Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Goals

G 1: Increase graduation rate
Increase graduation rate of Ed.D. and Ph.D. students.

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

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
(Discipline Knowledge) Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field
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Related Measures

M 1: Design and Administer a School Climate Survey
The ability to Design and Administer a School Climate Survey and suggest appropriate policies in response to any measured problems, as assessed by the program rubric. This course, AEL 650, is offered every other year (2011-2012, 2013-2014, etc.)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

M 2: Critique a Scholarly Research Article
The ability to Critique a Scholarly Research Article, as measured by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities
(Skills/Abilities) Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.
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Related Measures

M 3: Scholarly Paper
PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper at an academic conference or publish a research-based article

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

Target: 20% of PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While thi...

M 4: Dissertation Proposal
The Dissertation Proposal as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature
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Related Measures

M 5: Book Length Ethnographic Study
The ability to critically assess a Book Length Ethnographic Study, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

M 6: Comprehensive Examinations
Comprehensive Examinations, as assessed according to the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
The program's comprehensive examination participation rate will increase by 10 percent over the previous year; quality as assessed by the program rubric will increase by 10 percent over the previous year.

M 7: Analysis of Variables Project
The Identification and Analysis of Variables Project, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

SLO 4: Design and conduct
Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.
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Related Measures

M 8: Grounded Theory Pilot Study
The ability to design and conduct a Grounded Theory Pilot Study, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

M 9: Dissertation Defense
The program's dissertation defense rate and quality.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
The program's dissertation defense rate will increase by 10 percent over the previous year; quality as assessed by the program rubric will increase by 10 percent over the previous year.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality
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Related Measures

M 10: Present academic papers
The presentation of academic papers at scholarly conferences
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
30% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations will present papers at conferences in 2012-2013.

M 11: Student satisfaction Interview
The results of the student satisfaction interview.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
80% of respondents will express positive evaluations on the survey measures.

OthOtcm 6: Optimal level
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion
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Related Measures
M 12: Complete the program

Time to Graduation

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in 6 years

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

Improving Time to Graduation
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Faculty will meet at the fall semester retreat in order to develop an action plan that address the problem of improving the time taken to complete the doctoral degree.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 13: Rate of attrition

Attrition Rate

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

OthOtm 7: Program Value

The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.
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Related Measures

M 14: Exit Survey

The exit survey of graduating students.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
The exit interview will demonstrate graduating students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

M 15: Survey of former graduates

The survey of former graduates assessing the impact of the program on their careers

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
The survey of former graduates will demonstrate students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improving Time to Graduation

Faculty will meet at the fall semester retreat in order to develop an action plan that address the problem of improving the time taken to complete the doctoral degree.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Complete the program | Outcome/Objective: Optimal level

Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations

Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While this is above our outcome goal, it is lower than it could be given the quality work out students are producing.

We will work to more consistently communicate the value of presenting their work, the institutional resources available for them to do so, and seek to help move appropriate class projects to be published.

A more specific set of steps will be formulated at the fall faculty retreat.

The 2012-2013 target is 30% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presenting their work at professional conferences.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Scholarly Paper | Outcome/Objective: Skills/Abilities

Implementation Description: Faculty members will encourage students engaged in research projects as well as those whose course or comprehensive examinations are of appropriate quality and topic to submit proposals for presentations at conferences. The department chair will secure financial support for travel costs both from departmental monies and from the Graduate School.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2013

Responsible Person/Group: Philo Hutcheson, Department Chair

Additional Resources: The resources are available, so while they are in addition to previous budgets, there is
money available.

**Alumni/Alumnae survey**

The College of Education will survey its current students in December 2013.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Online survey administered by outside agency.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College of Education Dean's Office.
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Retaining students**

The program and the Department Head will implement a set of activities to retain more doctoral students in the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The Department Head will identify all enrolled doctoral students over the past year, review those students with the program faculty so that it is clear which students have which advisors. In addition, the Department Head will remind students as they approach their seven-year limit.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty and Department Head
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Student survey**

We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Online survey administered by outside agency.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College of Education Dean's Office.
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Survey of Graduates**

The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Online survey administered by outside agency.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College of Education Dean's Office.
- **Additional Resources:** None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes–as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

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

**SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge**
(Discipline Knowledge) Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field
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Related Measures

**M 1: Design and Administer a School Climate Survey**
The ability to Design and Administer a School Climate Survey and suggest appropriate policies in response to any measured problems, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This course was not offered in the 2012-2013 cycle.

