

**Academic Affairs Assessment of Student Learning**

**Report for Academic Year 2022-2023**

**Department/Program:** Leadership Studies/MEIL

**Assessment Coordinator’s Name:** Dr. Emily Waugh

**Assessment Coordinator’s Email Address:** ewaugh@wvstateu.edu

1. **Which learning outcomes did you measure this past year? [Please indicate whether any of these measures were conducted as follow-up to a previous year’s issues or in response to Program Review. Be specific.]**

Due to the requirements of our accrediting body and how we deliver our courses (once each on an annual basis), we plan to assess all PLOs during an academic year. During the last academic year, we adopted new PLOs to better align with the standards set forth by our Specialized Professional Organization (SPA), the National Educational Leadership Preparation Program Standards. In the 2023-2024 Assessment Plan, we submitted the newly adopted PLOs and a curriculum map.

The MEIL program volunteered as the pilot program to be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Council for the institutional Program Review. The review is required by WVHEPC and the GSC Constitution indicates that GSC will conduct those reviews. Two members of the GSC served as the review committee and recommended the following: *The MEIL program completed the executive summary that covers all information reported by the outside agency. It is clear that this program is in compliance and exceeds compliance standards when compared nationally to their like programs. They have clearly identified weaknesses and strengths that indicate a plan of progression for the program and the enrollment in the program justifies the program financially. Lastly, they are in full compliance with the university assessment process in regards to HLC. Based on what is presented in the Executive Summary, my recommendation would be to continue the program at current status.*

1. **In which course(s) were assessments conducted?**

LS 600. Principles of Educational Leadership

LS 610. Educational Policy and Law

LS 620. Change, Innovation and Professional Development in Education

LS 630. Financial and Human Resource Management of Schools

LS 640. Data-Based Decision Making for School Improvement

LS 650. Internship

1. **How did you assess the selected program learning outcomes?**

Programmatic assessments for evaluating candidate progress and for continuous improvement purposes are housed in the “licensure” classes (600, 610, 620, 630, 640, and 650) and are used to assess PLOs. These assessments are aligned with the standards of the Specialized Professional Organization (SPA) – the National Educational Leadership Preparation Program Standards. There are two levels of standards based on our program configuration – building level standards and district level standards. The MEIL Assessment Coordinator along with the MEIL Assessment Committee (and with input from external stakeholder groups) aligned the NELP Standards with the PLOs. These alignments are noted on the Curriculum Map. Also listed on the Curriculum Map is the course (and therefore the programmatic assessment) aligned with those standards.

1. **How many students were included in the assessment(s) of each PLO in a course?**

LS 600 – 51 students

LS 610 – 50 students

LS 620 – 46 students

LS 630 – 43 students

LS 640 – 46 students

LS 650 – 37 students

1. **How were students selected to participate in the assessment of each outcome (Helpful details might include- whether this assessment represents all students, a sample of students in a class, or a sample of students across sections)?**

We attempt to report out on all students enrolled in courses during their regularly scheduled offerings. Sometimes this is difficult. Adjuncts do not always have access to LiveText. With the transition to Watermark/Student Licensure and Learning (SLL), we can remedy this as we are able to give instructors access to the system on our end instead of having to go through the company for this. Further, course enrollments in LiveText do not always get updated with Banner changes, resulting in some issues with the class rosters in the assessment database. Still, we assess and report out on the vast majority of our students.

1. **In general, describe how each assessment tool (measure) was constructed (i.e. in-house, national, adapted).**

Programmatic assessments for evaluating candidate progress and for continuous improvement purposes are housed in the “licensure” classes (600, 610, 620, 630, 640, and 650). Each of these assessments was created in-house. These assessments are aligned with the standards of the Specialized Professional Organization (SPA) – the National Educational Leadership Preparation Program Standards. There are two levels of standards based on our program configuration – building level standards and district level standards. The MEIL Assessment Coordinator, along with the MEIL Assessment Committee (and input from the external stakeholder groups) aligned the NELP Standards with the PLOs. The assessments were created by the course instructors, keeping with the standards and the requirements of our accrediting bodies related to alignment and sufficiency requirements. Most of the assessments are project-based and many are situated in the field. Assessment rubrics are reviewed by the MEIL Assessment Coordinator and the MEIL Assessment Committee. The program is in the process of ensuring reliability and validity of assessments and has a calendar with projected dates to complete reliability and validity measures on assessments. In the spring of 2023, we piloted the content validity survey with plans to deliver the survey to the content expert group this fall. Rubrics with three levels of performance (as recommended by the specialty organization) were used to evaluate student performance on the assessments. The levels of performance are uniform across all programmatic assessments and are as follows: Approaching Standard, Meets Standard, and Exceeds Standard. Course instructors score assessments, often with self-assessment information from the students themselves. Course instructors enter scores into LiveText to be used to monitor student progress and for reporting purposes.

