NOTE: The Educational Leadership EdD program does not have any KSDE standards associated with it because it is not a preparation program and applicants are expected to demonstrate leadership proficiency as a criterion for acceptance. Therefore, the standards and indicators are not established by KSDE.

NOTE: The Attachment to Figure 1 lists additional assessments used to evaluate this program.

NOTE: If program standards have been adopted that are not KSDE standards, they are preceded by an asterisk (*).

**Transition Points in this Program:**
I: Program Admission
II: End of 3rd Semester (Assess readiness for Comprehensive Exams)
III: Comprehensive Exams (Middle of 4th Semester)
IV: Dissertation Proposal Defense
V: Program Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Standard 1:</em> Candidates who complete the doctorate in Educational Leadership have the knowledge and ability to apply inquiry processes necessary to help all students learn through a focus on problems of practice and human relations, and to contribute to the development of diverse learning organizations appropriate for the 21st century.</td>
<td><strong>1. Field Study Assessment</strong> “Acceptable” on 100% of 7 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”</td>
<td>EL 986—Advanced Field-based Research I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>CKS1</td>
<td>Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Standard 2:</em> Candidates who complete the doctoral program in Educational Leadership demonstrate an understanding of and are able to apply foundational knowledge in leadership, communication, organizational theory, diversity, communication and information technology integration, collaboration, decision-making, policy analysis, and research methodologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Seminar Assessment</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of 9 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”</td>
<td>EL 972—Leadership Theories Seminar</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>CKS1</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard 3:* Candidates who complete the doctorate in Educational Leadership have the knowledge and ability to work collaboratively and communicate effectively in multiple contexts with diverse groups.

1. **Field Study Assessment in EL 982**
   - “Acceptable” on 85% of 7 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”
   - EL 982—Intro to Field-based Research II
   - II
   - HDD2
   - Professional Knowledge and Skills

2. **Field Study Assessment in EL 986**
   - “Acceptable” on 100% of 7 items. Other proficiency levels are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”
   - EL 986—Advanced Field-based Research I
   - II
   - C1
   - Professional Knowledge and Skills

*Standard 4:* Candidates who complete the doctorate in Educational Leadership demonstrate an understanding of: the potential appropriate/emerging technology creates for transforming learning and the learning environment; and multiple applications and integration of technology in school leadership, research, and communication.

1. **Technology Assessment**
   - “Acceptable” on 100% of 9 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”
   - EL 986—Advanced Field-based Research I
   - II
   - T1
   - Professional Knowledge and Skills

*Standard 5:* Candidates who complete the doctorate in Educational Leadership reflect on their knowledge, its application to practice, and its
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Reflection Assessment</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of 10 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”</td>
<td>EL 972—Leadership Theories</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>PR4</td>
<td>Dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard 6:* Candidates who complete the doctorate in Educational Leadership reflect on their beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes related to global and multicultural awareness and demonstrate respect for diversity in personal and professional contexts.

4. Reflection Assessment

“Acceptable” on 100% of 10 items. Other proficiency ratings are “Unacceptable” and “Target.”

EL 972—Leadership Theories

II | PR4 | Dispositions
Program evaluation in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership occurs both (a) to make decisions about individual candidates’ progress through the program and (b) to make decisions about the effectiveness of the program at preparing candidates to meet the standards of the program. This document describes the operation of the Doctoral Program Assessment Plan. It first describes how decisions are made regarding individual candidates progress through program transitions points. Second, it describes how decisions are made regarding the effectiveness of the program.

Decisions about Individual Candidate Progress

There are five transition points at which decisions are made regarding candidates in the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program. These are identified in the attachment to the EdD in Educational Leadership Program Assessment Plan Figure 1. This section will describe how decisions are made at each of these transition points.

Transition Point: Program Admission

Applicants to the Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program must submit the materials identified in the Attachment to Figure 1 for the Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program Assessment Plan. The program faculty review each applicant’s admission packet to determine admission or denial for the doctorate in Educational Leadership degree program using the criteria identified in the Attachment. The top candidates are invited to an interview with faculty. The prospective candidate’s application file and interview responses are assessed using a rubric. A cohort of 6-10 individuals is selected each year.