**M 2: Critique a Scholarly Research Article**
The ability to Critique a Scholarly Research Article, as measured by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Nine students took this course in 2012-2013, and they all scored at 4 or higher.

**SLO 2: Skills/Abilities**
(Skills/Abilities) Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.
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Related Measures

**M 3: Scholarly Paper**
PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper at an academic conference or publish a research-based article

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

**Target:**
20% of PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Five students presented papers, some of them co-authored with papers. Both Ph.D. and Ed.D. students presented their work, and 20% percent of those had taken their comps prior to 2012-2013.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations**
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While thi...

**M 4: Dissertation Proposal**
The Dissertation Proposal as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Twenty students presented their dissertation proposals, and their average scores on the four categories evaluated in the 5-point program rubric were above 3.5.

SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature
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Related Measures

M 5: Book Length Ethnographic Study
The ability to critically assess a Book Length Ethnographic Study, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Six students completed this project in 2012-2013, and five of the six (83 percent) scored at 4 or higher.

M 6: Comprehensive Examinations
Comprehensive Examinations, as assessed according to the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Twenty-six students took the comprehensive examination; one in the fall and one in the spring did not pass the first time and re-took parts of the comps. Twenty-two students (85%) scored at 3 or higher.

M 7: Analysis of Variables Project
The Identification and Analysis of Variables Project, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Ten students completed the analysis of variables project, and 8 of the 10 (80%) scored above 4.0.

SLO 4: Design and conduct
Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.
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Related Measures

M 8: Grounded Theory Pilot Study
The ability to design and conduct a Grounded Theory Pilot Study, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Five students completed this project, and their average was above 4.0.

M 9: Dissertation Defense
The Dissertation Defense, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Eighteen students defended their dissertations in 2012-2013 and all scored above 3 on the program rubric.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality
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Related Measures

M 10: Present academic papers
The presentation of academic papers at scholarly conferences
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: 30% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations will present papers at conferences in
2012-2013.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Five students presented papers at conferences; publications co-authored with a faculty member are in press or submission.

M 11: Student satisfaction interview
The results of the student satisfaction interview.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
80% of respondents will express positive evaluations on the survey measures.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

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

Student survey
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

OthOtcm 6: Optimal level
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion
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Related Measures

M 12: Complete the program
Time to Graduation
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in 6 years

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
For this program, in 2012-2013, the doctoral graduates took an average of 5.5 years, with two students requesting extensions past the seven-year limit.

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

Improving Time to Graduation
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Faculty will review the enrolled doctoral students to determine which students have which advisors in order to improve the adv...

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 13: Rate of attrition
Attrition Rate
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Of the 35 doctoral students admitted in 2007-2008, nine are no longer taking courses, an attrition rate of 26%.

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

Retaining students
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The program and the Department Head will implement a set of activities to retain more doctoral students in the program.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

OthOtcm 7: Program Value
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.
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Related Measures

M 14: Exit Survey
The exit survey of graduating students.
Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
Target:
The exit interview will demonstrate graduating students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Alumni/Alumnae survey
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The College of Education will survey its current students in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 15: Survey of former graduates
The survey of former graduates assessing the impact of the program on their careers
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
The survey of former graduates will demonstrate students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of an alumni and alumnae survey to be administered in December 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Survey of Graduates
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improving Time to Graduation
Faculty will review the enrolled doctoral students to determine which students have which advisors in order to improve the advising relationship, key to completion of the doctoral degree.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Complete the program | Outcome/Objective: Optimal level
Implementation Description: Review of enrolled doctoral students.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and Department Head
Additional Resources: None

Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations
Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While this is above our outcome goal, it is lower than it could be given the quality work out students are producing.

We will work to more consistently communicate the value of presenting their work, the institutional resources available for them to do so, and seek to help move appropriate class projects to be published.

A more specific set of steps will be formulated at the fall faculty retreat.

The 2012-2013 target is 30% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presenting their work at professional conferences.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Scholarly Paper | Outcome/Objective: Skills/Abilities
Implementation Description: Faculty members will encourage students engaged in research projects as well as those whose course or comprehensive examinations are of appropriate quality and topic to submit proposals for presentations at conferences. The department chair will secure financial support for travel costs both from departmental monies and from the Graduate School.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Philo Hutcheson, Department Chair
Additional Resources: The resources are available, so while they are in addition to previous budgets, there is money available.

