

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Detailed Assessment Report 2015-2016 Educational Leadership Ed D

As of: 11/17/2016 09:11 AM CENTRAL

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Write and Defend Qualifying Paper

All doctoral students will be able to write and successfully defend a qualifying paper which clearly states a researchable problem, reviews the most important literature bearing on the problem, presents a conceptual framework for understanding the problem, and contains a methodological section that stipulates the research methods most appropriate for addressing the problem.

Related Measures

M 1: Qualifying Paper

(1) Qualifying Paper Assessment 2009-2010

Number of students assessed = 17

Each candidate's ability to write and defend a qualifying paper is evaluated by a committee of two faculty members. The qualifying paper is defended orally after the committee has assessed the written content. The committee asks questions regarding the candidates program of study and how the qualifying paper ties into the program to assess the candidates understanding of theory and the conceptual framework around their topic. The committee will vote to determine if the candidate has passed or failed after assessing the qualifying paper based on a program rubric. Please see the Supplemental Section for general information, sample rubric(s) and data reports.

EDLD Portal 10: Qualifying Paper Artifact

Artifact Requirements

The Qualifying paper includes the following major pages and parts in the order that follows:

Title page

Approval of Qualifying Paper page

Abstract

Table of Contents

Introduction

Problem, Significance and Purpose

(1) the problem statement/question is clearly stated in an interrogative form; (2) the statement is placed early in the paper, preferable within the first page or two; (3) secondary questions are clearly linked to the main question/problem statement; (4) the problem statement/ question informs the literature review such that there are no studies discussed not clearly related to the problem; (5) clear and extensive rationale/justification is given for investigation of the problem; (6) all necessary key terms are included and well defined.

Organization of the Review

How are the various studies going to be grouped as they are discussed, and why?

Scope/Limitations

What related literature is *not* going to be discussed and why?

Library Research Plan

What sources, indexes, etc., will be consulted to find the studies to be reviewed?

Review of Literature About . . .(Insert Topic/Problem)

Discussion

Assume that the problem statement and rationale answer a common-sense question: "What do I want to know and why is it worth knowing?" Further assume that the literature review answers: "Who else besides me has wanted to know what I want to know or nearly the same thing as I want to know, what did they find out and what did they do to find out?" The "discussion" is a summary of what other researchers found out about what you want to know. The "conceptual framework" is a model, based on the review, of how all of the pieces fit together, of all of the things involved and how they relate to each other, i.e., what influences what. I can be verbal or an actual schemata.

References

APA style

Bibliography

Appendix

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:

One-hundred percent (100%) of our candidates will attain an average score of 2.0 (Meets Expectations) or above on the Doctoral Qualifying Paper Assessment Instrument.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Artifact: EDLD Doctoral Qualifying Paper 2015-2016

Finding: 100% of the candidates scored 2.0 or above on this assessment.

TARGET MET

Connected Document

[EDLD Doctoral QP Assessment Data 2015-2016](#)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Enhance Technical Writing Skills

Data analysis indicated the need to initiate a Saturday writing class for candidates to employ technical writing skills. Students were also encouraged to present their scholarly work at state and regional professional conferences to provide external feedback on the quality of their work. The Ed.D. Handbook was modified so that the qualifying paper format made for clearer presentation. More one-on-one intensive feedback was initiated. An electronic learning environment (Moodle) was created to provide candidates with information on a variety of topics including "pdf files" of recent publications in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Qualifying Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Write and Defend Qualifying Paper

Review of the Requirements of a Problem Statement and Literature Review

During the defense of the Qualifying Paper, it became clear that the student was not sufficiently conversant with the requirements of a research problem statement and literature review. The student was referred to Gall, M., Gall, J., and Borg, W. (2007 or later) *Educational Research: An Introduction* for their detailed description of the requirements of an acceptable problem statement and literature review, and then asked to revise and resubmit their QP in light of this information.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Qualifying Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Write and Defend Qualifying Paper

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Robert Slater, Ed.D. Coordinator

Action Plan: Qualifying Paper 2014-2015

The Educational Leadership Ed.D. Faculty will review the Qualifying Paper Requirements to determine if the current structure still serves the purpose of the program. We will incorporate additional narrative in the guidelines for the QP for further clarification.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Qualifying Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Write and Defend Qualifying Paper

Implementation Description: On-going

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dianne Olivier, Ed.D. Program Coordinator

Writing Enhancement

Doctoral students are encouraged at an early state to participate in writing activities to enhance both scholarly and technical writing. An increased number of doctoral students utilize services through the University Academic Writing Center. Personnel from the writing center are invited into the EDLD 801: Writing for Educational Research course to share information available through the Writing Center. The focus of

these sessions include writing strategies and techniques, as well as writing resources. Additionally writing materials are available for student use on the doctoral website.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Qualifying Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Write and Defend Qualifying Paper

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dianne Olivier

SLO 2: Defend Research Proposal

All doctoral candidates will successfully defend a research proposal that clearly identifies a problem to be investigated, presents adequate theoretical and practical justifications for the study, gives an overview of the main points of the relevant literature, outlines a conceptual framework, and provides a discussion of what research methods will be used to answer the research questions.

