

2017 - 2018
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down.
If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

Ed. D. Educational Leadership
OR enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed
Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) did you assess? [Check all that apply]

- 1. Critical Thinking
- 2. Information Literacy
- 3. Written Communication
- 4. Oral Communication
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. Global Learning and Perspectives
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
- 19. Professionalism
- 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

20B. Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs/GLGs:

Criteria	Pass
(1) Critical Analysis	<p>Where appropriate, the response demonstrates a clear and convincing argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a thorough explanation of the problem• Provides a convincing argument to either support or refute• Provides consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange• Appropriately addresses the ethical implications of choices.• Effectively identifying and addressing critical issues/facets
(2) Integrative Thinking	<p>Where appropriate, response clearly incorporates the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a thorough analysis of relevant economic concept• Providing a thorough analysis of relevant budgeting and organizational structure• Providing a thorough analysis of the socio-political environment

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

1. Yes, for all PLOs
 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
 3. No rubrics for PLOs
 4. N/A
 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

1. Yes
 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.5.Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

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

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.Select **one** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):**Critical Thinking** If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:**Q2.1.1.**Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

(1) Critical Analysis	<p>Where appropriate, the response demonstrates a clear and convincing critical analysis evident by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a thorough explanation of the problem• Provides a convincing argument to either support or refute the case study's research design• Provides consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice a• Appropriately addresses the ethical implications of choices.• Effectively identifying and addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case:
------------------------------	--

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted *explicit program standards of performance/expectations* for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

Criteria
(1) Critical Analysis

Key evidence that supports the assigned scoring:

Grade: _____

Criteria
(2) Integrative Thinking

Key evidence that supports the assigned scoring:

Grade: _____

Criteria	Pass: Provides consistently strong evidence
(3) Effective Communication to K-14 Stakeholders	The response demonstrates mastery of the following elements by

No file attached No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard (stdrd) of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: University Council for Educational Administration application

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

- Q3.1.**
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
 - 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
 - 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?
2

- Q3.2.**
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
 - 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
 - 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

All Qualifying Exam PLOs are peer reviewed by two faculty. Once assessed, if student do not pass, then they are given a week to revise PLOs and then the Director reviews the revisions.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

- Q3.3.**
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
 - 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

- Q3.3.1.**
Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used? [Check all that apply]
- 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
 - 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
 - 3. Key assignments from elective classes
 - 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
 - 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
 - 6. E-Portfolios
 - 7. Other Portfolios
 - 8. Other, specify:
Qualifying Exam

Q3.3.2.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

I have attached the syllabus for the course that prepares student to be tested on the PLOs in the Qualifying Exam.

EDD-614_Langset.pdf 480.55 KB No file attached

- Q3.4.**
What tool was used to evaluate the data?
- 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4**)
 - 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2**)
 - 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2**)
 - 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2**)
 - 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2**)

6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
7. Used other means (Answer Q3.4.1.)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to Q3.4.4.)
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
4. Other, specify:

(skip to Q3.4.4.)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

Q3.5.

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

Q3.5.1.

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Q3.6.2.

Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?

Q3.6.3.

Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q3.8)
3. Don't Know (skip to Q3.8)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]

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

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you select your sample:

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, please enter the response rate:

Question 3C: Other Measures
(external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q3.8.2)
- 3. Don't Know (skip to Q3.8.2)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

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

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q4.1)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q4.1)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

(Remember: Save your progress)
Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in Q2.1 (see Appendix 12 in our [Feedback Packet Example](#)):

Student	Reviewer 1	Critical Analysis	Reviewer 2	Critical Analysis
1	Nevarez	R	Jez	R
2	Heilig	P	Wassmer	R
3	Nevarez	P	Jez	R
4	Nevarez	P	Jez	R
5	Heilig	P	Jez	P
6	Nevarez	R	Wassmer	R
7	Borunda	P	Wassmer	R
8	Borunda	P	Wassmer	P
9	Heilig	P	Borunda	P
10	Heilig	P	Borunda	P
11	Romero	R	Vang	R
12	Romero	P	Vang	P
13	Romero	R	Vang	F
14	Romero	R	Vang	F
15	Romero	F	Vang	R
16	Loeza	P	Langslett	R
17	Loeza	P	Langslett	R
18	Loeza	P	Langslett	P
19	Loeza	P	Langslett	P
20	Loeza	P	Langslett	P
21	Vang	R	Langslett	P

No file attached No file attached

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Yes, only 3 of 42 ratings deemed the student response to be falling on the PLO.