Alumni/Alumnae survey
The College of Education will survey its current students in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Survey | Outcome/Objective: Program Value
Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean's Office.
Additional Resources: None

Retaining students
The program and the Department Head will implement a set of activities to retain more doctoral students in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Rate of attrition | Outcome/Objective: Optimal level

Implementation Description: The Department Head will identify all enrolled doctoral students over the past year, review those students with the program faculty so that it is clear which students have which advisors. In addition, the Department Head will remind students as they approach their seven-year limit.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and Department Head
Additional Resources: None

Student survey
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student satisfaction Interview | Outcome/Objective: Recognized quality

Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean’s Office.
Additional Resources: None.

Survey of Graduates
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Survey of former graduates | Outcome/Objective: Program Value

Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean’s Office.
Additional Resources: None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

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

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
(Discipline Knowledge) Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field
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Related Measures

M 1: Design and Administer a School Climate Survey
The ability to Design and Administer a School Climate Survey and suggest appropriate policies in response to any measured problems, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met
Results on the Climate Survey Project indicate that 21 students earned an average score of 3.72. 13 scored four or better on the five point scale. This was somewhat lower than last year, although that measure was based upon a much smaller sample.

This fell slightly short of the expected goal for this outcome measure.

Faculty are relatively satisfied with student's knowledge of theoretical positions as demonstrated by the scores on the climate survey project. No major change suggested on the basis of these findings, but faculty will monitor the performance of students on comprehensive examinations and the dissertation to determine any pattern of poor progress in the ability to engage with theoretical literature in the field.

M 2: Critique a Scholarly Research Article
The ability to Critique a Scholarly Research Article, as measured by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This class was not offered during the 2011-2012 academic year.

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities
(Skills/Abilities) Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.
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Related Measures

M 3: Scholarly Paper
PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper at an academic conference or publish a research-based article

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

Target: 20% of PhD students will present a Scholarly Paper

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Four PhD students presented five scholarly papers and published two articles in 2011-2012. This represented 22% of those who had passed Comprehensive Examinations.

While this is above our outcome goal, it is lower than it could be given the quality work out students are producing. We will work to more consistently communicate the value of presenting their work, the
institutional resources available for them to do so, and seek to help move appropriate class projects to be published.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While thi...

**M 4: Dissertation Proposal**
The Dissertation Proposal as assessed by the program rubric.

*Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other*

*Target:*
- 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*
- The average scores on the four categories evaluated in the 5 point department rubric for the 16 students who defended their dissertation proposal were as follows: Knowledge of Literature 3.63, Organization 3.75, Argumentation 3.67, and Scholarly Writing 3.63. Overall the average total performance on the proposal was scored at 3.67. This was above the expected goal for this measure.

**SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings**
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature
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**Related Measures**

**M 5: Book Length Ethnographic Study**
The ability to critically assess a Book Length Ethnographic Study, as assessed by the program rubric.

*Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other*

*Target:*
- 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*
- Three students completed this project with scores of 3, 4, and 4. This is slightly below the expected goal. Given the numbers involved--one person was one point from target--faculty will monitor this outcome closely during the 2012-2013 academic year.

**M 6: Comprehensive Examinations**
Comprehensive Examinations, as assessed according to the program rubric

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

*Target:*
- 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*
- Twenty three students took and passed comprehensive examinations. Their average scores were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Literature</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Analysis of Variables Project**
The Identification and Analysis of Variables Project, as assessed by the program rubric

*Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group*

*Target:*
- 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*
- Two students completed this project both with scores of 3. Given that two students are involved, the program will collect more data in the coming year.

**SLO 4: Design and conduct**
Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.
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**Related Measures**

**M 8: Grounded Theory Pilot Study**
The ability to design and conduct a Grounded Theory Pilot Study, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Three students recorded 3, 4, and 5 on this assignment. Given the number of students, the program will collect more data on this outcome in the coming year.

**M 9: Dissertation Defense**
The Dissertation Defense, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Sixteen students defended their dissertation studies during 2011-2012, recording the following scores. These met the goal for this measure and improved significantly upon the previous year's assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 5: Recognized quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality

**Connected Document**
PhD Ed Admin Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 10: Present academic papers**
The presentation of academic papers at scholarly conferences
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
20% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Five PhD students presented eight scholarly papers and published three articles in 2011-2012. This represented 22% of those who had passed Comprehensive Examinations.

**M 11: Student satisfaction Interview**
The results of the student satisfaction interview.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**Target:**
80% of respondents will express positive evaluations on the survey measures.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Faculty will meet with students to discuss the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

**OthOtcm 6: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion

**Connected Document**
PhD Ed Admin Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 12: Complete the program**
Time to Graduation
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
75% of graduating students should complete the program in 6 years

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Met**
Analysis of graduating class demonstrates an average time to completion of degree as 5.5 years for 10 students.