Related Measures

M 2: Dissertation Proposal

(1) Dissertation Proposal Artifact 2009-2010

Number of students assessed = 15

Each candidate's ability to design a dissertation proposal is evaluated by a committee of faculty during the oral defense of the written dissertation proposal. The committee evaluates the proposal and determines through questioning if the candidate understands the problem to be researched and the theoretical and practical justifications for the study. The committee also determines if the research methodology is appropriate for the proposed study. The committee will vote to determine if the candidate passes or fails the proposal defense. If the candidate fails they continue to work on the proposal based on suggestions provided by the committee. Please see the Supplemental Section for general information, sample rubric(s) and data reports.

EDLD Portal 11: Dissertation Proposal

Artifact Requirements

Title page

Approval of Qualifying Paper page

Abstract

Table of Contents

Introduction

Problem, Significance and Purpose

(1) the problem statement/question is clearly stated in an interrogative form; (2) the statement is placed early in the paper, preferable within the first page or two; (3) secondary questions are clearly linked to the main question/problem statement; (4) the problem statement/ question informs the literature review such that there are no studies discussed not clearly related to the problem; (5) clear and extensive rationale/justification is given for investigation of the problem; (6) all necessary key terms are included and well defined.

Organization of the Review

How are the various studies going to be grouped as they are discussed, and why?

Scope/Limitations

What related literature is *not* going to be discussed and why?

Library Research Plan

What sources, indexes, etc., will be consulted to find the studies to be reviewed?

Review of Literature About . . .(Insert Topic/Problem)

Discussion/Conceptual Framework

Assume that the problem statement and rationale answer a common-sense question: "What do I want to know and why is it worth knowing?" Further assume that the literature review answers: "Who else besides me has wanted to know what I want to know or nearly the same thing as I want to know, what did they find out and what did they do to find out?" The "discussion" is a summary of what other researchers found out about what you want to know. The "conceptual framework" is a model, based on the review, of how all of the pieces fit together, of all of the things involved and how they relate to each other, i.e., what influences what. I can be verbal or an actual schemata.

Methodology

1) the research design--whether qualitative, quantitative or mixed-methods-- is not only appropriate but it is also comprehensive in scope, but can still be done in a reasonable time frame; (2) there are appropriate and effective definitions of all constructs relevant to the research problem; (3) if applicable, there are valid and reliable measures in place to produce meaningful evidence regarding the constructs under study.

References

APA style

Bibliography

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

One-hundred percent (100%) of our candidates will attain an average score of 2.0 (Meets Expectations) or above on the Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Artifact: EDLD Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Data 2015-2016
Findings: 100% of our candidates scored 2.0 or above on this assessment.
TARGET MET

Connected Document

[EDLD Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Data 2015-2016](#)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument

More one-on-one intensive feedback was initiated. Candidates will have a two-page summary of their prospectus reviewed by the doctoral program faculty. The Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument was added to quantify the assessment of candidates' work.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Dissertation Proposal | **Outcome/Objective:**
Defend Research Proposal

Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument

More one-on-one intensive feedback was initiated. Candidates will have a two-page summary of their prospectus reviewed by the doctoral program faculty. The Doctoral Prospectus Assessment Instrument was added to quantify the assessment of candidates' work.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Dissertation Proposal | **Outcome/Objective:**
Defend Research Proposal

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Robert Slater, Ed.D. Coordinator

SLO 3: Defend Written Dissertation

All doctoral candidates will successfully defend a written dissertation that has drawn on the relevant literature to conceptualize and investigate a significant problem in depth using appropriate methodologies, and that also concludes with the major findings of the research and their limitations, as well as recommendations and implications for further research.

Related Measures

M 3: Dissertation Defense

(1) Final Dissertation Defense Artifact Fall 2009-2010

Number of students assessed = 10

Each candidate's ability to analyze data, present the results, explain the results and make recommendations for further study is evaluated by a committee of faculty. The committee will evaluate the written dissertation and ask questions to evaluate their

understanding of the nature of the research, the implications for the findings. The committee vote to determine if the candidate passes or fails this assessment. Please see the Supplemental Section for general information, sample rubric(s) and data reports.