Outside of the programmatic assessments, our students are required to take a Praxis exam (ETS Praxis Test 5412: Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision) for licensure.

1. **Who analyzed results and how were they analyzed?**

Results were initially reviewed by the course instructor. Programmatic assessment scores were mostly entered into LiveText by course instructors and reported and reviewed by the MEIL Assessment Coordinator. LiveText reports indicate the number and percentage of students performing at each rubric level and each rubric level is aligned with one of the NELP standard components. The program uses three levels on each rubric (as recommended by the specialty organization) and they are as follows: Approaching Standard, Meets Standard, and Exceeds Standard. The reports also note the number of students assessed, the mean, the mode, and the standard deviation of student performance on each rubric indicator. Assessment results were discussed in the MEIL Assessment Committee and with the MEIL Advisory Council. Changes are considered based on assessment results in an effort for continuous improvement. In instances of low student performance, many instructors allow for students to revise and resubmit assignments with the goal of content mastery. In more than one instances, Drs. Blackwell and Waugh have held formal meetings with students in order to support their progress through the program.

1. **Provide a summary of the results/conclusions from the assessment of each measured Program Learning Outcome.**

LS 610

2022-2023

*Here’s how 610 was narrated for the CAEP Annual Report 2023*

*Results of student performance on the programmatic assessment housed in EDUC 610: Education Policy and Law were compared and are explained here as one example of student performance comparison and reporting. The Assessment Coordinator ran reports from LiveText from the fall 2021 and fall 2022 semester. In fall 2021, scores from 36 participants were report with all meeting or exceeding standards on rubrics aligned with both the building and district level NELP standards. In fall 2022, results were reported from 28 participants, with all participants meeting or exceeding all standard components on the building and district level rubrics. More students, overall, performed at the exceeds standard level in the 2022 reporting than in the 2021 reporting. Discussions were made over inter-rater reliability and this is scheduled to occur on this assessment.*

*NELP Building level rubric*

*35.7% scored exceeds standard on component 2.1 in 2022 as compared to 13.9% in 2021.*

*25% scored exceeds standard on component 2.2 in 2022 as compared to 27.8% in 2021.*

*28.5% scored exceeds standard on component 2.3 in 2022 as compared to 27.8% in 2021.*

*35.7% scored exceeds standard on component 6.3 in 2022 as compared to 25% in 2021.*

*The results on standard components 2.1 and 6.3 are of particular interest with a twenty percentage point difference on the scores in component 2.1 from 2021 to 2022 and a ten percentage point difference on component 6.3. This illustrates the need for inter-rater reliability studies that are scheduled to be completed on this instrument in the fall semester of 2024.*

*On the district level rubric, the exceeds standard comparisons are noted here: 2022, component 2.1 39.3%, component 2.2 35.7%, component 2.3 32.1%, and component 7.3 46.4% to 2021 component 2.1 16.7%, component 2.2 27.8%, component 2.3 27.8%, and component 7.3 25%*

LS 620

On 97% of the indicators, candidates scored at Meets or Exceeds Standards. Overall, candidate performance is strong on this assessment and these standard components. The n=33. 12% or 4 candidates scored at “Approaching Standard” on DL Standard Component 3.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to safe and nurturing schools and the opportunities and resources, including instructional materials, technologies, classrooms, teachers, interventions, and adult relationships, necessary to support the success and well-being of each student. Six percent of candidates scored at “Approaching Standard” on DL Standard Component 3.1 and BL Standard Component 4.3. Something to consider: meeting district level standards on assessments outside of the internship when they have better access to the district. In 4 Standard Components (BL 3.1, DL 3.1, BL 3.2, BL 4.1), 50%+ of candidates scored at the “Exceeds Standard” level.

Note: we allow students to revise and resubmit assignments in order to ensure content mastery.