Four took longer than 6 years.

Faculty are concerned across the department with the time many students take to graduation. Oftentimes this results from the challenges of balancing a career with full time study, oftentimes family and
health issues come into play, especially for older students. Even so faculty are committed to monitoring progress and improving on the amount of time students take to finish their degree. The rate of attrition is a related concern, but here the numbers seem strong compared with national averages. As a result, faculty will develop a multi-year action plan to monitor and promote student engagement in the program.

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

**Improving Time to Graduation**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Faculty will meet at the fall semester retreat in order to develop an action plan that address the problem of improving the ti...

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**M 13: Rate of attrition**

**Attrition Rate**

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

Of the 30 students admitted in 2006-2007 eight have dropped out of the program. That is an attrition rate of 26%

**OthOtcn 7: Program Value**

The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Connected Document**

*PhD Ed Admin Curriculum Map*

**Related Measures**

**M 14: Exit Survey**

The exit survey of graduating students.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**

The exit interview will demonstrate graduating students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

2. All things considered, how would you rate the intellectual environment at UA compared to other academic institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. All things considered, how would you evaluate the overall graduate education that you received at UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Has your degree at UA contributed to your professional advancement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. To what extent do you think your graduate education at UA contributed to your knowledge, skills, and/or personal development in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehension skills (written information)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scientific methods of inquiry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public speaking skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ability to function as part of a team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ability to work with people of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ability to recognize and act on ethical principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Appreciation of issues related to race, class, and gender.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please assess program faculty on each of the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Were you encouraged to express your ideas?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did at least one faculty member in your program demonstrate interest in your academic progress?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Did faculty encourage you to be an actively involved learner?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did faculty provide prompt and informative feedback on your submitted work?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey of former graduates will demonstrate students' strong positive satisfaction with the program. 80% of responses should be positive across the various items on the survey.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The former graduate survey will be administered at the beginning of the fall semester.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improving Time to Graduation**

Faculty will meet at the fall semester retreat in order to develop an action plan that address the problem of improving the time taken to complete the doctoral degree.

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: High*  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
  *Measure: Complete the program | Outcome/Objective: Optimal level*

**Increase Number of Scholarly Presentations**

Only 22% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations presented their work at professional conferences. While this is above our outcome goal, it is lower than it could be given the quality work out students are producing.

We will work to more consistently communicate the value of presenting their work, the institutional resources available for them to do so, and seek to help move appropriate class projects to be published.

A more specific set of steps will be formulated at the fall faculty retreat.

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
*Implementation Status: Planned*  
*Priority: High*  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
  *Measure: Scholarly Paper | Outcome/Objective: Skills/Abilities*
## Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.</td>
<td>Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.</td>
<td>Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.</td>
<td>Ability to design and conduct a research study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>AEL 645</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>AEL 650</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>AEL 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>AEL 664</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>AEL 666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>AEL 669</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>AEL 675</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>AEL 682</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td>AEL 683</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td>BEF 667</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 11</td>
<td>BEF 681</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 12</td>
<td>BER 540</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 13</td>
<td>BER 545</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 14</td>
<td>BER 631</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 15</td>
<td>BER 632</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map II (Assessment Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field of social foundations.</td>
<td>Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.</td>
<td>Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.</td>
<td>Ability to design and conduct a research study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;AEL 650</td>
<td>Climate Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;AEL 675</td>
<td>Analysis of Research Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ber 631 OR Ber 540</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Ethnographic Book Review OR Identification and Analysis of Variables project</td>
<td>Grounded Theory Pilot Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic presentation and scholarly papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Examinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written and oral response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Dissertation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Proposal</td>
<td>The Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional Additional Narrative: Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan

The point scale used to evaluate student responses on these four categories:

5 = Excellent answer, all points of the question are answered fully with comprehensive documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise.

4 = Good answer, well above average, all points of the question are answered with documentation that generally supports the answer. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise. Errors in minor details of answers are tolerated.

3 = Answer is adequate, all points of the question are treated but at a minimal level and with sketchy documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear. Minor errors are tolerated.

2 = Answer is inadequate, fewer than on half of the points called for by the question are answered and documentation is either lacking or is erroneous. Portions of the information are invalid and not pertinent. Organization lacks a logical flow and language is vague. Major points made in the answer are in error.

1 = Answer is less than would be expected from a competent graduate student. Documentation is absent and most of the information is incorrect. The answer does not address the question, lacks logical flow and indicates a deficiency in verbal skills.

0 = N/A The answer is inadequate, does not address the question and is incorrect.