SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Educational Leadership	Department: Educational Leadership
Degree or Certificate Level: EdS	College/School: School of Education
Date (Month/Year): 9/2022	Assessment Contact: Dr. Jaime Welborn

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? no

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

SLO 2 – Students will apply evidence-based practice in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail and identify the course(s) in which they were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Final projects from EDL 6450 were analyzed from the fall of 2021 to determine evidence-based practices in guiding district level curriculum. These curriculum audits of district practice compared to best practices as outlined in a PDK type curriculum audit reviewed the district policies relevant to curriculum, the district personnel and their job descriptions, the district's guiding documents, the district's evaluation system, the objectives of various curriculums, the equity of the allocations the district uses, the assessments used to evaluate and track student progress, and the promising practices being put into place. These documents when completed were shared with the appropriate personnel within the named district. Triangulation was used in terms of determining recommendations based on the documents, survey data, and observations. A rubric was used to assess the quality of the work. The data from the rubric was used to evaluate this outcome. The top 5 rows of the rubric specifically assess "application of evidence-based practice in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration."

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

First, the instructor of record assessed the artifacts, curriculum audits, using the rubric. Alignment to the standard was examined during the review. Following this review, the faculty members who conduct the curriculum audits shared information regarding strengths, areas of needed growth, and what might need to be added regarding the "application of evidence-based practice in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration." The next steps of the evaluation process was discuss any program-related changes based upon the data. The evaluation was done utilizing a rubric to evaluate the quality of the work and to determine if students were meeting SLO 2. It was determined that the top five rows of the rubric are relevant to SLO 2. See attached rubric.

4. **Data/Results**

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

During Fall 2021, there were 29 students who worked on teams to complete the curriculum audit. This resulted in 10 completed audits. Five the audits received 20/20; four of the audits received 19/20; and one received 18/20. The classes were face to face classes and students engaged in both classwork and teamwork throughout the completion of the curriculum audit. It became obvious the audit did not go into enough depth in terms of equity either in the curriculum reviewed or the practices of the district. The audit format was updated to be used in fall of 2022.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The data tell us that students who completed the curriculum audit are achieving SLO2 at 90% or greater. If we are to identify a learning gap, it was in the connection between the findings and recommendations. The recommendations are directly connected to the "application of evidence-based practice in educational administration, aspects of running a school district, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration." Students demonstrated strengths in conducting the audit, gaining knowledge about evidence-based practice related to curriculum. Often times, we hear of our students getting promoted following audits because of their ability to apply the knowledge and skills. Based on review of the data, culturally proficient rubrics have been added to the curriculum audit to use when reviewing the curriculum objectives and guides and components of an equity audit itself have been added.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings**

   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

   Utilizing the rubrics a more uniform method od assessing student depth of knowledge, understanding of curriculum leadership, and evidence-based practices within the field of curriculum became evident. The rubrics were reviewed among faculty on the curriculum committee within the Educational Leadership faculty.

   B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

   Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
   - Course content
   - Teaching techniques
   - Improvements in technology
   - Prerequisites
   - Course sequence
   - New courses
   - Deletion of courses
   - Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

   Changes to the Assessment Plan
   - Student learning outcomes
   - Artifacts of student learning
   - Evaluation process
   - Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
   - Data collection methods
   - Frequency of data collection

   Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

   The program faculty has begun evaluating each course, approaches to theories, activities, and assessments to create a curriculum map and then review it for gaps and overlaps as well as alignment to standards. The faculty has agreed to continue this evaluation process until all coursework and major projects have been reviewed. Based on review of the data, culturally proficient rubrics have been added to the curriculum audit to use when reviewing the curriculum objectives and guides and components of an equity audit itself have been added.

<div style="border:1px solid #000; height:80px;"></div>

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

<div style="border:1px solid #000; height:80px;"></div>

7. Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

The review of the curriculum audit based on evaluation on the rubric allowed the professors to determine needed additions to ensure components of cultural proficiency and equity are embedded within this major project of the program.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

They have been assessed through faculty review and discussion and have added clarity of expectations prior to conducting the major project.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

It was determined that up until this time there had not been a focus on culturally proficient curriculum nor on the components of equity; therefore, these are being added.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

The newly designed curriculum audit will be piloted in fall 2022 and reviewed following the fall semester.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

Research Report : Curriculum Audit Report

Student Name: _____

CATEGORY	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Incomplete
Amount of Information (5 points)	All topics are addressed and all forms completed with indepth information from the school district	All topics were addressed and all forms completed with district information	All topics are addressed, and most forms completed	One or more topics/forms were not addressed.
Quality of Information (5 points)	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several supporting details and/or examples.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It provides 1-2 supporting details and/or examples.	Information clearly relates to the main topic. No details and/or examples are given.	Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic.
Sources (1 points)	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format. (cited from if copied from Internet)	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. (cited from if copied from Internet)	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format. (cited from if copied from Internet)	Some sources are not accurately documented.
Theory of Change (2 points)	A specific and relevant theory of change is included and directly aligned to data	A relevant theory of change is included and aligns to the problem found in the data	A theory of change was included but did not align clearly to the data	No theory of change was included.
Logic Model (2 points)	A clear and logical logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	A clear logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	A limited logic model provides the roadmap for improvement	No logic model was included.
Appendix (1 point)	Attachments are recorded and organized in an extremely neat and orderly fashion.	Attachments are recorded legibly and are somewhat organized.	Attachments are recorded.	Attachments are recorded only with peer/teacher assistance and reminders.
Paragraph Construction (2 points)	All paragraphs include introductory sentence, explanations or details, and concluding sentence.	Most paragraphs include introductory sentence, explanations or details, and concluding sentence.	Paragraphs included related information but were typically not constructed well.	Paragraphing structure was not clear and sentences were not typically related within the paragraphs.
Graphs & Illustrations (3 points)	Diagrams and illustrations are neat, accurate, and add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are accurate and add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are neat and accurate and sometimes add to the reader's understanding of the topic.	Diagrams and illustrations are not accurate OR do not add to the reader's understanding of the topic.
Introduction (4 points)	Introduction contained explicit demographic data and information relevant to the school.	Introduction contained necessary demographic data and information relevant to the school.	Introduction contained basic information and demographic data for the report.	Introduction contained only minimal demographic data.
Standards (5 points)	Each of the 5 standards was addressed explicitly with documentation to back up the findings.	Each of the 5 standards was addressed with documentation to back up the findings.	Each of the 5 standards was addressed and findings were outlined carefully.	Each of the 5 standards was noted with some findings in each area.
Recommendations (5 points)	Each finding that indicated less than the standard was addressed in a recommendation format.	Almost findings that indicated less than the standard were addressed in a recommendation format.	Most findings were directly addressed.	Findings were addressed, but recommendations were vague and not specific as far as what should be changed.
Equity and Cultural Proficiency (5 points)	Components on equity and cultural proficiency was very thorough and explicit as far as findings and explained in recommendations.	Components on equity & cultural proficiency was thorough as far as findings and explain in recommendations.	Components on equity & cultural proficiency was surface level as far as findings and not clearly aligned in the recommendations.	Components on equity & cultural proficiency did not directly link to any recommendation.

Comments: