EdD in Instructional Leadership for Nurse Educators

Academic Program: Analysis of assessment results from comprehensive examinations along with dissertation prospectus and proposal defenses revealed that students needed to strengthen their ability to articulate a sound theoretical framework together with an appropriate research methodology for their research study. To address this concern faculty instituted two actions. First, the introductory statistics class NHM 580 was replaced with the two course quantitative sequence BER 540 and BER 640 in order to more adequately cover the use of SPSS and the topics of hypothesis testing, correlation, chi-square, simple regression, discriminant analysis, multivariate analysis of variance, covariance and regression. Second, in the summer semester prior to spring examinations, the final projects of the two related courses AEL 681 and BEF 641 are presented as research papers in trial comps. Based upon written and oral presentations students receive feedback designed to better prepare them to successfully complete comprehensive examinations and formulate a rigorous and coherent research study.

Since the implementation, faculty and students report greater confidence in the preparation for comps and a clearer understanding of the research process.

The following data were recorded for the two years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Data for the current academic year will be added in Fall 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pass/fail</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comps</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>11/4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>15/2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data indicate an improvement in comprehensive examination results for the first year after the trial examinations were instituted. As yet, these students have yet to reach the dissertation proposal and defense stage, so the tabulated results will be used for future comparisons.

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: Knowledge of key theoretical positions**
Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field of Nurse Education

**Connected Document**
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 1: BEF 644 Final Paper**
BEF 644 Final Paper, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target:**
The average class grade for the final course project should exceed 3.25 as assessed by the program rubric.

**M 2: NUR 531 Course Assessment**
Student scores on NUR 531 Course Assessment
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

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

**Pending**
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

**SLO 2: Conceptual framework**
Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research in the field of Nurse Education.

**Connected Document**
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641**
Scores on the Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3.25 or higher

**M 7: Prospectus**
Scores on the Prospectus Document in NUR 696, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target:**
90% of students should earn an average measure of 3.25 on the program rubric

**SLO 3: Critically assess research methods**
Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature within the field of Nurse Education.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Analysis of Variables project in BER 540**
Scores on the Identification and Analysis of Variables project in BER 540, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
**Target:**
The average grade on the Analysis of Variables project should exceed 90 points on the 100 point scale.

**M 6: Comprehensive Examination**
Scores on written component of the Comprehensive Examination, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
**Target:**
Average grades on the four outcomes Organization, Knowledge, Argument, and Writing should exceed 3.25 as measured by the program rubric.
SLO 4: Candidates are able to design and conduct a research study
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Candidates are able to design and conduct a research study

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 4: Present academic papers
Students should present academic papers at scholarly conferences.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

M 8: Proposal and Defense
The dissertation Proposal and Defense, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% should score 3 or Higher

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
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 9: Research-based study for presentation
Presentations at a scholarly conferences.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

M 10: Student satisfaction survey
The results of the student satisfaction survey should indicate a strong positive view of the program.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
.80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

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

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 11: Complete the program
Time to program completion
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 5.5 years

M 12: Rate of attrition
The rate of attrition
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The rate of attrition during the coursework phase of the program will be less than 30%.

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

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 13: Exit interview
The exit interview.
Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
Target:
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

M 14: Survey of former graduates
Survey of former graduates.
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements
Target:
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items

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

#### Pending
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of key theoretical positions

#### Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** NUR 531 Course Assessment
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of key theoretical positions

#### Scholarly Workshop
In order to increase the quantity and quality of scholarly work conducted by students in the program the following two step scheme will be introduced:

1) At the beginning of the second year students will meet with faculty teams and present a three page outline of a research study to be developed for presentation at an academic conference. This proposal should include a statement of the problem, a short review of the relevant literature and some discussion of the methodology to be utilized. Faculty will critique the project and grade the student’s work on the standard 5 point program rubric.