No file attached No file attached

Q4.3. For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 1. Exceeded expectation/standard
- 2. Met expectation/standard
- 3. Partially met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

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

Q4.5. Were all the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

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

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q5.2)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q5.2)

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

We may change the culminating qualifying exam structure for 2019-20.

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

- 1. Yes, describe your plan:

We will use student surveys to gather feedback on the optional alternative assessment of PLOs.

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Other, specify:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

We will use the assessment data in the next faculty retreat to consider another assessment that could be optional to the traditional qualifying capstone exam.

Q5.3.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5.3.1.

Please share with us an example of how you applied **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

N/A

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.

If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

N/A

No file attached No file attached

Q6.1. Please explain how the assessment activities reported in Q6 will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

Still being determined.

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [Check all that apply]

- 1. Critical Thinking
2. Information Literacy
3. Written Communication
4. Oral Communication
5. Quantitative Literacy
6. Inquiry and Analysis
7. Creative Thinking
8. Reading
9. Team Work
10. Problem Solving
11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
12. Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives
13. Ethical Reasoning
14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
15. Global Learning and Perspectives
16. Integrative and Applied Learning
17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
19. Professionalism
20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q8. Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

The feedback is valuable to evaluating and innovating current activities.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

No file attached No file attached
No file attached No file attached

Q9.1. If you have attached any files to this form, please list every attached file here:

Section 4: Background Information about the Program
Program Information (Required)

Program:
(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q11)

Q10. Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]
Ed. D. Educational Leadership

Q11. Report Author(s):
Julian Vasquez Heilig

Q11.1. Department Chair/Program Director:
Julian Vasquez Heilig

Q11.2. Assessment Coordinator:
Carlos Nevarez

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):
Education - Graduate

Q13.
College:
College of Education

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):

Q15.
Program Type:
 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
 2. Credential
 3. Master's Degree
 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
 5. Other, specify:

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?
0

Q16.1. List all the names:

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?
2

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?
0

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?
N/A

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?
N/A

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?
1

Q19.1. List all the names:

When was your Assessment Plan ...	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Before 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	No Plan	Don't know
Q20. Developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q20.1. Last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment of **student learning** occurs?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?
 1. Yes, specify:

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?

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

(Remember: Save your progress)
Save When Completed!

ver. 10.31.17

EDD 614 – Issues in Educational Leadership: Synthesis & Application (3 Credits)

<p><u>INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JoLynn Langslet, Ph.D.• Phone: (916) 390-7277 (call or text)• DrLangslet@gmail.com	
--	--

Class SacCT site: <http://online.csus.edu>

COURSE OVERVIEW AND INFORMATION

This case study based seminar course is designed to help candidates prepare for the qualifying examination. The course integrates the three themes of the program: 1) Transformational Leadership, (2) Critical Policy Analysis and Action, and (3) Informed Decision-Making. There will be an emphasis on learning to apply the seven general objectives of the EdD program by critically reviewing appropriate cases studies in educational leadership. The seven objectives are: Critical Analysis, Integrative Thinking, Effective Communication to K-14 Stakeholders, Understanding Professional Role, Practical Applications, Leadership and Equity.

REQUIRED COURSE MATERIALS

The instructor will provide all required course materials. Students are strongly encouraged to consult texts, articles and other resources and materials that were provided in previous courses. Course materials include the following:

- **Case Study #1 – (class example):**

This case study will be selected by the instructor and will be the initial case study used to introduce the rubric and analysis process. It will be emailed to the students (along with the syllabus) prior to the start of the course. This case study will be very similar in style and length to the ones that will be used for the actual exam, and will serve as a “practice” brief in class to prepare students for both the Mock Exam experience and the final Qualifying Exam. Students will need to thoroughly read and analyze this case study prior to the first class meeting and should be prepared to discuss it as its relate to the 7 point exam rubric.

- **Case Studies #2 and #3 – (Mock Exam):**

- Case #2 = P-12
- Case #3 = Community College

These case studies will also be selected by the instructor for the purpose of the Mock Exam. One will be a case study relevant to P-12 educational leadership, and the other will be relevant to community college leadership. Students will not see these case studies before the Mock Exam as they will be used to simulate the actual exam experience. Following the mock exam, students will engage in peer review and class discussion of these case studies regarding the analyses they have completed during the mock exam based on the exam rubric.

