

**Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study
Ed.S. Educational Leadership**

**Columbus State University
September 2005**

Executive Summary for the Ed.S. Educational Leadership

Major Findings of the Program's Quality and Productivity

Program Quality: Very Strong

In February 2005, a continuing approval review of the College of Education was conducted by a Board of Examiners (BOE) consisting of representatives from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC). The 2000 NCATE Standards and the Georgia 2000 Standards were used to assess the unit and its programs. The BOE judged all standards to be met for the unit and for all initial and advanced programs.

The Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership is very strong and prepares school leaders with expertise in school improvement, action research, and professional learning. The program is committed to the development of school leaders with this level of expertise, a commitment consistent with the three pillars of excellence that support the College of Education Conceptual Framework: excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism.

Program Productivity: Strong

The numbers of candidates in the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership are the highest of any graduate program offered at the College of Education with an average enrollment of 57.25 each year (2001-2005). The number of candidates enrolled in the program decreased from 65 in 2003-2004 to 37 in 2004-2005 as the Educational Leadership program moved from a distance learning instructional delivery format to an on-campus instructional delivery format. Whereas in previous years, travel to campus was unnecessary for candidates from areas more than fifty miles from campus, in 2004-2005, travel became necessary for those candidates. Additionally, the Educational Leadership program changed from a program where candidates registered for courses when they appeared in a cycle to a cohort structure where all candidates participate in coursework together. Courses are now scheduled one time each year and candidates are required to take courses when they are offered. Numbers of students in the Ed.S. program have doubled in the 2005-2006 academic year from levels the year before.

The number of Ed.S. degrees conferred through the Educational Leadership program has averaged 41.75 (2001-2005) and is the highest in the College of Education. With the move to the cohort structure, the percentage of those majors who graduate now approaches 100%.

List of Recommendations for Improving Program Quality

Though the program quality is very strong, we continue to look for ways to make improvements. Current initiatives include:

- The implementation of a rubric and assessment developed for candidate performance in fieldwork at the Ed.S. level.
- The implementation of an assessment instrument developed to gather data regarding candidate performance in effecting improved student achievement after two years in a leadership role. This instrument will be administered to graduates in those roles.

- The strengthening of assessment components collected at the end of each semester (fieldwork assessments for Ed.S., assessment of dispositions, candidate satisfaction surveys) and stored electronically and analyzed.
- The continued use of individual reports on Praxis II test results and other state tests to identify areas of weakness in the program.

List of Recommendations for Improving Program Productivity

The Educational Leadership Program Advisory Council (PAC) oversees the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership and works to improve the curriculum, courses, and resources offered to students. Recommendations to improve program productivity are:

- Align coursework with the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) Eight Roles for School Leaders. By responding to current initiatives and mandates, we hope to recruit more educators into the Ed.S. program.
- Continue to improve the Ed.S. internship so that students are immersed in the actual work of the school leader in area schools in order to attract students who desire to participate in experiences enabling them to effect improvement in student achievement.
- Continue recruiting initiatives to include recruiting trips to area schools, recruiting trips to area universities, use of area newspapers and media outlets to publicize the program, and participation in area forums to include the Chamber of Commerce fair, the Muscogee County School District job fair, and area career fairs.
- Continue to develop the program website as a recruiting tool.

Conclusion about the Program's Viability at CSU

In February 2005, the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners evaluated the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership and judged the quality to be extremely high in terms of the national standards articulated in ELCC SAPEL (formerly ISLLC). In addition, program quality is enhanced by strong partnerships with area schools where students can gain valuable field experiences with educational leaders who helped in the development of the internship.

Faculty in the Educational Leadership program contribute to the partnership with K-12 schools in the area by working with them in research and consulting capacities. Faculty members from the program work with Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) Better Seeking Teams in partner schools, leadership teams in elementary and middle schools, research teams from other area universities (Troy State and Auburn University) aimed at improving student achievement, and in a research initiative with an area school system targeting leadership dispositions that contribute to school improvement.