Artifact Requirements

Title page

Approval of Qualifying Paper page

Abstract

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Problem, Significance and Purpose

(1) the problem statement/question is clearly stated in an interrogative form; (2) the statement is placed early in the paper, preferable within the first page or two; (3) secondary questions are clearly linked to the main question/problem statement; (4) the problem statement/ question informs the literature review such that there are no studies discussed not clearly related to the problem; (5) clear and extensive rationale/justification is given for investigation of the problem; (6) all necessary key terms are included and well defined.

Organization of the Review

How are the various studies going to be grouped as they are discussed, and why?

Scope/Limitations

What related literature is *not* going to be discussed and why?

Library Research Plan

What sources, indexes, etc., will be consulted to find the studies to be reviewed?

Chapter 2: Review of Literature About . . .(Insert Topic/Problem)

Discussion/Conceptual Framework

Assume that the problem statement and rationale answer a common-sense question: "What do I want to know and why is it worth knowing?" The "discussion" part of the literature review answers: "Who else besides me has wanted to know what I want to know or nearly the same thing as I want to know, what did they find out and what did they do to find out?" The "conceptual framework" is a model, based on the review, of how all of the pieces fit together, of all of the things involved and how they relate to each other, i.e., what influences what. It can be verbal or an actual schemata.

Chapter 3: Methodology

1) the research design--whether qualitative, quantitative or mixed-methods-- is not only appropriate but it is also comprehensive in scope, but can still be done in a reasonable time frame; (2) there are appropriate and effective definitions of all constructs relevant to the research problem; (3) if applicable, there are valid and reliable measures in place to produce meaningful evidence regarding the constructs under study.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Discussion

(1) the data analysis begins with a restatement of the main problem under investigation;(2) if quantitative, a thorough and comprehensive discussion of key descriptive statistics; if qualitative, a thorough and comprehensive discussion apropos to the coding or emerging theme; (3) if quantitative, a thorough and

comprehensive examination of bi-variate relationships or correlation matrices; (4) a thorough and progressively sophisticated analysis controlling for third variables leading up to multi-variate analysis if appropriate.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

(1) The summary presents a thorough overview of the study, its purpose, conceptualization, design, and major findings; (2) conclusions reached are well-articulated and properly constrained and limited to the findings from the study; (3) implications of the findings for theory, research and practice are thoroughly discussed and recommendations made.

References

APA style

Bibliography

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:

One-hundred percent (100%) of our candidates will attain an average score of 2.0 (Meets Expectations) or above on the Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Artifact: EDLD Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Data 2015-2016

Finding: 100% of our candidates scored 2.0 or above on this assessment.

TARGET MET

Connected Document

[EDLD Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Data 2015-2016](#)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

One-on-one Feedback

More one-on-one intensive feedback was initiated. The Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Instrument was added to quantify the assessment of candidates' work.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Dissertation Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Defend Written Dissertation

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?

1. The Associate Dean's Office in conjunction with the Assessment Coordinator provides data on a variety of assessments, events and practices by semester. A Master Data Table was designed in 2012, however data sets have been available for all academic programs and centers since 2008.
2. Data tables are submitted to the College of Education's Administrative Council for analysis, interpretation and review. The leaders of the academic divisions receive this information electronically as well as in print and are required to review with the members in their division.
3. Ed.D. Data (assessments taken by all Ed.D. candidates) are shared during the College of Education Faculty Meetings at the beginning of each academic year.

Identify which action plans [created in prior cycle(s)] were implemented in this current cycle. For each of these implemented plans, were there any measurable or perceivable effects? How, if at all, did the findings appear to be affected by the implemented action plan?

The success of the 2015-2016 data cycle appears to be attributed to the following:

1. Enhanced one-on-one assistance provided to candidates in preparation for the Qualifying Paper, the Prospectus and the Dissertation Defenses.
2. Utilization of the University Writing Center.

In comparing the current 2015-2016 data results with previous results, there is an increased number of candidates scoring at the highest level, (Level 3 - Exceeds Expectations) than in previous years.

What has the unit learned from the current assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?

We've learned that through our additional efforts an increasing number of candidates are reaching the dissertation stage of the program. Candidates are showing improved success on earlier benchmarks, such higher levels of achievement on the Qualifying Paper and Prospectus Assessments. Faculty members have worked collaboratively to further the progress of the candidates. However, the resources available to the faculty has become an increasing issue, particularly since the number of candidates at the completion stage has increased. Faculty members indicate the focused one-on-one sessions designed to address the needs of individual students has attributed to the continuous improvement of the program.