

**Assessment Data 2016-2017
Professional Administrative Services**

Learning Outcome 1:

EQUIP: Students are equipped with a deep and coordinated understanding of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions demonstrated by effective educators.

Maintains competencies in knowledge and skills by demonstration of the following:

CPSEL 1: A candidate is able to facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Outcome Measure(s):

GED 672 Signature Assignment

GED 689 Culminating Research Project

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the rubric content criteria is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest). The rubric performance levels are: Exceeds Standard (4), Meets Standard (3), Below Standard (2), and Far Below Standard (1).

The three rubric content criteria are: Area of Focus, Literature Review, and Data Collection and Analysis.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas:

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| GED672 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Personal Reflection | 3.90 | | |
| Role of Philosophical Perspectives | 3.89 | | |
| Role of Theoretical Perspectives | 3.79 | | |
| Role of Cultural/Political Perspectives | 3.92 | | |

| GED689 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------|--|--|
| Area of Focus | 3.90 | | |
| Literature Review | 3.62 | | |
| Data Collection and Analysis | 3.88 | | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Students are performing at a high level on their competence of leadership vision and community stewardship.

Learning Outcome 2:

TRANSFORM: Students engage in ongoing development and competence to apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educators in supportive diverse environments.

Promotes the success of all students by demonstration of the following California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs)

CPSEL 2: The candidate is able to advocate, nurture, and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

CPSEL 3: The candidate ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

CPSEL 5: The candidate is able to model a personal code of ethics and develop professional leadership capacity.

Outcome Measure:

GED 672 Signature Assignment

GED 689 Culminating Research Project

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the rubric content criteria is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest). The rubric performance levels are: Exceeds Standard (4), Meets Standard (3), Below Standard (2), and Far Below Standard (1).

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| GED672 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Personal Reflection | 3.90 | | |
| Role of Cultural/Political Perspectives | 3.92 | | |

| GED689 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Impact on Teaching Practice | 3.92 | | |
| Content | 3.83 | | |
| Action Plan | 3.75 | | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Students are performing at a high level on their competence of the creation of a strong school culture and safe environment while maintaining personal ethics.

Learning Outcome 3:

EMPOWER: Program completers are empowered to sustain high levels of mastery and demonstrate continual transformation in their professional practice.

Promotes the success of all students by demonstration of high levels of mastery and continual transformation of the following California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs).

CPSEL 4: The candidate collaborates with families and community members, responds to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizes community resources.

CPSEL 6: The candidate understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Outcome Measure(s):

GED 672 Signature Assignment

GED 689 Culminating Research Project

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the rubric content criteria is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest). The rubric performance levels are: Exceeds Standard (4), Meets Standard (3), Below Standard (2), and Far Below Standard (1).

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| GED672 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Personal Reflection | 3.90 | | |
| Role of Cultural/Political Perspectives | 3.92 | | |
| Written Communication | 3.71 | | |

| GED689 | Target: Average Score for the three is 3.0 or higher | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| Rubric Content Criteria | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| Impact on Teaching Practice | 3.92 | | |
| Content | 3.83 | | |
| Action Plan | 3.75 | | |
| Organization and Clarity | 3.61 | | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Students are performing at a high level on their competence in responding to external needs within their communities through collaboration.

Rubrics Used

GED 672 signature assignment

| | value: 1.00 | value: 2.00 | value: 3.00 | value: 4.00 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Personal Reflection on one's own personal philosophy of education with application to everyday experience and effective instructional practice | Demonstrates little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of this concept | Demonstrates a cursory, limited or partial understanding of this concept | Demonstrates an accurate and appropriate understanding of this concept | Consistently and accurately demonstrates a detailed understanding of this concept |
| Role of Philosophical Perspectives that contribute to personal philosophy formation with application to everyday experience and effective instructional practice | Demonstrates little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of this concept | Demonstrates a cursory, limited or partial understanding of this concept | Demonstrates an accurate and appropriate understanding of this concept | Consistently and accurately demonstrates a detailed understanding of this concept |
| Role of Theoretical Perspectives that contribute to personal philosophy formation with application to everyday experience and effective instructional practice | Demonstrates little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of this concept | Demonstrates a cursory, limited or partial understanding of this concept | Demonstrates an accurate and appropriate understanding of this concept | Consistently and accurately demonstrates a detailed understanding of this concept |
| Role of Cultural/Political Perspectives that contribute to personal philosophy formation with | •Demonstrates little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of this concept | Demonstrates a cursory, limited or partial understanding of this concept | Demonstrates an accurate and appropriate understanding of this concept | Consistently and accurately demonstrates a detailed understanding of this |

