

California State University, Stanislaus  
**Education: School Administration (MA)**  
**Graduate Annual Assessment Report 2008-09 AND Assessment Plan 2009-10 DRAFT**

*Updates made to previous year's report and submitted to Graduate School by June 04, 2009*

As noted in the Academic Program Review procedures, each graduate program is required to provide an assessment of student learning. Assessment reports will be submitted annually and with the seven-year Academic Program Review.

**Mission, Goals, Objectives**

For items 1-5, please indicate any changes made during AY 2008-09. If no changes were made, please continue on to the assessment report and plan.

**1. Mission**

California State University, Stanislaus offers a nationally recognized program in professional graduate level study leading to the Master of Arts degree in Education with an emphasis in Administration and Supervision. In addition, the course work required for a MA in Education with an emphasis in Administration and Supervision leads to a Preliminary, which allows a graduate to serve in any administrative capacity in education.

School Administration faculty are committed to preparing wise, scholarly, compassionate, and ethical educational leaders. Each course in the graduate School Administration program at CSU, Stanislaus offers not only practical and theoretical methods of school management, but also the highest ethical principles. Graduates are expected to serve as models of leadership in the schools of the future.

**2. Six Graduate Learning Goals**

- a. Advanced knowledge, skills, and values appropriate to the discipline.
- b. Ability to be creative, analytical, critical thinkers.
- c. Ability to work as individual researchers/scholars as well as in collaboration with others in contributing to the scholarship of their disciplines, as appropriate.
- d. Relevant knowledge of the global perspectives appropriate to the discipline.
- e. Knowledge of new and various methods and technologies as appropriate to the discipline.
- f. Advanced oral and written communication skills, complemented, as appropriate to the discipline, by the ability to access and analyze the information from a myriad of primary, print, and technological sources.

**3. Specific Program Learning Objectives**

California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELS)

Inherent in these standards is a strong commitment to cultural diversity and the use of technology as a powerful tool. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:

1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. Modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

CTC Standards of Quality & Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credentials

1. Program Rationale and Design
  2. Program Coordination
  3. Development of Professional Perspectives
  4. Equity, Diversity, and Access
  5. Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society
  6. Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership
  7. Nature of Field Experiences
  8. Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback
  9. Assessment of Candidate Competence
  10. Vision of Learning
  11. Student Learning and Professional Growth
  12. Organizational Management for Student Learning
  13. Working with Diverse Families and Communities
  14. Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity
  15. Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding
4. **Curriculum Map** (Alignment of Program Core Courses, Graduate Learning Goals, Program Student Learning Objectives, Assessment Methods, Instructional Emphasis, and Primary Assessment Methods)

**PRELIMINARY & INTERN ADMINISTRATIVE CREDENTIAL PROGRAM**

**Graduate Annual Assessment Report 2008-09 & Assessment Plan 2009-10**

University staff evaluates the School Administration Program systematically by utilizing: (1) criteria that relate to the design, rationale, goals and objectives of the program and (2) competence criteria that assess candidate performance. Staff collects information regarding strengths, weaknesses and needed improvements from all participants in the program, including course instructors, University and district supervisors, and employers of recent graduates. In addition to the evaluation of individual courses, students are surveyed following

the completion of the Exit Examination to obtain their feedback regarding program quality and relevance. Finally, community and professional input is solicited via regularly-scheduled Program Focus Group meetings. This format allows University personnel to obtain feedback and respond to practitioners' concerns regarding the role of the University in the preparation of school administrators in a collaborative, collegial manner. As a result of on-going consultation with program graduates and practitioners in the field, program faculty began designing and implementing a rigorous process of student assessment that would lead to program improvement.

<b>Developmental Phases of Program Assessment</b>	
January 2007	Minor revisions to the 30 Essential Questions
September 2007	Development of common assessment rubrics
February 2008	Pilot of common assessment rubrics embedded in coursework
August 2008	Collaborative instructor evaluation of student work products
September 2008	Program revisions based on outcomes of common assessments

### Candidate Assessment

Formative and summative candidate assessment techniques are embedded throughout the School Administration Program.

- Coursework activities are evaluated in a variety of ways, such as instructor observation, oral and written examinations, portfolios, performance-based activities, individual consultation and other authentic forms of formative assessment.
- Fieldwork projects are assessed by the candidate (self-reflection), District mentor and University supervisor and credit is assigned when competence is demonstrated to the satisfaction of all parties.
- A first semester interview and a final semester comprehensive, written examination are administered as benchmarks to assess the competency of candidates. The interview and examination are comprised of open-ended questions selected from 30 Essential Questions that are provided to students: (1) at the beginning of the program during orientation sessions and (2) on the School Administration website (<http://www.csustan.edu/advstd/administration>). The interview and the written

examination are evaluated by the Program Coordinator, program faculty members, and local practitioners to determine each candidate's level of competence at two benchmarks during program enrollment.