- **Exam Rubric and Faculty Scoring Sheet:**

The exam rubric and the faculty scoring sheet will be provided to the students at the start of the course and will be used during class instruction and discussion in order to prepare the students for both the Mock Exam and the Qualifying Exam. Students are encouraged to study and become familiar with the 7 domains on the rubric, along with their corresponding sub-points, and apply this knowledge to class discussion, course assignments, and exam preparation.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS

Students will attend and participate in all sessions, and actively participate in peer review activities and group discussions. All readings and learning activities have been selected to help orient and prepare students for the Qualifying Exam. Students are expected to read and think about the applications of the material, and complete all assignments on or before their due dates. Students are expected to demonstrate a high level of scholarship in all activities and assignments, in keeping with the norms of doctoral level coursework. All written assignments are to be typed, double-spaced and in hardcopy or electronic format using Microsoft Word. When applicable, written assignments should conform to APA writing style. Students will be expected to complete the following assignments for the course:

Assignments & Grading Scale:

- 40% Assignment #1: Individual Case Study Analysis (Case Study #1)
- 40% Assignment #2: Mock Exam Case Study Analysis/Peer review (Case Studies #2 & #3)
- 20% Class participation, attendance, and contribution to a variety of class discussions

A	93 – 100%	B	83 – 86%
A-	90 – 92%	B-	80 – 82%
B+	87 – 89%	C+	77 – 79%

Due Dates:

All assignments are to be completed and submitted according to the specified due dates shown on the course schedule in order to receive full credit. Late assignments will receive no more than half credit.

APPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR AND PROFESSIONALISM IN THE CLASSROOM

All students attending this course have a right to a classroom environment which permits the highest quality learning experience. Students have a right to disagree and to debate points of view on the subjects and topics covered. However, criticism of others is not acceptable.

The assignments students turn in for this course must honestly be their work. A student committing plagiarism will be subject to disciplinary action which could include failing the assignment, failing the course, being dropped from the course or other action as deemed appropriate by the instructor or the university. Plagiarism is defined as: presenting someone else’s work as your own whether it be their ideas, expression of those ideas, or rewriting of your own ideas by someone else.

If you have a disability that warrants accommodations for this course, please see the instructor at your earliest convenience. It is my goal to provide the assistance you need in order to have a fair and

optimum learning experience. Additionally, please see the campus office designated to help students with disabilities as many course accommodations require written authorization:

- Services to Students with Disabilities (SSWD) Lassen Hall room #1008
- Phone: (916) 278-6955 / Fax: (916) 278-7825 / sswd@csus.edu

Instructor Profile:

I am in my 11th year of teaching at CSUS, and have been teaching in the doctoral program since Cohort #2. In our EDD program, I have taught research methods and statistics courses (EDD 604 & 606), along with the Dissertation Proposal Course (EDD 615), and I also sit on numerous doctoral committees. I teach SPSS Seminars to both students and faculty, and work with students one on one with their statistical analyses. Additionally, I have been calibrating for and scoring the Qualifying Exam for the past 7 years.

Along with my part-time teaching at CSUS, I have taught undergraduate teacher education courses, along with graduate level research methods and statistics courses in other colleges and universities in California. My professional writing and research has been focused on both adult education and leadership styles. I have a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education from Bethel College, a Master's Degree in Teacher Education from Eastern Oregon University, and a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership from Colorado State University.

Personal note to students:

I would like to welcome you to this course and tell you that I am excited to work with you and get to know each of you on a personal level. My teaching approach is very student centered and I make every effort necessary to ensure that you will have the most positive and successful learning experience with me. I welcome your critiques of my course, content and teaching style, as you will see with the brief, two-question "Quick Response Form" I will ask you to fill out following the first and second weekends of class. This way, I can get your feedback BEFORE the class is over (unlike the traditional course evaluations that are completed at the END of the course), and can adjust things as needed to help you.

Regarding this particular course, I realize there is a significant amount of anxiety that accompanies both the preparation for and the execution of the Qualifying Exam. I have every confidence that both our program coursework and faculty successfully prepare students to meet the expectations of this exam. It is my goal to create a stress-free learning environment, since stress creates negative effects on a person's mental, physical, and emotional well-being, making it challenging to cope with the responsibilities of daily life, as well as remain healthy. I look forward to our first weekend of class.

Warmly,
Jolynn Langslet