

# EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

## Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** M.A. in Educational Leadership

**B2. Report author(s):** Geni Cowan, Ph.D.

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:**

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]**

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
x	2. Credential
x	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

## Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

**Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.**

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
x	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

\* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

**Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:**

Our M.A. requires candidates to complete a written report (the thesis or project) of research conducted on an issue of significance in their field (P-12 Educational Leadership, Higher Education Leadership). The submitted document is to be the product of research and analysis conducted with the guidance of qualified faculty and demonstrating candidates' mastery of course content and achievement of the student learning outcomes. The thesis/project demonstrates candidates' ability to read, comprehend, analyze, interpret and report scientific literature in their field (PLO 3: Written communication; PLO 6: Inquiry and analysis; PLO 8: Reading; PLO), and to draw conclusions from data that they collect and analyze.

Our program closely aligns with the following PLOs:

- 3. Written communication (WASC 3)
- 6. Inquiry and analysis
- 8. Reading

Our program is driven by our commitment to prepare candidates to excel in areas that will define their professional journeys. Each course contains practical application of academic concepts that apply to leadership in the broad field of education. The thesis/project process provides candidates an opportunity to implement their knowledge and skills in practice, and then to document their mastery.

**Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

The College of Education has undergone major restructuring changes during the 2013-14 academic year. Our former departmental structure has changed from Educational Leadership & Policy Studies to our new department known as the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Department. The changes have required us to consider curricular and procedural changes that will need to be made to accommodate new structures.

**Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q1.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q1.4)</b>

The MA in Educational Leadership is aligned with the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, certified by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

**Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

The student learning outcomes extend the standards established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to address the skills and knowledge candidates should have in order to master the CCTC standards for school administrators.

**Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)*\* to develop your PLO(s)?**

	1. Yes
x	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master’s degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

**Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL</b> PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME</b> PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
x	3. No ( <b>If no, go to Q2.2</b> )
	4. Don’t know ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )
	5. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

**Q2.2.** Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

	1. Yes
x	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q3.1</b> )

**Q2.2.1.** If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. In <b>SOME course syllabi/assignments</b> in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL course syllabi/assignments</b> in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university’s strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university’s budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

**Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO**

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information</b> )
	3. Don’t know ( <b>Go to Part 3</b> )
	4. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Part 3</b> )

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information</b> )
	3. Don’t know ( <b>Go to Part 3</b> )
	4. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Part 3</b> )

**Q3.3.** If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

The primary data examined for the 2013-14 academic year were derived from the thirty-nine submitted theses/projects. On the basis of those documents, the following strengths and areas for improvement are identified.

**Strengths:**

- Candidate Performance: Our candidates continue to exhibit strong assessment skills in the area of gathering and analyzing data. Those candidates who completed their culminating experiences and submitted theses/projects demonstrated the capacity to read and comprehend scientifically-based research literature in education, and to then apply their understanding to the data that they gathered and analyzed. Their theses/projects demonstrated that they were able to draw conclusions from the analyzed data, and then to interpret their findings through the lens of previously-published research literature in their field.
- Knowledge: In two programs – the MA in P-12 Educational Leadership and the MA in Higher Education Leadership – candidates demonstrated mastery of knowledge in areas of leadership and organization, as well as in areas not directly assessed (intercultural understandings, promotion of student learning, etc.). Candidates documented their knowledge and understanding of key issues in their fields, and articulated potential problem solving strategies they could apply. The majority of our candidates are employed in their fields, and demonstrated that they could apply their knowledge to their professional practice on the job.
- Program effectiveness: Through anecdotal evidence, we learned that our program has affected candidates’ career trajectories. Recent graduates have achieved promotions and new placements in educational programs in the region (vice principals, principals, program directors, etc.).

**Areas for Improvement:**

- Candidate performance: Though the great majority of 2013-14 graduates (90%) demonstrated improved writing performance, our implementation of direct writing instruction in the research course (EDLP 250) will need to be directly measured in future periods to determine its effectiveness. This was done in response to the CSUS graduate writing requirement, as a strategy to assess and improve candidates’ written communication abilities.
- Candidate assessment: We are currently working on an enhanced program of candidate assessment that will allow us to conduct both formative and summative examination of candidates’ progress through our programs. Our primary source of data currently is the culminating project. We will organize course assignments that address specific learning outcomes and develop measuring strategies that determine candidate progress and provide feedback to both candidates and the programs.