- Specific exit requirements include the maintenance of a 3.0 GPA, completion of all program admission/exit requirements and certification from the Program Coordinator to the Credential Office that the candidate has satisfied all standards in Category III—Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance.

### *Academic Benchmarks*

Candidates' progress toward achieving program standards is reviewed periodically during enrollment. Program faculty provides numerous opportunities for re-learning and mastering course competencies. While many opportunities for assistance are provided to candidates in reaching their desired goals, students may be removed from program participation for one or more of the following reasons:

- Failure to demonstrate academic proficiency by maintaining a 3.0 GPA and a minimum grade of "C" in each course in the program. A grade of "C" or below or a "NC" in any required course shall result in probation. A second grade of "C" or "NC" in a required course may result in disqualification from the program unless further intervention is initiated.
- Failure to demonstrate competency in communication and interpersonal skills, or to demonstrate the ability to acquire knowledge relevant to the profession of school administration.
- Failure to comply with other university, college, department and/or program policies, regulations or rules.

Program faculty meet periodically throughout the semester to determine the admission status of newly-enrolled and continuing candidates. At that time, candidates with perceived deficiencies will be discussed and possible intervention strategies developed.

### *Formative Assessment*

Coursework activities include, but are not limited to: collaborative group projects, class presentations, research papers, administrative communication assignments, technological applications, dilemmas, simulations, role playing and collective brain-storming and problem-solving. Coursework activities are systematically evaluated in a variety of ways to determine candidates' progress toward achieving course competencies. Assessment methodology includes, but is not limited to: instructor observation, oral and written examinations, portfolios, individual consultation and performance-based tasks. Candidates are informed of the instructors' expectations in the course syllabi, which describe the curriculum and identify

specific competencies for each course (course coverage and competencies are cross-referenced with the Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary ASC Programs).

Candidates also complete four guided fieldwork projects (45 hours each), which are integrated and aligned with the coursework. The projects allow candidates to implement theory to practice. Periodic site meetings between the candidate, District mentor and University supervisor are scheduled in order to assess, monitor and guide each candidate's progress toward satisfactory achievement of the course competencies. Project documentation (including a written self-reflection and portfolio of products) is prepared at the conclusion of each fieldwork project. Candidates receive credit when they are able to demonstrate competence in each of the identified objectives to the satisfaction of both the District mentor and University supervisor. The assessment is completed by the instructor of the course, and in the case of field work, with input from the District mentor and candidate.

### *Summative Assessment*

Two summative assessments are administered during a candidates' tenure in the program. A formal interview is conducted at the end of the candidates' initial semester of enrollment. A comprehensive written examination is administered at the conclusion of the program (final semester) to assess and validate candidates' achievement of the competencies embedded throughout the Preliminary ASC Program. In both cases, candidates are provided immediate feedback and relevant support, as needed.

### First Semester Interview

An interview is conducted by teams of local practitioners (district and site-level administrators) at the end of the students' first semester of enrollment. Teams of two or three administrators ask selected Essential Questions from courses completed by the candidates. Non-specific 3-point rubrics were utilized during the fall 2006, spring 2007, and fall 2007 semesters. Interviews receiving a "2" or "3" rating were considered "passing" and a "1" rating was considered "not passing." Data regarding student outcomes (using the former 3-point rubric) are illustrated in Table 3.

Revised 5-point rubrics were implemented during the spring 2008 semester to assist the team in more effectively rating the competency of the candidates after one semester (See Appendix A). Interviews receiving "5," "4," or "3" ratings are considered as meeting standards and "2" or "1" ratings are considered as not meeting standards. Data regarding student outcomes (using the revised 5-point rubric) are illustrated in Table 4.

In all cases, candidates receive feedback regarding the quality of responses and suggestions for improvement (if appropriate). The Program Coordinator and team leaders discuss the results and arrive at a consensus regarding candidates' final ratings. Unsuccessful candidates are offered a second opportunity to successfully complete the interview on a subsequent date. Candidates may attend one or more tutoring and/or intervention sessions with faculty

members. Candidates are asked a different set of questions (randomly selected from the 30 Essential Questions). The goal is to provide all candidates with multiple opportunities to successfully complete the examination.