Based on faculty review of the program to include alignment of the program with state and national standards and a review of student performance in the classroom, the Ed.S. program was redesigned in terms of selection and admission procedures, coursework and delivery of instruction. During that transitional phase, the number of degrees conferred through the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership was the highest in the College of Education. Even more significant is the fact that, despite increased rigor in selection and admission and in the classroom, the percentage of degrees granted to participants in the Ed.S. program has increased to 92%. After an initial decrease in cohort numbers in 2004-2005, numbers of students in the

Ed.S. program have doubled from the previous year with an attrition rate of only 1.9% (one student).

Program Improvement Plan

In response to the findings of the Comprehensive Program Review, the faculty members and administrators of the Ed.S. in Educational Leadership propose the strategies outlined below to improve the quality, productivity and viability of the program. These strategies will be facilitated by the Educational Leadership Program Advisory Committee (PAC).

<i>Departmental Plans and Priorities</i>	<i>CPR Indicator</i>	<i>Projected Timeline</i>
1. Refine the College of Education Recruitment Plan to focus on specific methods for recruiting graduate students from diverse backgrounds	Productivity Viability	2006-2007
2. Explore various funding sources to provide scholarships for students seeking advanced degrees in Educational Leadership	Productivity Viability	2006-Ongoing
3. Align coursework with the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) Eight Roles for School Leaders. By responding to current initiatives and mandates, we hope to recruit more educators into the Ed.S. program	Quality Productivity Viability	2006-Ongoing
4. Continue to refine the Ed.S. internship so that candidates have authentic leadership experiences in the field which will prepare them to assume leadership roles	Quality Productivity Viability	2006-Ongoing

The resources needed to accomplish these priorities should be minimal. Departmental resources will be allocated as necessary to accomplish these plans. Priority 2 will require the assistance of individuals in the Office of University Advancement to develop endowments which provide scholarships for graduate students. The Educational Leadership Program Coordinator will be provided one course release time each academic year to provide leadership to these activities. The Program Coordinator will communicate additional resource requests as needed to the appropriate administrator within the College of Education at Columbus State University.

Summary Recommendation and Supporting Rationale

Recommendation: *Maintain and Strengthen the Program*

The Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership has been and continues to be a program that serves a high number of graduate students. Preparing leaders for work at the school and system level in areas served by Columbus State University, the Educational Leadership program has seen an increase in the rate of graduation to one that approaches 100%. After an initial decrease in Fall enrollment following a transition to a cohort structure that admits students once a year, numbers of students in the program have increased for the 2005-2006 academic year. Numbers of students enrolled in the program during summers when cohorts are ending and beginning simultaneously actually exceed the numbers reported in Table 3.2.

It is the recommendation of the faculty that the program be maintained and strengthened as partnerships with area schools and systems continue to strengthen and as numbers of students continue to increase.

I. Program Overview

The Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership prepares transformational leaders who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effect improvement in learning and student achievement at the school and school system level. Students in the Ed.S. program learn effective leadership practices that can be employed at various levels. They learn to leverage those practices to create the maximum effect in transforming schools and school systems into learning communities. Students learn by being immersed in the work of educational leadership and understand that student achievement is connected with the personal and professional development of leaders and their colleagues. Program faculty have established requirements in terms of knowledge, skills, and dispositions evaluated during the entry phase into the program. These are evaluated through the administration of the GRE, and verbal and written interviews conducted during the selection/admission process. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed during the program are evaluated throughout the program. Among tools used by the faculty to evaluate student performance are the electronic portfolio, assessment of dispositions completed by faculty, problem-based assessments, simulated experiences, artifacts documenting candidate expertise, and candidate performance on comprehensive exams.

Throughout the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership, students are provided opportunities to use content knowledge and practice leadership skills in simulated and real-life experiences. These experiences take place in the classroom and during field experiences embedded in coursework and during internships in partner schools. The program faculty monitors and evaluates student performances. Student work in the Educational Leadership Program is consistent with the conceptual framework of the College of Education and is based on national standards, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (SAPEL). These standards are now designated the Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium (ELCC) standards.

The goals for the program are promoting the success of all students by:

1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. Collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
7. Incorporating new and emerging technologies into the instructional and other programs and fostering innovative use of technology.