LS 640

Summer 2023 640 results: 29 students reported

BL NELP 4.2 – 10 (35%) students scored as “Meets”

BL NELP 4.3 – 8 (28%) students scored as “Meets”

DL NELP 4.1 – 8 (28%) students scored as “Meets”

Two students scored “Approaching Standard” on all areas of the rubric. The two students are currently repeating the course and are receiving regular check-ins and support.

LS 650

There were 37 students enrolled in LS 650 for the summer 2023 semester. All but 5 students received an A in the course and the remaining students are resolving their “Incomplete” grades during this fall 2023 semester.

**Review performance on Praxis exam**

ETS Praxis Test 5412: Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision  
  
WVSU MEIL Program test results from the 2022-2023 academic year included 24 test takers. The required passing score is 146. Of the 24 test takers, 23/24 test takers achieved passing scores. The median score was 161.5 and the main score was 163.96. The average performance range was 155 to 176. Of note, the average performance range was higher than the required score to pass, and the median and mean scores of test takers was 15+ points higher than the required passing score. The highest observed score of the 24 test takers was 187 and the lowest observed score was 125.

The results provided by ETS include category sub scores. The six categories sub scores include the following: Category I – Strategic leadership; Category II – Instructional leadership; Category III -- Climate and Cultural Leadership; Category IV – Ethical Leadership; Category V – Organizational Leadership; and Category VI – Community Engagement and Leadership.

In four of the six categories (II, III, IV, and V), scores from test takers who attended our program meet or exceed average scores reported in the state of West Virginia, and/or national scores reported. Scores in Category III – Climate and Cultural Leadership, were a full three points above the national average and nearly 5 points above the state average. In two areas, (I and VI), test takers from our program scored below the national and state average. In Category I – Strategic Leadership, students scored more than 10 points below the national and state averages with 14 of 24 test takers scoring in the lowest quartile. Test takers from WVSU also scored below the state and national average in Category VI – Community Engagement and Leadership. Scores here were two points below the state average and four points below the national average, but again 14 of 24 test takers scored in the lowest quartile in this section of the test.

Analysis:

96% pass rate with mean and median test scores well above the required passing score all indicate success in performance of program and candidates. Scores in 2/3 of the categories being at/above state AND national averages also point to successes.

Areas for improvement: Category I – Strategic Leadership and Category VI – Community Engagement and Leadership.

1. **What are next steps? (e.g., will you measure this same learning outcome again? Will you change some feature of the classroom experience and measure its impact? Will you try a new tool? Are you satisfied?)**

We are satisfied with the status/progress of our assessment system. In the 7 years in existence, we have had two separate sets of specialized standards, national recognition from our specialized organization, and overall program (unit) accreditation through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. Much of the progress has been made once the assessment coordinator was assigned full-time to this one program which has allowed focused and dedication attention to program assessment. And while we are satisfied with where we are, we still have work to do. The MEIL Assessment Coordinator (last year) drafted the first Priority List for the program which was reviewed at the end of the academic year for progress on the program priorities. Items completed annually (such as this report and the annual progress report to CAEP) and items still under construction were forwarded to the list for 2023-2024 and the MEIL Assessment Committee reviewed and approved the list. This is part of continuous improvement.

One change we have made based on student performance is the internship (LS 650). In an effort to meet hour requirements of our specialty accreditation, many students were having difficulty completing requirements in the course configuration over the summer semester. Last year, we embedded some of the field hours into the licensure classes. Mostly these were activities that students were already completing in their coursework with the guidance of administrators. We developed a formal process to track those hours in the licensure classes, mostly in the fall and spring semester. Further, in spring 2024, we will hold an orientation for the internship weeks prior to the start of the internship in an effort to facilitate some of the internship paperwork that seems to delay the start for some students.

With regard to student performance on the Praxis exam, discussion was made in the MEIL Assessment Committee as to the classes aligned with the areas of concern in Praxis results. The group had considerable discussion about not wanting to “teach to the test”. The group decided that the information would be shared with course instructors as supplementary information. We anticipate that the information will be used in supplementary fashion rather than being an additional requirement for the classes.

1. **Please attach an example of the assessment tool used to measure your PLO(s). These can be added as an appendix, a link to the assessment, or sent separately in email with your report.**

Please see attachment titled MEIL Assessment 5 EDUC 620 Spring 2023 final.