

<p>California State University, Fresno Kremen School of Education Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Administration with a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Department/Program Assessment Coordinator: Dr. Jessica Hannigan</p>
<p>Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP)</p>
<p>I. Mission Statement</p> <p>The Educational Leadership and Administration Program develops multi-faceted scholar-practitioners and prepares ethical and resilient leaders in education committed to advocating for equity, social justice and excellence in educational leadership for K-12 throughout California.</p>

II. Institutional Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes/Goals, and SLO's [a,b,c]

- A. Institutional Learning Outcomes. Fresno State ILO's are posted on the following webpage:
<http://fresnostate.edu/academics/oie/assessment/fresno-state-assessment.html>
1. **Developing a foundational, broad and integrative knowledge** of the humanities, the arts, the sciences, and social sciences, and their integration with their major field of study. Students will consolidate learning from different fields and explore the concepts and questions that bridge those essential areas of learning. Graduate students will articulate the significance, implications and challenges within their field in a societal and global context. In fields in which interdisciplinarity is fundamental, graduate students will further draw from the perspectives of other domains of inquiry/practice so as to assess a problem better and offer solutions to it.
 2. **Acquiring specialized knowledge** as identified by program learning outcomes in their major field. Students will demonstrate expertise in a specialized area of study, including integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice. Graduate students will demonstrate further mastery of the field's theories, research methods, and approaches to inquiry. They will also show the ability to assess major contributions to the field, as well as expand on those contributions through empirical research or aesthetic exploration.
 3. **Acquiring specialized knowledge** as identified by program learning outcomes in their major field. Students will demonstrate expertise in a specialized area of study, including integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice. Graduate students will demonstrate further mastery of the field's theories, research methods, and approaches to inquiry. They will also show the ability to assess major contributions to the field, as well as expand on those contributions through empirical research or aesthetic exploration.
 4. **Improving intellectual skills** including critical thinking, effective oral and written communication, information literacy and quantitative reasoning. Students will demonstrate fluency via application of these skills to everyday problems and complex challenges. Graduate students will hone these skills further, demonstrating coherent arguments, analysis, insight, creativity, and acumen as they address local, regional, and global issues in their respective fields of study.

5. **Applying knowledge** by integrating theory, practice, and problem solving to address real world issues using both individual and team approaches. Students will apply their knowledge in a project, paper, exhibit, performance, or other appropriate demonstration that links knowledge and skills acquired at the university with those from other areas of their lives. Graduate students will integrate knowledge and skills from coursework, practicum, and research to address critical issues in their field and demonstrate advanced application of knowledge through a culminating experience that validates, challenges, and/or expands the profession's body of knowledge.

6. **Exemplifying equity, ethics, and engagement.** Students will form and effectively communicate their own evidence-based and reasoned views on public issues, interact with others to address social, environmental and economic challenges, apply knowledge of diversity and cultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in the classroom and the community, value the complexity of ethical decision making in a diverse society, acknowledge the importance of standards in academic and professional integrity, and demonstrate honesty, tolerance, and civility in social and academic interactions. Building upon this at the graduate level, students will apply these values in the creation of scholarly and/or aesthetic works that enrich the human experience.

- B. Program Learning Outcomes (Also known as Goals) and related SLO's
- Program Learning Outcomes or GOALS are the specific knowledge and skills that the department/program will develop or strengthen in students. These PLO's or Goals may be broader than SLO's but must be measurable and each PLO must have at least one SLO to which is directly linked/aligned.

The overarching goal of the The Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Administration with a Preliminary Administrative Services credential is to prepare candidates to assume administrative roles as credible instructional leaders that have a well-formed philosophy of educational leadership based on a deep theoretical/knowledge base as well as practical on-site experience. The selected PLOs and SLOs are aligned with state (CCTC) and national (AAQEP) accreditation standards for our program. There are four overarching standards and six elements (a-f) for each standard. For the purpose of this SOAP, we selected two overarching standards and 2 SLOs for each.

1. **PLO (Goal) - Program completers will perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.** **This PLO is derived from Standard 1 AAQEP Candidate Completer Performance Standard.*
 - a. **SLO - 1a.** Candidates will demonstrates content, pedagogical, and/or professional knowledge relevant to the credential or degree sought.
 - b. **SLO - 1d.** Candidates will demonstrates assessment of and for student learning, assessment and data literacy, and use of data to inform practice.