*Table 3 – First Semester Interview (Former Format)*

Semester	N	N=PASS	N=NO PASS	% PASS	Overall Mean (3-point scale)
Fall 2006	113	110	3	97	2.44
Spring 2007	46	42	4	91	2.22
Fall 2007	73	71	2	97	2.42

*Table 4 – First Semester Interview (Revised Format)*

Semester	N	N=MEETS STANDARDS	N=DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS	Overall Mean (5-point scale)
Spring 2008	52	47	05	4.31
Fall 2008	78	74	04	3.77

### Final Semester Comprehensive Written Examination

The comprehensive written examination consists of three open-ended questions selected from the 30 Essential Questions (six questions for each course) and is administrated during the candidates' last semester in the program. Candidates are expected to formulate thorough, well-reasoned responses that can be justified based on accepted leadership theory and practical application. The 30 Essential Questions encapsulate all course competencies and are distributed to students during program orientation and are available electronically on the web (<http://www.csustan.edu/advstd/administration>). Candidates respond to two of the three questions using an open-ended, written format. Candidates' responses are submitted to the Program Coordinator via e-mail attachment.

During the fall 2006, spring 2007, and fall 2007 semesters, each question was evaluated by the Program Coordinator and selected faculty members utilizing a non-specific 3-point rubric to determine each candidate's level of competence. Written responses receiving a "2" or "3" rating were considered "passing" and a "1" rating was considered "not passing" (a total of 4 to 6 points was required to pass the Exit Examination). Data regarding student outcomes (using the former 3-point rubric) are illustrated in Table 5.

Revised 5-point rubrics were implemented during the spring 2008 semester to assist faculty in more effectively rating the end-of-program competency of the candidates (See Appendix A).

Written responses receiving “5,” “4,” or “3” ratings are considered as meeting standards and “2” or “1” ratings are considered as not meeting standards (a total of 6 to 10 points is required to pass the entire Exit Examination). Data regarding student outcomes (using the revised 5-point rubric) are illustrated in Table 6.

In all cases, unsatisfactory responses are re-assessed by a second reader. The Program Coordinator and the second reader discuss the results and arrive at a consensus regarding the final rating. Unsuccessful candidates are offered a second opportunity to successfully complete the examination. Candidates may attend one or more tutoring sessions and/or intervention sessions with faculty members. Candidates are subsequently administered a different set of questions (randomly selected from the 30 Essential Questions). The goal is to provide all candidates with multiple opportunities to successfully complete the examination.

*Table 5 – Final Semester Comprehensive Written Examination (Former Format)*

Semester	N	N=PASS	N=NO PASS	% PASS	Mean (3-point scale) X 2 Questions
Fall 2006	40	39	01	97	N/A
Spring 2007	84	80	04	94	3.90
Fall 2007	53	50	03	95	5.00

*Table 6 – Final Semester Comprehensive Written Examination (Revised Format)*

Semester	N	N=MEETS STANDARDS	N=DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS	Mean (5-point scale) X 2 Questions
Spring 2008	79	74	05	8.66
Fall 2008	32	31	01	8.21

### *Summary*

Multiple summative measures are utilized to determine whether a candidate will receive an institutional recommendation for the Preliminary ASC. Successful completion of all program requirements results in an institutional recommendation of the candidate by the Program Coordinator for the Preliminary ASC or Certificate of Eligibility.

During AY2007-08, a program-wide assessment of student competence model was developed (fall) and piloted (spring). This model utilizes multiple measures, including, but not limited to: (1) authentic performance-based capstone assignments in all courses, (2) common rubrics to assess these assignments, and (3) collaborative faculty appraisal of selected student work samples. First, instructors embed one or more capstone assignments that are representative of the Essential Questions for their respective courses (Note: Essential Questions are aligned with specific Course Competencies, the Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness, and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership [CPSELs]). Second, instructors utilize common grading rubrics to assess capstone assignments for their own instructional purposes. Finally, instructors select five (5) work samples to share with colleagues at a bi-annual faculty/professional meeting. Instructors in course-alike cohorts analyze work samples to: (1) assess student achievement of course competencies, (2) identify specific areas of student deficiency, and (3) validate the efficacy of specific capstone assignments.

Faculty completed the development and piloting of this program assessment model during AY2007-08 and fully implemented the process in AY2008-09. The conclusions generated by the faculty were utilized to formulate revisions to curricular content and to improve instructional delivery during AY2008-09 and AY2009-10. In addition, certain Essential Questions and Common Grading Rubrics were re-written to provide additional clarity and to ensure fidelity with CTC Standards and Course Competencies.

The School Administration Program faculty intends to refine the assessment process during AY2009-10, including the continuation of bi-annual professional development workshops for full-time and adjunct faculty. The goals of these sessions are to: (1) increase awareness of program requirements, (2) solicit input regarding curricular and program issues, (3) share effective instructional strategies, and (4) evaluate common course assessments. Curricular and operational changes will be implemented, as appropriate.