Coursework in the Ed.S. program in Educational leadership provides candidates in Educational Leadership the knowledge critical to their work of leading others in improving student achievement. Candidates are required to successfully complete 12 courses (36 semester hours). The responsibilities of candidates enrolled in the Educational Leadership Program include the following: completing all Educational Leadership program degree requirements; maintaining a GPA of 3.0 on all graduate work; successfully completing an internship conducted in the school or school system environment; earning a passing score on the Praxis II Educational Leadership Examination; and applying for certification to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission.

II. Summary Findings of the Program's Overall Quality

In February 2005, a continuing approval review of the College of Education was conducted by a Board of Examiners (BOE) consisting of representatives from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC). The 2000 NCATE Standards were used to assess the unit and its programs. The BOE judged all standards to be met for the unit and for all initial and advanced programs. Following is a summary of the findings taken from the BOE final report.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Assessment data from Praxis I, Praxis II, GPA's, MAP evaluations, exit examinations, and national licensing exams indicate that teacher candidates know their subject matter and candidates for other school roles know their fields, both of which are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. MAP evaluations and the Disposition Evaluation Form give evidence that candidates and other school personnel know how to teach their subject matter and can deliver information in a clear and meaningful way so that all students learn.

Areas for Improvement: Candidates in Art Education, Biology, Chemistry, and French do not demonstrate content mastery.

Rationale: While overall more than 80 percent of the candidates in the unit have passed their respective content licensure exams, fewer than 80 percent of candidates in Art Education, Biology, Chemistry, and French passed their respective content licensure exams. Note: Chemistry and French had only one program completer each over the past three years.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit maintains a comprehensive assessment system for the initial and advanced levels to ensure the systematic collection of data, providing opportunities for the unit to analyze, evaluate, and improve the quality of programs, unit operations, and candidate performance. The assessment systems reflect the conceptual framework and are aligned with INTASC and NBPTS standards as well as specialty professional associations. The unit utilizes information technologies to effectively collect and aggregate data for candidate, program, and unit improvement.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

All of the unit's programs which prepare candidates to become teachers or fill other roles as members of the education profession include field work/clinical practice as an integral part. Use of the MAP Evaluation Instrument and the Dispositions Evaluations which connects with the Conceptual Framework supports the work of the unit and provides scaffolding so that candidates acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by those who are in professional education roles. Candidates are also surrounded by experienced, caring, competent professionals representing both the University and P-12 partners. Innovations such as the use of information technology for scheduling and

tracking candidate progress in a very flexible and comprehensive database, the STEADY new teacher mentoring program, and the refinement of the Partner School Network enhance to quality of the program and its graduates.

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit has clearly defined its candidate dispositions related to diversity, and these dispositions are assessed throughout required coursework in the initial and advanced programs. Three of the 32 unit faculty represent diversity. The diversity of candidates in unit programs roughly mirrors that of the university and service area as a whole. Because of the racial and ethnic diversity in the university's service area, initial and advanced candidates also work with a broadly diverse population of P-12 students.

Areas for Improvement: The college has not been successful in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty.

Rationale: Even though efforts have been made to recruit additional minority faculty, currently there are three minority faculty in the unit. While this constitutes a slight improvement from 1998, a significant impact has not been made to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse faculty.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Unit faculty have extensive academic backgrounds. Eighty-four percent (84%) of the full-time faculty, and seventeen percent (17%) of the part-time faculty hold terminal degrees while the remaining faculty either are working to complete doctoral studies or have master's degrees. Unit faculty are effective teachers who model best teaching practices in their areas of specialty. Most faculty have been engaged in scholarly activities and service activities to the local, state, regional, national, and international communities. All full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty are systematically and annually evaluated by their department chair, personnel committee, unit dean, and throughout the university input system. The faculty serve on committees and boards at the university and in the local community. They are also involved in local, state, and national professional associations. The unit has an expectation of professional growth/development of both full-time and part-time faculty, and faculty concur with the expectation by attending workshops and conferences, reading journals, and conducting research.

Areas for Improvement: Part-time faculty are not systematically evaluated.