2. **PLO (Goal) - Program completers will adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.** **This PLO is derived from Standard 2 AAQEP Completer Professional Competence and Growth Standard.*
- a. **SLO - 2c.** Candidates will create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.
- b. **SLO - 2e.** Candidates will establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection.

III. Curriculum Map [d]: Courses in which SLO's are addressed and evaluated

	PLO 1 /SLO 1a.	PLO 1/SLO 1d.	PLO 2/SLO 2c.	PLO 2/SLO 2e.
Course (Program Courses)	I, or D or M			
EAD 261 School Leadership for Equity and Improvement	M	M	M	M
EAD 271 Leadership Seminar and Fieldwork 1	D	D	D	D
EAD 262 Communities of Practice for Student Learning and Wellbeing	M		M	M
EAD 272 Leadership Seminar and Fieldwork 2	D	D	D	D
ERE 244 Mixed Methods Research in Diverse Classrooms				
EAD 263 Professional Learning for Teacher Growth	M	M		
Site-Based Leadership and Fieldwork 3	D	D	D	D
EAD 298 Research Project				

For courses in the major, using the abbreviations below, indicate which outcomes are introduced, which are developed, and which are mastered in that particular course.

I = Introduced

D = Developed

M=Mastered

IV. SLO's Mapped to Assessment Measures and Methods [e]

Assessment Measure	Evaluation Method	PLO/SLO 1a.	PLO/SLO 1d.	PLO/SLO 2c.	PLO/SLO 2e.
(Assignment or survey)	Criteria, Rubric, Score				
Cycle 1 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 1 Rubric 1.1	X			
Cycle 1 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 1 Rubric 1.2		X		
Cycle 1 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 1 Rubric 1.6			X	
Cycle 1 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 1 Rubric 1.8				X
Cycle 2 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 2 Rubric 2.2				X
Cycle 2 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 2 Rubric 2.3	X			
Cycle 3 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 3 Rubric 3.3			X	
Cycle 3 Signature Assignment (Direct)	CalAPA Cycle 3 Rubric 3.4	X	X		
P12 PASC Program AAQEP Candidate Self-Assessment (Indirect)	Survey	X	X	X	X

V. Assessment Measures: Description of Assignment and Method (rubric, criteria, etc.) used to evaluate the assignment [f]

- A. Direct Measures (Department/Program must use a minimum of three different direct measures)
1. Cycle 1 Signature Assignment with rubric 1.1: Rubric 1.1 which is to used evaluate the candidate's ability to select a California State indicator (student absenteeism, suspension rate, English learner progress, graduates rate, academic performance, college/career readiness) and analyze quantitative data across three years to identify trends related to school equity for one student group. Candidates are also evaluated on how clearly they make connections between the data analysis and specific components of the school's vision, mission, and/or goals. From this foundation, candidates work towards exploring additional data linked to the indicator to support their trend analysis and further understand the group differences (i.e., language, ethnicity, gender) within the selected state indicator. Candidates at the highest level also cite relevant research that supports the trend analysis related to equity and clearly explains why the cited research informs their understanding of the observed equity gap. Candidate success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno

State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.

2. Cycle 1 Signature Assignment with rubric 1.2: Rubric 1.2 evaluates the candidate's ability to collect and analyze relevant qualitative data and explain their relation to quantitative data findings and the student group equity issue. Candidates work towards demonstrating a comprehensive analysis of a range of quantitative data sources over three years as well as follow up qualitative data to deepen their understanding of the equity issues surrounding the selected State-wide indicator and the student group equity issue. Candidate success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.
3. Cycle 1 Signature Assignment with rubric 1.6: Rubric 1.6 evaluates the candidates', as second semester completers, ability to develop strategies for equitable school improvement for a student group well informed by the findings of the equity gap analysis, including contributing factors, and responsive to the problem statement and aligned to the school's vision, mission, and/or goals. Candidates also work towards proposing relevant strategies with a strategic focus to represent a contextually responsive approach to addressing equity issues and educational needs. Completer success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.
4. Cycle 1 Signature Assignment with rubric 1.8: Rubric 1.8 evaluates the candidates', as second semester completers, to reflect on, summarize, and analyze what they have learned about equity-driven leadership, and, then, use this learning to identify strengths and areas for leadership growth. Candidates also work towards reflection on how the school context—including social, economic, or cultural contexts—impacts their approach to providing equity-driven leadership, as well as, on how to develop steps to address their identified area(s) of professional growth as an equity-driven leader to improve learning and/or well-being at this school site. Candidates at the highest level also demonstrate a level of reflection that demonstrates how the school context—including social, economic, or cultural contexts—impacts their approach to providing equity-driven leadership, and develops steps to address their identified area(s) of professional growth as an equity-driven leader to improve learning and/or well-being at this school site. Completer success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean

scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.