| | value: 1.00 | value: 2.00 | value: 3.00 | value: 4.00 |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| application to everyday experience and effective instructional practice | | | | concept |
| Writing is effective in that grammar and spelling are correct, and thoughts are clear and organized. | Demonstrates little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of this concept | Demonstrates a cursory, limited or partial understanding of this concept | Demonstrates an accurate and appropriate understanding of this concept | Consistently and accurately demonstrates a detailed understanding of this concept |

GED 689 Culminating Research Project

<http://www.taskstream.com/> **GED 689**

| | value: 1.00 | value: 2.00 | value: 3.00 | value: 4.00 |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Impact on Teaching Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes no transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project does not describe how and why research improves student learning • Project does not refer to existing body of literature or literature is inappropriate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes little transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project describes very little of how and why research improves student learning • Project is vaguely situated in and tied to existing body of literature | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes some transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project describes how and why research improves student learning • Project is situated in and tied to existing body of literature | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes clear transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project clearly describes how and why research improves student learning • Project clearly refers to existing body of literature or literature is appropriate |
| Content | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report shows no application of the research cycle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report shows little application of the research cycle and shows little connection throughout the paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report shows some application of the research cycle that is connected throughout the paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report shows a clear and detailed application of the research cycle and is connected throughout the paper |
| Area of Focus | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear area of focus • Research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area of focus is overly broad or narrow • Research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of focus is somewhat vague • Research questions are | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated area of focus • Research questions are |

| | value: 1.00 | value: 2.00 | value: 3.00 | value: 4.00 |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | questions are inappropriate | questions are unclear | somewhat vague | clearly written and appropriate |
| Literature Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few or no citations • Less than 10 total sources • Citations are not in the proper format | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 recent sources cited • At least 10 total sources • Some are relevant and credible • Some citations are correctly made according to APA format | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 to 5 recent sources cited • At least 20 total sources • Most sources are relevant and credible • Most citations are correctly made according to APA format | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 or more recent (5 years) sources cited • At least 20 total sources • All sources are relevant and credible • All citations are correctly made according to APA format |
| Data Collection and Analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no description of target population • Little or no description of how the data was collected • Utilizes one source of data • No analysis of the data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some description of target population • Minimal description of how data was collected • Utilizes one or two sources of data • Little analysis of the data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of target population • Some details of how data was collected • Utilizes at least two sources of data • Analysis of the data mentions themes and patterns | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of target population • Detailed description of how data was collected • Utilizes multiple data sources • Detailed analysis of the data provides identification of themes and patterns |
| Action Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recommendations or action plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions • Most components of the action plan are missing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions • Elements of the action plan are missing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific and clear connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions |
| Organization and Clarity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative is unclear and difficult to follow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative is unclear, lacks organization • Statements are rarely supported by evidence from the research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative is somewhat clear, organized and succinct • Statements are mostly supported by evidence from the research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative is clear, organized and succinct • Statements are all supported by evidence from the research |
| Format and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report does not | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report mostly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report follows |

| | value: 1.00 | value: 2.00 | value: 3.00 | value: 4.00 |
|------------|--|---|--|---|
| Quality | follow APA format and/or has many grammatical, punctuation or spelling errors | somewhat follows APA format with some (more than 5) grammatical, punctuation or spelling errors | follows APA format with minimal (fewer than 5) grammatical, punctuation or spelling errors | APA format with no grammatical, punctuation or spelling errors |
| Appendices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant documents are missing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant documents included | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most relevant documents included | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Relevant documents included |