**DPELFS**

**Major Assessment Report (2015-2016)**

Please download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section. Send your assessment reports to Dr. Angel Sanchez ([aansanchez@csufresno.edu](mailto:aansanchez@csufresno.edu)) in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and copy Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). Please complete a separate report for each Bachelors and Masters program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. The G.E. Committee will issue a separate call for G.E. assessment reports.   SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort.  SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice.  SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader.  SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success.  SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations. |
| 1. **What instruments (assignment) did you use to assess them?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the instrument (assignment) is able to measure the outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3   SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation**  SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation and Qualifying Examination**  SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader. **Pre and Post 360 Disposition Surveys**  SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success. **Dissertation Criteria and Oral Written Rubric**  SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation** |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation**  **Standard Met-** Yes, All the students involved in embedded fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results.Fieldwork clients were assessed at the end of each fieldwork project, program facilitators use qualitative data to measure impact on organization, professionalism and overall quality of the work product.  SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation and Qualifying Examination**  **Standard Met-** Yes, students use organization theory analysis as learned in core courses to apply in the evaluation of client organization. All students who participated in fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results. All students currently in year 3passed the qualifying examination and were approved to begin the dissertation process.  SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader. **Pre and Post 360 Disposition Surveys**  **Standard Met-** Yes, however, there was a low response rate on these surveys since they were distributed in paper/pencil format. According to the survey results, we had approximately 20% return rate from previous cohorts. The ratings demonstrated positive self-perception in leadership disposition skills (pre/post) but there was not enough data at this time. This survey has since been modified to an electronic format to provide for much faster responses and a more efficient process of collecting surveys from students, employers and peers.  SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success. **Dissertation Criteria and Oral Written Rubric**  **Standard Met-** Yes, all students who defended their dissertations received an average of 4’s and 5’s on the dissertation rubrics and passed their preliminary and final defense. All students are expected to complete a comprehensive review of the literature, include various theoretical frameworks, thought provoking conclusions among other things. This is all assessed using a rubric during the preliminary and final oral defense of the dissertation. Approximately 3-5 students from both Fresno/Bakersfield cohorts are still working on completing their final defense.  SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation**  **Standard Met-** Yes, All the students involved in embedded fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.  * DPELFS faculty developed a new Embedded Fieldwork Client Evaluation and online logging system. The embedded fieldwork client evaluation includes a semi-structured interview component to better gather information from the clients. * DPELFS Embedded Fieldwork Subcommittee were established to help ensure quality fieldwork outcomes, progress monitoring of fieldwork, and ongoing fieldwork improvement. * The DPELFS Graduate Faculty Group adopted a new policy for administering the Qualitative Exam. Core Faculty voted on creating a two-page study guide aligned with the core courses to help assist students during Qualifying Examinations (new policy is in place beginning with CODEL Cohort 1 and DPELFS Cohort 10 students) * Town Hall meetings are scheduled to occur in the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 (one face to face and one electronic survey version of the town hall questions developed to gather additional input from students who cannot make the town hall meetings). * The DPELFS office has been contacting past Alumni to update records and requesting students to contact us when they change email addresses, phone numbers and or place of employment. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   The DPELFS uses multiple direct and indirect measures to gauge student and program outcomes. These instruments include:  *Direct Measures*  1. Embedded Fieldwork Assessment (Client Evaluation Semi-structured Interview)   1. Qualifying Examination and Rubrics (Problems of Practice) 2. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Preliminary Defense)(Oral and Written Rubrics) 3. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Final Defense) (Oral and Written Rubrics)   *Indirect Measures*   1. Annual Student Evaluation (based on assessments and comments from the core faculty (Red, Yellow, and Green Disposition Survey) 2. Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey) 3. Town Hall Meetings 4. Alumni Survey 5. Employer Survey 6. External Review of Dissertations (Rubric) |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”  * Strengthening Graduate Group Culture (regular meetings established) * Re-established Graduate Group Subcommittees * Electronic format of the 360 student and employer surveys developed * Electronic format of the town hall surveys utilized in addition to face to face meeting to collect valuable information about the program * Embedded fieldwork evaluation and progress monitoring process refined * Writing studio collaboration to support students through the process of writing their dissertation   **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please attach a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.  **Not applicable** |