2) At the beginning of the third year students will meet with faculty teams and present a draft paper. Faculty will review and rate this submission using the standard 5 point program rubric. They will also provide critical feedback that will help students bring the project to a form suitable for presentation at an academic conference and possibly publication.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The plan will begin with the cohort who entered the program in fall 2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Stephen Tomlinson
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Trial Comps
Measures of comprehensive examination performance indicate students need to improve their ability to articulate an appropriate conceptual framework in the context of a research study. During the summer semester instructors for AEL 681 and BEF 641 will meet and review student presentations of a joint course project styled on the comprehensive examination to be offered the following spring.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of key theoretical positions

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Steering Committee: Stephen Tomlinson
- **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: Knowledge of key theoretical positions
Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field of Nurse Education

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 1: BEF 644 Final Paper
BEF 644 Final Paper, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
The average class grade for the final course project should exceed 3.25 as assessed by the program rubric.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
18 students recorded the following average grades, significantly higher than the previous year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 2: NUR 531 Course Assessment
Student scores on NUR 531 Course Assessment

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All 17 students enrolled in NUR 531 scored 4.0 or higher on the target assignment.

Measurement of component outcomes yielded the following averages
NUR 531_Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 students</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Pending
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

M 3: Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641
Scores on the Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3.25 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The following satisfactory averages were recorded by 19 students. However 4 scored below 3.25, with grades of 2.75, 3, 3, and 3. Because 15/19 or approximately 80% of the class scored above 3.25 and the overall averages were high, we consider the target met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Pending
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

Trial Comps
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Measures of comprehensive examination performance indicate students need to improve their ability to articulate an appropriate c...

SLO 2: Conceptual framework
Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research in the field of Nurse Education.

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 11: Complete the program
Time to program completion
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 5.5 years.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The six students graduating in the academic year 2012-2013 completed the degree in an average of 4.53 years.

SLO 3: Critically assess research methods
Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature within the field of Nurse Education.

Related Measures

M 5: Analysis of Variables project in BER 540
Scores on the Identification and Analysis of Variables project in BER 540, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
The average grade on the Analysis of Variables project should exceed 90 points on the 100 point scale.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Excellent results were recorded on the Analysis of Variance project. 21 students scored between 95 and 100, with an average of 98.3. This clearly meets the target expectation.

M 6: Comprehensive Examination
Scores on written component of the Comprehensive Examination, as assessed by the program rubric

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

Target:
Average grades on the four outcomes Organization, Knowledge, Argument, and Writing should exceed 3.25 as measured by the program rubric.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fifteen candidates recorded the following averages. Of the three failures, two subsequently passed a second sitting and one was eliminated from the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Examinations</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 4: Candidates are able to design and conduct a research study
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Candidates are able to design and conduct
a research study

**Connected Document**

[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Prospectus**

Scores on the Prospectus Document in NUR 696, as assessed by the program rubric.

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

**Target:**

90% of students should earn an average measure of 3.25 on the program rubric

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

The overall averages on the Prospectus assignment were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 17 students scored 3.25 or higher.

**M 8: Proposal and Defense**

The dissertation Proposal and Defense, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% should score 3 or Higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Data from the dissertation defense yielded the following average evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students scored 3 or better on each category.

**M 9: Research-based study for presentation**

Presentations at a scholarly conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**

20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Reports of student activity for 2012-2013 indicate no fewer than:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nature</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 scholarly presentations and two publications by students (cohorts 3 and 4) in post comprehensive examination phase of the degree.
This meets the target expectation for this program outcome.

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

**OthOtcm 8: Recognized quality**

The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Connected Document**

[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Present academic papers**

Students should present academic papers at scholarly conferences.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Reports of student activity for 2012-2013 indicate no fewer than:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nature</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 scholarly presentations and two publications by students (cohorts 3 and 4) in post comprehensive examination phase of the degree.
This meets the target expectation for this outcome.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Scholarly Workshop**
*
*Established in Cycle*: 2012-2013

In order to increase the quantity and quality of scholarly work conducted by students in the program the following two step sc...