After faculty has assessed and determined program acceptance or denial, the Graduate Coordinator writes a letter telling the applicant the recommendation being made to the Graduate School.

Should an individual’s application be denied, the individual has a right to appeal the decision in writing to the Chair of the Department. The Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and the Dean of the Graduate School, makes the decision and informs the candidate.

Transition Point: End of the 3rd Semester

Candidates’ progress on Program Standards 1-6 is assessed. Faculty review Seminar, Field Study, Technology, and Reflective Journal rubrics completed on each candidate to date. The Graduate Coordinator compiles the data and creates a composite assessment. Candidates must be rated “acceptable” on 100% of the items on each rubric. Candidates who do not meet this criterion develop a “plan of improvement” to rectify those areas where the candidate’s knowledge and performance are deemed unacceptable.
Candidates are also assessed on their readiness for the Comprehensive Exams based on their progress on the above rubrics. Candidates with fewer than 100% of the items rated as “acceptable” on any rubric develop a “plan of improvement” to rectify those areas where the candidate’s knowledge and performance are deemed unacceptable.

The candidate’s advisor meets with the candidate at the end of his or her 3rd semester in the program. The advisor provides the candidate with the results of the assessments and determines if a plan of improvement is needed. If a candidate needs a plan of improvement to focus on areas of weakness, the faculty and candidate collaborate in developing the plan. Candidates receive a letter from the Graduate Coordinator that documents the outcome of the meeting.

Transition Point: Middle of 4th Semester (Written Comprehensive Exams)

To be eligible to take the Written Comprehensive Exam, candidates must have a grade of “B” or higher in all courses taken during the first two summers and first three semesters and a rating of “Acceptable” or “Target” on 100% of items on Field Study, Seminar, Technology, and Reflection rubrics for Transition Point 2.

The Written Comprehensive Exam consists of two documents. Candidates are provided with a case scenario that requires a response written in the form of a Research Proposal. Candidates in the cohort initially work together to help each other organize their response. Each candidate then writes an individual response to the scenario and a reflection on the process. Written work must show that candidates can synthesize knowledge gained relative to Program Standards 1-6 by receiving scores of “acceptable” on all rubric items.

Each EdD faculty member reviews the written materials submitted and uses a rubric to assess the candidate’s individual products (both the research proposal and reflection). EdD program faculty members collectively review the assessments and reach consensus on each individual’s performance and the results are recorded on one rubric. The candidate’s dissertation advisor provides specific feedback to his or her advisee on the individual’s product. Candidates must be scored “acceptable” on all items on the Written Comprehensive Exam rubric. Candidates whose products are not rated “acceptable” are given an opportunity to re-write either all or just the portions of the exam not rated “acceptable.” Candidates receive written notification from the Graduate Coordinator that they have either passed or failed their Written Comprehensive Exam.

Should a candidate’s performance not meet standards on either Comprehensive Exam, the candidate may appeal the negative decision and meet with the Department Chair and Graduate Coordinator to review the candidate’s appeal. The Department Chair sends a letter notifying the candidate of the outcome of the appeal.

Transition Point: Dissertation Proposal Defense

Candidates who have completed all coursework and received a grade of “B” or higher in all courses, and have passed the Written Comprehensive Exams, are eligible to defend their
Dissertation Proposals before their Committees. To “pass,” 4 of 5 Committee Members must approve the proposal. With the dissertation chair’s approval, the EdD candidate submits the proposal 10 days in advance of the defense and defends the proposal before his or her dissertation committee. The candidate is informed of the decision at the end of the session.

