	5,6
Assess and evaluate student learning using a variety of techniques.	10	5.10	5.00	5
Identify effective principles of instruction.	10	5.70	6.00	6
Use data for measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies.	10	5.10	5.00	5
Promote life long learning for self and others.	10	5.70	6.00	6
Utilize professional development for school improvement.	10	6.00	6.50	7
Provide a safe and supportive environment.	10	6.40	7.00	7
<u>Standard #3: Management</u>				
Confront and resolve problems in a timely manner.	10	6.40	7.00	7
Involve stakeholders in decisions affecting the school.	10	6.70	7.00	7
Use problem framing and problem solving skills effectively.	10	6.60	7.00	7
Manage conflict effectively.	10	6.00	6.00	6
Maintain confidentiality and privacy of school records.	10	6.00	6.50	6
Identify and implement principles for fiscal operations	10	4.30	5.00	5
Enhance teaching and learning through decisions.	10	5.50	6.00	6
Accept responsibility for student outcomes and performances.	10	5.60	6.00	6,7

More

Responses were generated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 8. A “1” indicated satisfactory and an “8” indicated excellent. Scores of or below a 4 indicated “developing” and at or above a “5” indicated proficient. A derived score of 4.5 would indicate satisfactory.

Continued Table 1: Responses from a follow-up survey of alumni of the Educational Leadership Program: Cohorts 4 through 8.

Standard and Item Concept	n	Mean	Median	Mode
<u>Standard #4: Collaboration with Families and the Community:</u>				
Respect individuals and groups that may conflict with majority mores and values.	10	6.30	7.00	7
Treat community stakeholders equitably and fairly.	10	6.00	7.00	7
Develop and maintain effective media relations.	10	5.80	6.50	7
Show knowledge of the diverse school community.	10	6.20	7.00	7
Demonstrate knowledge of community/ district administration	10	5.80	6.00	6
Accept families as equal partners in the education of their children	10	6.10	7.00	7
Inform the public of school activities, goals, and outcomes	10	5.80	6.00	7
Inform families of issues/ principles in the interests of children.	10	5.80	6.00	7
<u>Standard #5: Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in the Ethical Manner:</u>				
Demonstrate values/ ethics/ beliefs that inspire others.	10	6.50	7.00	7
Consider the impact of one's administrative practices.	10	6.60	7.00	7
Include, encourage and welcome community members.	10	6.20	6.50	7
Make decisions based on ethical principals.	10	6.50	7.00	7
Respect the diverse school community.	10	6.70	7.00	7
Subordinate one's own interest for good of community.	10	6.60	7.00	7
Accept consequences for acting through on one's principles.	10	6.30	7.00	7
Development of values that reflect a caring school community.	10	6.50	7.00	7
<u>Standard #6: The Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context</u>				
Work within framework of policies, laws, and regulations	10	6.40	7.00	7
Communication with others outside of school community.	10	5.30	5.00	5
Views education as key to opportunity, mobility, self-realization.	10	6.70	6.00	6
Appropriately engage policies and legal system to protect student, staff, and parent rights.	10	5.80	6.00	6

Responses were generated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 8. A "1" indicated satisfactory and an "8" indicated excellent. Scores of or below a 4 indicated "developing" and at or above a "5" indicated proficient. A derived score of 4.5 would indicate satisfactory.