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

**M 10: Student satisfaction survey**
The results of the student satisfaction survey should indicate a strong positive view of the program.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

.80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The annual meeting with students elicited the following comments:

**Strengths of program**
- exceptional instructors (identified a few instructors) and well-designed courses
- opportunities to develop strong relationships among cohort students
- responsive faculty
- current information that can be used in practice

**Areas/suggestions for improvement**
- provide calendar of class times further ahead so travel arrangements can be made
- consider a ph.d.
- explore funding for students

Group responses clearly indicated that our target metric was reached. Suggestions will be discussed by the Steering Committee.

In addition survey results yielded the following average responses on the five point scale 1.Very strong, 2. Strong, 3.Average, 4.Weak, 5.Very weak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs professional duties</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate curriculum</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very strong to Strong

the target expectation clearly met for this student outcome.

**OthOtcm 9: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Connected Document**
[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 12: Rate of attrition**
The rate of attrition

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

The rate of attrition during the coursework phase of the program will be less than 30%.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Eighteen of the twenty students who started with cohort 5 in fall 2011 are currently enrolled in the program. This yields an attrition rate of just 10%

**OthOtcm 10: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves

**Connected Document**
[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Exit interview**
The exit interview.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**

80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Although a poor completion rate, n=2 of seven graduates, average responses on the five point scale 1.Very strong, 2. Strong, 3.Average, 4.Weak, 5.Very weak
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic experience at UA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value of coursework</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid professional advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend this degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4 Very strong to Strong</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All responses were positive, so target met.

**M 14: Survey of former graduates**

Survey of former graduates.

**Source of Evidence:** Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic experience at UA</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in profession</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend degree</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the program</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.25 Very strong to Strong</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All responses were positive, so target program outcome met.

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

**Pending**

Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of key theoretical positions

**Pending**

Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** NUR 531 Course Assessment
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of key theoretical positions

**Scholarly Workshop**

In order to increase the quantity and quality of scholarly work conducted by students in the program the following two step scheme will be introduced:

1) At the beginning of the second year students will meet with faculty teams and present a three page outline of a research study to be developed for presentation at an academic conference. This proposal should include a statement of the problem, a short review of the relevant literature and some discussion of the methodology to be utilized. Faculty will critique the project and grade the student’s work on the standard 5 point program rubric.

2) At the beginning of the third year students will meet with faculty teams and present a draft paper. Faculty will review and rate this submission using the standard 5 point program rubric. They will also provide critical feedback that will help students bring the project to a form suitable for presentation at an academic conference and possibly publication.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Present academic papers
- **Outcome/Objective:** Recognized quality

**Implementation Description:** The plan will begin with the cohort who entered the program in fall 2013
Trial Comps

Measures of comprehensive examination performance indicate students need to improve their ability to articulate an appropriate conceptual framework in the context of a research study. During the summer semester instructors for AEL 681 and BEF 641 will meet and review student presentations of a joint course project styled on the comprehensive examination to be offered the following spring.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Joint presentation assignment for AEL 681 and BEF 641 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of key theoretical positions

Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Steering Committee: Stephen Tomlinson
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) Candidates have the pedagogic knowledge necessary to create an environment in classroom, laboratory and clinical settings that facilitates student learning and the achievement of specific cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes.

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 1: Evidence-based Teaching Strategy Paper
Scores on Evidence-based Teaching Strategy Paper as assessed by the program rubric.

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

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

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met
15 out of 20 students enrolled completed the assignment and were awarded average scores of 3.6, 3.3, and 3.3 respectively for the categories of Organization, Literature, and Scholarly writing on the project. Since only 10 of the 15 earned a score of 4, the goal of this measure was not met.

Taken together both measures of Outcome #1 raise concern about student's pedagogic knowledge and their ability to create a classroom environment that facilitates student learning.