If 4 of 5 committee members do not accept the proposal, the candidate will be given an opportunity to make corrections and resubmit the proposal for a second defense. Candidates who do not successfully defend a revised proposal will not be allowed to continue. Candidates may appeal this decision and meet with the doctoral program faculty to review the candidate’s appeal. The Graduate Coordinator sends a letter notifying the candidate of the outcome of the appeal. If the candidate is not satisfied with the outcome of the appeal with the program faculty, he or she may then appeal the decision to the Department Chair. The Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and the Dean of the Graduate School, makes the decision and informs the candidate.

Transition Point: Program Completion

Candidates applying to complete their EdD in Educational Leadership must successfully defend their Dissertation before all Committee Members. 4 of 5 members must approve of the defense and the completed dissertation.

With the dissertation chair’s approval, the EdD candidate submits the dissertation two weeks in advance of the defense and orally defends the dissertation before his or her dissertation committee. The candidate is informed of the decision at the end of the session. Once the candidate has completed any changes requested by the members of the Committee, the candidate submits it to the Graduate School for final approval, and uploads a PDF version via Blackboard. The Chair of the dissertation Committee submits change of grade forms for the dissertation hours.

If 4 of 5 committee members do not accept the dissertation, the candidate may appeal this decision and meet with the doctoral program faculty to review the candidate’s appeal. The Graduate Coordinator sends a letter notifying the candidate of the outcome of the appeal. If the candidate is not satisfied with the outcome of the appeal with the program faculty, he or she may then appeal the decision to the Department Chair. The Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and the Dean of the Graduate School, makes the decision and informs the candidate.

Decisions about the Effectiveness of the Program

Decisions about the effectiveness of the EdD in Educational Leadership are made by the Educational Leadership Program Committee, in consultation with the Educational Leadership Advisory Council utilizing aggregated data from transition points, program follow-up surveys, external reviews, and relevant unit operations (e.g., advisement). This section describes how decisions are made about the program’s effectiveness at preparing candidates to meet the standards adopted for the program.
Who Reviews the Data

The Educational Leadership Program Committee is the primary group responsible for reviewing the data and for making decisions about the adequacy of the program. The Educational Leadership Program Committee obtains advice from the EdD in Educational Leadership Advisory Council. Membership in these groups and the terms in office are consistent with the Professional Education Unit Governance document.

Frequency of and Nature of the Reviews

At least once each year, the Educational Leadership Program Committee examines program data to ascertain program effectiveness. After making tentative conclusions about the program and any changes, it forwards to the Advisory Council the aggregated data that have led it to believe changes are or are not needed along with its proposed changes (if any). The Committee also makes recommendations about possible changes in the Conceptual Framework or Guiding Program Document (if any). The Council examines these and offers advice on (a) whether the decision(s) about the need for changes is/are consistent with what the data show, (b) whether any proposed changes will reasonably address the problem(s) that have been detected, and (c) any additional suggestions members may have for improving the program. After receiving the recommendations of the Council, the Committee makes final decisions about program changes to be recommended, if any, and forwards those to the appropriate University groups according to University policy.

Questions to be Considered by the Educational Leadership Committee

At a minimum, the annual review by the Educational Leadership Program Committee considers the Core Questions in Appendix A of the Unit’s “Program Assessment” document. If changes are being recommended for the program, for the common assessments and their rubrics, or for the criteria to be used, the Committee identifies the data that will be used in the following year(s) to examine the effectiveness of the changes.

If changes were made as a result of the prior reviews of program data, the Committee also examines the data to determine the success of those changes or any collateral adverse results from the changes.

Data to be Examined at Yearly Reviews

For the yearly reviews, the Educational Leadership Program Committee examines aggregated data for the preceding year. This includes but is not limited to aggregated data from (a) decisions made about individual candidates at transition points, (b) the EdD in Educational Leadership Program advising survey, (c) candidate exit surveys, (d) surveys of graduates, (e) surveys of employers of graduates, and (f) any external reviews that occurred in the past year. Whenever possible, data coming from candidates, graduates, and employers are aggregated by (a) transition point, (b) by program standard, (c) by Unit Conceptual Framework proficiencies.
and dispositions, and (d) by type of knowledge. Where possible data are disaggregated by ethnicity and gender. Finally, the Committee also examines reports from the Assessment Coordinator on (a) the predictive validity of the assessments used for making decisions at transition points, and (b) the reliability of the common assessments used by the program.