5. Cycle 2 Signature Assignment with rubric 1.6: Rubric 1.6 evaluates the candidates', as second semester completers, ability to develop strategies for equitable school improvement for a student group well informed by the findings of the equity gap analysis, including contributing factors, and responsive to the problem statement and aligned to the school's vision, mission, and/or goals. Candidates also work towards proposing relevant strategies with a strategic focus to represent a contextually responsive approach to addressing equity issues and educational needs. Completer success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.
6. Cycle 2 Signature Assignment with rubric 2.3: Rubric 2.3 is on the facilitation of a community of practice to develop a problem of practice related to student learning and/or well-being that is based on school data where candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of aspiring school leaders. Candidate success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3, as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.
7. Cycle 3 Signature Assignment with rubric 3.3: Rubric 3.3 is to evaluate the candidates' ability to create productive learning environments through a coaching process during the teaching and learning environment with a voluntary teacher in which they recognize and document qualities of teaching practice related to the selected CSTP element(s) and learning goals of the lesson. Candidate success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.

Cycle 3 Signature Assignment with rubric 3.4: Rubric 3.4 is to measure candidate content, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills using instructional coaching tools during the post-observation meeting between the candidate and volunteer teacher. These meetings incorporate the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), lesson observation videos, and student work to identify teaching strengths and areas for growth which are all expected knowledge, skills, and abilities exhibited by aspiring school leaders. Candidate success would be measured at Level 2 or Level 3 as proficiency with the CTC is currently at a Level 2; however, Fresno State faculty instruct toward all 5 levels with an emphasis on Level 3 or 4. In

addition, maintaining mean scores above the state average by rubric will be considered as an element of success criteria.

- B. Indirect Measures (Department/Program must use a minimum of one indirect measure)
 - 1. P12 PASC Program AAQEP Candidate Self-Assessment Survey: The P12 PASC Program AAQEP Candidate Self-Assessment was designed to capture student reflection and growth after each semester in the program in alignment with AQQEP aspects. This is used at the end of each semester as an additional program indirect assessment data point used for reflection and continuous improvement.

VI. Assessment Schedule/Timeline [g]

Academic Year	Measure	SLO 1a.	SLO 1d.	SLO 2c.	SLO 2e.
2021-2022	Rubrics Survey	X			
2022-2023	Rubrics Survey		X		
2023-2024	Rubrics Survey			X	
2024-2025	Rubrics Survey				X
2025-2026	Rubrics Survey	X			

<p>VII. Closing the Loop [h,j,k]</p> <p>Fresno State Closing the Loop process is described immediately below.</p> <p>8. A major assessment report, which focuses on assessment activities carried out the previous academic year, is submitted in September of each academic year and evaluated by the Learning Assessment Team and Director of Assessment at Fresno State.</p> <p>Program/Department Closing the Loop process: Based on our annual report submission dated September 2021 we have identified closing the loop next steps for the specific SLOs we assessed in this report and for overall program process closing the loop improvements next steps:</p> <p>Reviewed SLOs next steps: further instruction on how to triangulate quantitative and qualitative data to demonstrate a sophisticated analysis of equity disparity among groups of students would be a future emphasis and an added layer of support in connecting multiple data findings to relevant research will be a focus to help students meet the level 4 and/or level 5 standards. Specifically, we decided to implement the following two strategies 1) Intentional opportunities for rubric centered</p>
--

peer to peer feedback embedded into the courses and 2) implement a Faculty Learning Community focused on reflection and development of rubric analysis, instructional best practices, and resources/practices/materials for mastery to target SLOs.

Overall program process next steps: We will establish a faculty learning community (FLC) designed to meet regularly, student learning outcome goals and progress monitor student assessment information aligned with state and national accreditation standards. This will allow us to discuss current teaching best practices and adjust our teaching and support based on the student data. We will also develop an internal competency task rubric aligned with state and national requirements to provide feedback and have a faculty data collection procedure.