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

Pending
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

M 2: Online Course Creation Project
Scores on the Online Course Creation 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: Partially Met
An overall average of 3.6 was recorded for the Online Course Creation activity. This is somewhat less than the averages of the previous year, and below the expectation that 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher on the project. Only 4 of 19 students met this level, though all passed with a grade 3 or higher. A more detailed analysis of component scores follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Research</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Argument</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taken together both measures of Outcome #1 raise concern about student's pedagogic knowledge and their ability to create a classroom environment that facilitates student learning. Faculty will consider an action plan to address this concern when they meet at the fall retreat.

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

**Pending**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

**SLO 2: Skills/Abilities**
(Skills/Abilities) Candidates are able to identify individual learning styles and unique learning needs of international, adult, multicultural, educationally disadvantaged, physically challenged, at-risk and second degree learners.

**Connected Document**
*Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map*

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Final Paper Assignment in BEP 561**  
Scores on the Final Paper Assignment in BEP 561, as assessed by the program rubric.  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.  
**Target:** 80% or more of students will score 4 or higher  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
All students completed the assignment satisfactorily; the average score was 4.4 on the 5 point rubric.

**M 4: Final Project in AEL 667**  
Scores on the Final Project in AEL 667, 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**  
18 students enrolled. Four earned 2; one earned 3; six earned 4; and 9 earned 5 on the 5 point rubric. Issues of race, class, and gender present some of the most complex conceptual and practical challenges for students. Students demonstrated target on the learning situations assignment but were more challenged by discussions of social justice. Conceptual discussions about race, class and gender presented in social and cultural studies courses need to be conducted across the curriculum. In the previous year we adopted a common course text for AEL 667, BEF 644, AEL 695, and BEF 642. The results of this action will be assessed as students progress through coursework and respond to questions on their comprehensive examinations. In the case of those taking AEL 667, this course was taken out of sequence due to faculty sabbatical leave and the assumption is that students will perform better by taking BEF 644 as a preliminary, given it introduces some of the key conceptual issue addressed in AEL 667. Accordingly, faculty will monitor this outcome with the coming cohort.

**M 17: Complete the program**  
Time to program completion  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
**Target:** 75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 5.5 years.  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
Analysis of graduating class demonstrates an average time to completion of degree as 4.43 years for 6 students

None took more than 5.3 years.

**SLO 3: Candidates are able to employ a variety of strategies**  
Candidates are able to employ a variety of strategies to assess and evaluate student learning in classroom, laboratory and clinical settings.

**Connected Document**
*Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map*

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Practicum Logs**  
Evaluation of Practicum Logs, 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**  
Of the 18 students enrolled only two scored less than the measurement goal. The average assessment was 4.05. Students demonstrated the ability to evaluate student learning in classroom, laboratory and clinical settings.

**M 6: Analysis of Variables project in BER 540**  
Scores on the Identification and Analysis of Variables project in BER 540, 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
The results of the Analysis of Variance assignment were satisfactory, with 18 of 19 students receiving a grade of 4 or above.

SLO 4: Candidates are able to formulate program outcomes
Candidates are able to formulate program outcomes that reflect contemporary health care trends and prepare graduates to function effectively in a variety of health care environments.

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 7: Final Papers in NUR 532
Final Papers in NUR 532, as assessed by the program rubric.

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

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

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
13 students earned an average aggregate score of 4.7 on the assignment. 100% met the expected goal; 46% were assessed at the target level.

Presentations developed in NUR 532—later included in an open poster session—demonstrated candidate ability to formulate program outcomes that reflect contemporary health care trends. No action envisioned at this point.

M 8: Final Project in NUR 696
The Final Project in NUR 696, 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
18 students completed the assignment, meeting the stated goal for this outcome measure. The average score was a 4.4 on the program rubric.

The Draft Prospectus assignment in NUR 696 reinforced confidence in the student's capacity to design research studies that address topical problems of practice.

SLO 5: Candidates are able Identify
Candidates are able Identify how social, economic, political and institutional forces influence higher education in general and nursing education in particular.