**Frequency of and Nature of the Reviews**

Each year, the Educational Leadership Program Committee submits to the Unit Assessment Committee the annual report of its program review. Each annual report summarizes its conclusions and recommendations, and describes program changes undertaken, the problem each program change was designed to address, and how the data should change if the revision is successful. Additionally, it summarizes how effective prior program revisions were at addressing the problem(s) they were designed to solve, and any unexpected outcomes thought to be due to the program revisions.

Once every five years, the Educational Leadership Program Committee submits to the Unit Assessment Committee evidence of its work for review. The materials submitted include, but are not limited to,

1. the EdD in Educational Leadership Program Assessment Plan,
2. the minutes of the meetings of the Educational Leadership Program Committee,
3. the minutes of the EdD in Educational Leadership Advisory Council,
4. the aggregated and disaggregated data that were reviewed by the Program Committee during its most recent program review,
5. a copy of the suggestions given to the Educational Leadership Program Committee by the Unit Assessment Committee as a result of its last review of the Educational Leadership Program Committee’s work, and
6. a brief statement of how the Educational Leadership Program Committee addressed any suggestions that were provided at the last review by the Unit Assessment Committee.

In addition, the Educational Leadership Program Committee provides other information requested by the Unit Assessment Committee to assist in this review.
Figure 1. Educational Leadership EdD
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NOTE: Information that belongs in the boxes is provided immediately below Figure 1.
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**Educational Leadership EdD, Attachment to Figure 1**
**Transition Point and Post Program Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard (Assessment)(^a)</th>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 1: Program Admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>GPA in graduate courses</td>
<td>3.5 or higher</td>
<td>Pre Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores</td>
<td>Target scores are a total score of 1000 on the verbal and quantitative subtests; 3.5 on the writing assessment</td>
<td>Pre Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Three letters of recommendation from employers and peers</td>
<td>Letters attest to the applicant’s leadership qualities as well as potential for doctoral study</td>
<td>Pre Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Interview with faculty, if invited to interview</td>
<td>“Acceptable” or higher in all areas of the rubric</td>
<td>Pre Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point II: End of 3(^{rd}) Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Field Study Assessment</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of items</td>
<td>EL 986—Advanced Field-based Research I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technology Assessment</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of items</td>
<td>EL 986—Advanced Field-based Research I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seminar Assessment: Standard 1, Items K1-2</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of items</td>
<td>EL 972—Leadership Theories Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>Reflection Rubric</td>
<td>“Acceptable” on 100% of items</td>
<td>EL 972—Leadership Theories Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point III: Middle of 4(^{th}) Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Grades in coursework in first two summers and first three semesters</td>
<td>“B” or higher in all courses</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Written Comprehensive Exam consisting of a Research Proposal</td>
<td>“Acceptable” or higher on all rubric items</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (Assessment)*</td>
<td>Common Assessment</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Course Where Assessment is Administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and a written reflection on the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition Point IV: Dissertation Proposal Defense**

| 1-6                    | Completion of all coursework                          | Grades of “B” or higher in all courses         | Freestanding                           |
| 1-6                    | Defense of Dissertation Proposal                      | A majority of Committee Members approves the proposal | Freestanding                           |

**Transition Point V: Program Completion**

| 1-6                    | Dissertation Defense                                  | Committee Members all approve of the dissertation defense and the completed dissertation | Freestanding                           |

**Other Review Data: Program Follow-Up**

| NA                     | Program Follow Up Survey                               | To be determined                               | Post Program                           |

*Numbers outside parentheses are program standard numbers. Numbers inside parentheses are the numbers assigned to that assessment instrument in Table 2. If “none” is listed, this assessment does not assess a program standard. If “NA” is listed, this column is “Not Applicable” because either the assessment is not created by faculty at Wichita State University or it is a Unit-Wide assessment keyed to the Unit’s Conceptual Framework.