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: [ Reading ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
x	5. Don't know

**[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]**

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [     Inquiry and analysis     ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.3. Third PLO: [     Reading     ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [     3     ]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures**

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [Check all that apply]

x	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
x	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams,

	critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The culminating project – the thesis or project -- was used as the key assignment to assess candidates’ written communication at the end of their course of study. Typically, such assignments are 75 – 150 pages in length, and require that candidates articulate their research, review of the professional and scientific literature in their field, analysis of data, and conclusions in academic language and format.

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don’t know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don’t know

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [**Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
x	5. Use other means. Specify: <b>SEE BELOW</b>

The criteria of performance for our program are based on the standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Per CCTC, “The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program includes a purposeful, developmentally-designed sequence of course work and field experiences that builds upon the foundational knowledge, skills and competencies developed in the preservice program. It effectively prepares candidates to teach all students to read and helps candidates understand the challenges of developing literacy among California’s diverse population. Successful candidates will be able to maximize literacy development for all students.”

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [**Select one only**]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
x	4. Use other means. Specify: <b>REVIEWED BY FACULTY</b>

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don’t know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

The MA requires that candidates submit a thesis or project. The sample consisted of all thirty-nine papers submitted for the Fall 2013 semester.

***Indirect Measures***

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

***Other Measures***

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

**Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [ writing proficiency assessment ]**

EDLP was granted the authority to deliver a course (EDLP 250) designated as “writing intensive.” Candidates are able to satisfy the University’s graduate writing proficiency requirement by completing the course with a grade of “B” or better. The course is generally offered once each semester, and requires that candidates complete a minimum of 5 writing assignments that are then peer-reviewed, revised, and then instructor-reviewed. Candidates are required to write at least 5000 words during the course.

**Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]**

The submitted assignments were reviewed by faculty. This assessment approach lacks a single rubric, and is on the Program’s agenda to develop a unified rubric for use in all sections of the writing intensive course (EDLP 250).

**Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [2]**

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?**

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.**

**Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]**

	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Quite a Bit (2)</b>	<b>Some (3)</b>	<b>Not at all (4)</b>	<b>Not Applicable (9)</b>
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum			x		
3. Improving advising and mentoring			x		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				x	
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations				x	
6. Developing/updating assessment plan				x	
7. Annual assessment reports		x			
8. Program review				x	
9. Prospective student and family information					x
10. Alumni communication					x
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)			x		
12. Program accreditation				x	
13. External accountability reporting requirement					x
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					x



15. Strategic planning			x		x
16. Institutional benchmarking				x	
17. Academic policy development or modification					x
18. Institutional Improvement					x
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					x
20. New faculty hiring					x
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					x
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

We are able to monitor faculty performance against workload using the review of theses/projects, as well as to discuss curricular content. We looked at how our curricula were reflected in the submitted theses/projects, and made recommendations to instructors. Additionally, this review gave us the opportunity to begin to organize an enhanced assessment system. Finally, as the CCTC has issued revised standards for the preliminary and clear administrative credentials, we are able to use our review of submitted theses/projects to determine how such a key assignment can be organized to indicate satisfaction of these standards.

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
x	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q5.3</b> )

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don't know

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
x	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
x	16. Integrative and applied learning

	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to <b>assess but not included above:</b> a. b. c.

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

x	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

x	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
	2. No
x	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [\_EDLP 500\_\_\_\_\_]

The core faculty in the program has met to review our assessment measures and discuss the effectiveness of our program.

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: M.A. in Education: Educational Leadership, Higher Education Leadership

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: Graduate and Professional Studies in Education – College of Education

**A9.** Department Chair’s Name: Dr. Susan Heredia

**A10.** Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [1\_\_]

**A11.** College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
x	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

***Undergraduate Degree Program(s):***

**A12.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

**A12.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A12.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_ \_\_]

***Master Degree Program(s):***

**A13.** Number of Master’s degree programs the academic unit has: 2

**A13.1.** List all the name(s): M.A. in Education, Educational Leadership, Higher Education Leadership

**A13.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1

***Credential Program(s):***

**A14.** Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 3

**A14.1.** List all the names: Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Preliminary Administrative Services Internship Credential, Professional Administrative Services (Clear) Credential

***Doctorate Program(s)***

**A15.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

**A15.1.** List the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?**

x	1. Yes
	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: Educational Leadership, Higher Education Leadership

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: Educational Leadership, Higher Education Leadership