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 9: BEF 644 Final Paper
BEF 644 Final Paper, as assessed by the program rubric

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

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

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The following class averages were recorded for the final course project. They demonstrate a significant improvement over the previous year and clearly meet outcome goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In concert with AEL 667, BEF 644 works on establishing the conceptual groundwork for understanding research into the social, economic, political and institutional forces that influence higher education and nursing practice. Students were clearly in a developmental phase of the program, but showed great enthusiasm for the topics and began to demonstrate a critical appreciation of central issues and theoretical perspectives. The results were very encouraging, certainly better than those of the previous year.

M 10: The Teaching Controversial Issues Project
The Teaching Controversial Issues 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
All 20 students met the target standard 5 for the exercise.
SLO 6: Candidates are able to apply the concepts and principles
Candidates are able to apply the concepts and principles of curriculum development and revision to teaching learning situations

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 11: Final Paper in NUR 620
The Final Paper in NUR 620, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
All 16 students met the required outcomes of the exercise. 14 earned 5s; 2 earned 4s.

M 12: Final Paper in AEL 695
The Final Paper in AEL 695 as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
22 out of 26 students scored 4 or higher. The class average on this assignment was 4.17

SLO 7: Candidates are able to design and conduct a research study
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Candidates are able to design and conduct a research study

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 13: Research-based study for presentation
Presentations at a scholarly conferences.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Nurse education students presented at least 12 scholarly papers and published on article. This includes five of the nine who have passed comprehensive examinations, or 24%.

M 14: Proposal and Defense
The dissertation Proposal and Defense, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% should score 3 or Higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Pass/Fail</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>15/2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

OthOtcm 8: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Connected Document
Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 15: Present academic papers
Students should present academic papers at scholarly conferences.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
20% of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

M 16: Student satisfaction survey
The results of the student satisfaction survey should indicate a strong positive view of the program.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: .80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met

1. All things considered, how would you rate the academic environment at UA compared to other institutions of higher education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Overall, the quality of instruction in the Nurse Education program is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. All things considered, how appropriate is the content of the coursework in the Nurse Education program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent do the knowledge and skills you are acquiring in this program inform your professional work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. To what extent do you think the following kinds of knowledge and skills are contributing to your personal development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: .80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All things considered, how would you rate the academic environment at UA compared to other institutions of higher education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall, the quality of instruction in the Nurse Education program is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All things considered, how appropriate is the content of the coursework in the Nurse Education program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To what extent do the knowledge and skills you are acquiring in this program inform your professional work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To what extent do you think the following kinds of knowledge and skills are contributing to your personal development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Writing skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comprehension skills (written information)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehension skills (written information)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scientific methods of inquiry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scientific methods of inquiry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Computer skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public speaking skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public speaking skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to function as part of a team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ability to function as part of a team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to work with people of diverse backgrounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ability to work with people of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to recognize and act on ethical principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ability to recognize and act on ethical principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding of issues related to class, race and gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Understanding of issues related to class, race and gender.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Very strong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>They encourage you to express your ideas.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>They demonstrate an interest in your academic progress.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They encourage you to be an actively involved learner.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They provide prompt and informative feedback on your submitted work.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OthOtcm 9: Optimal level**

The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Connected Document**

[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 18: Rate of attrition**

The rate of attrition

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

The rate of attrition will be less than 35%.

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

Students records indicate that four of 23 students admitted into the first cohort have dropped out of the program. That is an attrition rate of approximately 17%.

**OthOtcm 10: Program Value**

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

**Connected Document**

[Doctorate in Instructional Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 19: Exit interview**

The exit interview.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**

80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

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

Although only one nurse education graduate responded to the Exit Survey their responses were very positive and clearly met the goal set for the program.

