2017-2018 Assessment Cycle EDUC_Educational Leadership Ed D

Mission (due 12/4/17)

University Mission

The University of Louisiana at Lafayette offers an exceptional education informed by diverse worldviews grounded in tradition, heritage, and culture. We develop leaders and innovators who advance knowledge, cultivate aesthetic sensibility, and improve the human condition.

University Values

We strive to create a community of leaders and innovators in an environment that fosters a desire to advance and disseminate knowledge. We support the mission of the university by actualizing our core values of equity, integrity, intellectual curiosity, creativity, tradition, transparency, respect, collaboration, pluralism, and sustainability.

University Vision

We strive to be included in the top 25% of our peer institutions by 2020, improving our national and international status and recognition.

College / VP and Program / Department Mission

Mission of College or VP-area
Provide the mission for the College or VP-area in the space provided. If none is available, write "None Available in 2017-2018."
The mission of the College of Education at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette is built on the three pillars of the academy: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. A commitment to high standards in each of these areas enables the college to be responsive to community, regional, and state needs while addressing national and international concerns. Through Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, the college strives to prepare outstanding teachers, educational leaders, and other professionals in related domains, while developing viable public and private partnerships which systematically improve education. This mission, being fundamental and timeless, represents the professional and ethical imperative of the College of Education to be attentive to the needs of contemporary college students and to the challenges of serving a diverse, modern society.

Mission of Program / Department
Provide the program / department mission in the space provided. The mission statement should concisely define the purpose, functions, and key constituents. If none is available, write "None Available in 2017-2018."
Program Mission: Focused on current and future educational leaders, the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership Degree program's mission is to prepare its graduates to meet the challenges of today's complex educational landscape by fostering the development of practical knowledge and problem-solving skills grounded in a framework of relevant educational theory.

Attachment (optional)
Upload any documents which support the program / department assessment process.

Assessment Plan (due 12/4/17)

Assessment Plan (Goals / Objectives, Assessment Measures and Criteria for Success)

Assessment List

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Qualifying Paper Assessment.(Imported)
Legends	SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units); PO - Program Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	
Assessment Measures	

Assessment Measure	Criterion	Attachments
Direct - Comprehensive Exam (graduate level)	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the three identified Qualifying Paper standards: Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 6: Writing/formatting	Doctoral_Qualifying_Paper_Assessment_Instrument.4.2.12.pdf

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Prospectus/Proposal Defense.(Imported)
Legends	PO - Program Objective (academic units); SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	
Assessment Measures	

Assessme	Criterion	Attachments

	nt Measure		
	Indirect - Graduate Acceptance	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the four identified Prospectus/Proposal Defense standards: Prospectus/Proposal Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 6: Writing/formatting	Doctoral_Prospectus_Proposal__Assessment_Instrument.4.2.12.pdf

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified six standards for the Dissertation Defense.(Imported)
Legends	PO - Program Objective (academic units); SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	
Assessment Measures	

Assessment Measure	**Criterion**	**Attachments**
Direct - Thesis	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the six identified Dissertation Defense standards: Dissertation Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2:	Doctoral_Dissertation_Assessment_Instrument.4.2.12.pdf

		Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 4: Data analysis and Discussion • Standard 5: Summary, conclusions, and recommendations • Standard 6: Writing/formatting	

Program / Department Assessment Narrative

The primary purpose of assessment is to use data to inform decisions and improve programs (student learning) and departments (operations); this is an on-going process of defining goals and expectations, collecting results, analyzing data, comparing current and past results and initiatives, and making decisions based on these reflections. In the space below, describe the program's or department's overall plan for improving student learning and/or operations (the "assessment plan"). Consider the following:
1) What strategies exist to assess the outcomes?
2) What does the program/department expect to achieve with the goals and objectives identified above?
3) How might prior or current initiatives (improvements) influence the anticipated outcomes this year?
4) What is the plan for using data to improve student learning and/or operations?
5) How will data be shared within the Program/Department (and, where appropriate, the College/VP-area)?

Assessment Process

1) What strategies exist to assess the outcomes?
The EDLD Division uses all of the primary modalities to make sure all students are being taught to the highest standards.
2) What does the program/department expect to achieve with the goals and objectives identified above?
The main goal is to continue to produce highly productive scholars who provide meaningful educational innovations in the work place.
3) How might prior or current initiatives (improvements) influence the anticipated outcomes this year?
We will continue to utilize the Writing Center in order to continue to strengthen our candidates technical and working knowledge of the writing process.
4) What is the plan for using data to improve student learning and/or operations?
We will continue to meet regularly on the candidate's outcomes in order to maintain the high level of performance noted in the data sets.
5) How will data be shared within the Program/Department (and, where appropriate, the College/VP-area)?
Data is shared via email, face-to-face and in group presentations on a regular basis.

Results & Improvements (due 9/15/18)

Results and Improvement Narratives

Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Qualifying Paper Assessment.(Imported)

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Qualifying Paper Assessment.(Imported)

Legends	SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units); PO - Program Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	

Assessment Measures	

Assessment Measure	**Criterion**
Direct - Comprehensive Exam (graduate level)	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the three identified Qualifying Paper standards: Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 6: Writing/formatting

Assessment Findings	

Assessment Measure	**Criterion**	**Summary**	**Attachments of the Assessments**	**Improvement Narratives**
Direct - Comprehensive Exam (graduate level)	Has the criterion Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the three identified Qualifying Paper standards: Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 6: Writing/formatting been met	All candidates (N=19; 100%) scored Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations on Standard 1 - Problem State, Rationale and Key Terms, Standard 2 - Literature Review and Standard 6 - Writing/Formatting.	Doctoral_QP_Assessment_Data_Totals___Percentages_2017_2018.docx	- Assessment Process: Continuous monitoring: In order to improve the results on each of the three standards assessed on the Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument, doctoral faculty will review the performance

		yet? Met				outcomes of the students and incorporate strategies within their courses to specifically address the needs of the students. For example, the use of the UL Writing Center is beneficial and UL Writing Center personnel are invited to speak with the students regarding the benefits and procedures for using the center. This strategy is now incorporated into the EDLD 801 Writing for Research in Educational

				Leadership course.

Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Prospectus/Proposal Defense.(Imported)

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified three standards for the Prospectus/Proposal Defense.(Imported)
Legends	PO - Program Objective (academic units); SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	
Assessment Measures	

Assessment Measure	Criterion
Indirect - Graduate Acceptance	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the four identified Prospectus/Proposal Defense standards: Prospectus/Proposal Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 6: Writing/formatting

| Assessment Findings | |

Assessment Measure	Criterion	Summary	Attachments of the Assessments	Improvement Narratives
Indirect - Graduate Acceptance	Has the criterion Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the four identified Prospectus/Proposal Defense standards: Prospectus/Proposal Assessment Instrument • Standard 1:	All candidates (N=17; 100%) scored Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations on the following standards: 1)Stand	Doctoral_Prospectus_Assessment_Data_Totals___Percentages_2017_2018.docx	- Assessment Process: Continuous monitoring: In order to improve the results on each of the four standards assessed on the Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument, doctoral faculty will review the performance

		Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 6: Writing/formatting been met yet? Met	ard 1: Problem Statement, Rationale, and Key Terms; 2) Standard 2: Literature Review; 3) Standard 3: Methodology and 4)Standard 8: Writing /Formatting.		outcomes of the students and incorporate strategies within their courses to specifically address the needs of the students. For example, an added focus on transitioning from the Qualifying Paper to the Proposal/Prospectus will be incorporated into doctoral course work, as well as student sessions specifically targeting this transition with a focus on alignment to methodology.

Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified six standards for the Dissertation Defense.(Imported)

Goal/Objective	To have 100% of students score at an acceptable level (2-3) on the identified six standards for the Dissertation Defense.(Imported)
Legends	PO - Program Objective (academic units); SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);
Standards/Outcomes	
Assessment Measures	

Assessment Measure	Criterion
Direct - Thesis	Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the six

| | | identified Dissertation Defense standards: Dissertation Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 4: Data analysis and Discussion • Standard 5: Summary, conclusions, and recommendations • Standard 6: Writing/formatting |

Assessment Findings	

Assessment Measure	Criterion	Summary	Attachments of the Assessments	Improvement Narratives
Direct - Thesis	Has the criterion Score at a level of 2 (Meets Expectations) or 3 (Exceeds Expectations) on the six identified Dissertation Defense standards: Dissertation Assessment Instrument • Standard 1: Problem statement, rationale, and key terms • Standard 2: Literature review • Standard 3: Methodology • Standard 4: Data analysis and Discussion • Standard 5: Summary, conclusions, and	All candidates (N=11; 100%) scored Meets Expectation or Exceeds Expectations on all 6 of the identified Dissertation Defense Standards on the Dissertation Assessment Instrument.	Doctoral_Dissertation_Assessment_Data_Totals___Percentages_2017_2018.docx	- Pedagogical Change : In order to improve the results on each of the six standards assessed on the Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument, doctoral faculty will review the performance outcomes of the students and incorporate strategies within their courses to specifically

| | | recommen dations • Standard 6: Writing/for matting been met yet? Met | | | address the needs of the students. For example, added focus on alignmen t of proposal goals with data analyses , major findings, and research implicati ons will be incorpor ated into the advance d research courses (example , EDLD 900 and 999) for the purpose of enhancin g student performa nce on the overall summati ve dissertati on. |

Reflection (Due 9/15/18)

Reflection

The primary purpose of assessment is to use data to inform decisions and improve programs and operations; this is an on-going process of defining goals and expectations, collecting results, analyzing data, comparing current and past results and initiatives, and making decisions based on these reflections. Recalling this purpose, respond to the questions below.

1) How were assessment results shared in the program / department?
Please select all that apply. If "other", please use the text box to elaborate.
Distributed via email
Presented formally at staff / department / committee meetings (selected)
Discussed informally (selected)
Other (explain in text box below) (selected)

The EDD Coordinator conducts one-on-one meetings with faculty members regarding student progress and data.

2) How frequently were assessment results shared?

Frequently (>4 times per cycle)
Periodically (2-4 times per cycle) (selected)
Once per cycle
Results were not shared this cycle

3) With whom were assessment results shared?
Please select all that apply.
Department Head (selected)
Dean / Asst. or Assoc. Dean (selected)
Departmental assessment committee
Other faculty / staff (selected)

4) Consider the impact of prior applied changes. Specifically, compare current results to previous results to evaluate the impact of a previously reported change. Demonstrate how the use of results improved student learning and/or operations.

The EDLD faculty recognized the need to assist candidates with Standard 6: Writing/Formatting. Over the last couple of years, faculty advisors have continued to guide candidates to the UL Lafayette Writing Center. After examining the 2017-2018 data has indicated an improvement in the writing format as illustrated in the Qualifying Paper (Comprehensive Exam).

5) Over the past three assessment cycles, what has been the overall impact of "closing the loop"? Provide examples of improvements in student learning, program quality, or department operations that are directly linked to assessment data and follow-up analysis.

At the time of the defense (Qualifying Paper, Proposal Defense, and Dissertation Defense), 100% of our candidates score "Meets Expectations". In the past, we've had a couple of candidates fall below the expected score. The EDLD faculty have adopted a "one-on-one approach" to enhance candidates understanding and performance based on the standard.

Attachments (optional)
Upload any documents which support the program / department assessment process.