**M 20: Survey of former graduates**

Survey of former graduates.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**

80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

---

The table is a summary of writing skills assessed by program faculty on a scale from very strong (6) to never (0). The table provides the number of times the faculty was assessed as very strong, strong, moderate, weak, and very weak. The columns are labeled Much, Little, Seldom, and Never. The rows represent different skills such as writing skills, comprehension skills, scientific methods of inquiry, computer skills, public speaking skills, ability to function as part of a team, ability to work with people of diverse backgrounds, ability to recognize and act on ethical principals, and understanding of issues related to class, race, and gender.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Pending
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Online Course Creation Project | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Knowledge

Pending
Actions measures will be considered by faculty at the first fall steering committee meeting, and shared at the 2012 retreat.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evidence-based Teaching Strategy Paper | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Knowledge
## Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Course 5</th>
<th>Course 6</th>
<th>Course 7</th>
<th>Course 8</th>
<th>Course 9</th>
<th>Course 10</th>
<th>Course 11</th>
<th>Course 12</th>
<th>Course 13</th>
<th>Course 14</th>
<th>Course 15</th>
<th>Course 16</th>
<th>Course 17</th>
<th>Course 18</th>
<th>Course 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUR 531</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIL 600</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEF 644</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEL 667</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIL 602</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHM 580</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIL 604</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER 540</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER 631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 532</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 620</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHE 603</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEP 541</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 540</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEL 681</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEF 641</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER 631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEL 695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 696</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map II (Assessment Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 6</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>NUR 521 candidates have the ability to create an environment in classroom, laboratory and clinical settings that facilitates student learning and the achievement of specific cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>NUR 580 candidates are able to identify individual learning styles and unique learning needs of international, adult, multicultural, educationally disadvantaged, physically challenged, at-risk and second degree learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>NUR 532 candidates are able to employ a variety of strategies to assess and evaluate student learning in classroom, laboratory and clinical settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>NUR 540 candidates are able to formulate program outcomes that reflect contemporary health care trends and prepare graduates to function effectively in a variety of health care environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>NUR 620 candidates are able to identify how social, economic, political and institutional forces influence higher education in general and nursing education in particular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>AEL 667 candidates are able to apply the concepts and principles of curriculum development and revision to teaching learning situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>AEL 695 candidates are able to design and conduct a research study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Course 1 | NUR 521 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 2 | NUR 580 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 3 | NUR 532 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 4 | NUR 540 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 5 | NUR 620 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 6 | AEL 667 Community Health Project                                                                 |                                                                                          | Teaching Controversial Issues project                                                    |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 7 | AEL 695 Final Paper                                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 8 | BEF 644 Final Paper                                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 9 | BER 540 Identification and Analysis of Variables project                                              |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 10 | NUR 696 Course Embedded Assessment                                                                 |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |
| Course 11 | AIL 604 Online Course Creation                                                                      |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |

### Activity

- Scholarly Work
  - Online Course Creation

- Dissertation Defense
  - Record of student work through citations submitted at online database
  - Report of dissertation committee
Optional Additional Narrative:  Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan

The following program rubric will be used to evaluate student responses:

5 = Excellent. All points of the question are answered comprehensively and persuasively; the information is valid and pertinent; the organization is logical; and the language is clear and concise.

4 = Good. All points of the question are answered with evidence that generally supports the answer; the information provided is relevant; the organization is appropriate; and the language is clear. Minor errors of detail are tolerated.

3 = Adequate. The most important points in the question are treated; the central arguments are sound; most of the information is valid and pertinent; the organization is clear; and the language is scholarly. Small errors are tolerated.

2 = Inadequate. Some of the points called for in the question are not answered; documentation is either lacking or is erroneous; portions of the information are invalid or not pertinent; the organization lacks a logical flow; and the language is vague. Major points made in the answer are in error.

1 = Unacceptable. Few of the points asked in the question are answered; documentation is absent; most of the information is incorrect; the argument does not flow logically; and the language is replete with grammatical errors.

0 = N/A The question was not answered.