Rationale: There is no systematic process for evaluating part-time faculty across the unit.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the responsibility for authority for the delivery of the preparation of all professional educators. Systems and processes are in place to ensure that all constituencies are represented in the design, delivery and assessment of unit programs. Facilities, personnel and budget are adequate to meet the needs of candidates, faculty and programs. The unit does not require part-time faculty who teach or supervise student

teachers to attend an orientation/training session on the conceptual framework or the use of the disposition or MAP rubrics.

Areas for Improvement: Not all part-time faculty are adequately trained on assessments used to evaluate candidates.

Rationale: The unit cannot ensure that part-time faculty have the requisite knowledge and skills to effectively assess candidates.

III. Summary Findings of the Program's Overall Productivity

III A. Enrollment of Students in the Program

The enrollment pattern for the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership is reflected in Table 3.1 (below)

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Full-Time	8	29	36	8
Part-Time	52	38	29	29
<i>Total</i>	60	67	65	37

Table 3.1 Number of Declared Majors in Ed.S. in Educational Leadership – Fall Semester

The number of Ed.S. candidates enrolled in 2004-2005 as recorded during the Fall 2004 semester decreased when compared with numbers of students in previous years. A reason for this is that the Educational Leadership program moved from a distance learning instructional delivery format to an on-campus instructional delivery format. Under the distance learning delivery format, students from areas more than fifty miles from campus were not required to travel to campus to complete coursework. They were able to attend class in locations close to the areas in which they worked and lived. The instruction was delivered through real-time television broadcasts. In 2004-2005, the distance learning format was discontinued. At the same time, students were no longer able to choose the courses for which they registered. Instead, students attended classes together in a cohort structure. Under the new cohort delivery system, all candidates participate in the same courses each semester. Each course is offered one time each year and students are required to take courses when they are offered.

Table 3.2 outlines enrollment in all Ed.S. Programs in the College of Education. The numbers of candidates in the Educational Leadership program have been and remain significantly higher than those in other programs.

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Early Childhood Education	13	5	1	1
Educational Leadership	60	67	65	37
Middle Grades Education	19	15	10	12
School Counseling	10	3	7	5
Secondary English	1	5	3	8
Secondary Mathematics	8	7	8	5
Secondary Science	2	3	1	2
Secondary Social Science	2	2	2	1

Table 3.2 Number of Declared Majors in M.Ed. Programs-Fall Semester

The availability of the distance learning format made attending class convenient and thus the numbers enrolled in courses has been high. With the advent of the cohort structure, there has been an initial drop in enrollment during Fall semester (although numbers

remain high during the summers when incoming and outgoing cohorts are enrolled in courses at the same time). The graduation rate of students in the cohort approaches 100%. Those students who are evaluated and selected for admission to the cohort program finish the degree within 15 months and graduate.

III B. Annual Degree Productivity of the Program

The numbers of Ed.S. degrees conferred each year in Educational Leadership has increased overall since 2001-2002. Numbers of degrees conferred are the highest of any graduate program in the College of Education.

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Early Childhood Education	4	5	1	0
Educational Leadership	18	75	40	34
Middle Grades Education	7	5	10	4
School Counseling	7	3	4	3
Secondary English	0	5	0	2
Secondary Mathematics	2	2	5	2
Secondary Science	2	1	1	0
Secondary Social Science	0	0	2	0

Table 3.3 Number of Degrees Conferred – Fiscal Year

Although there has been an initial decrease in enrollment brought about by a transition to on-campus instruction through a cohort structure, the number of degrees conferred by the Educational Leadership program has not significantly decreased. In fact, there was an increase in degrees conferred in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 when students in the distance learning program were required to finish their degrees prior to 2004-2005 when the initial cohort was scheduled to begin. It is projected that 37 students will graduate from the Ed.S. program in 2005-2006, a number of graduates consistent with figures in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. That number is significantly higher than the number of graduates in 2001-2002.

III C. Program Completion Efficiency & Graduation Rate

Table 3.4 reflects graduation rates for Ed.S. programs in the College of Education. The graduation rates for the Educational Leadership program are highlighted. It is significant to note that the graduation figure for the 2004-2005 academic year approaches 100%. It is anticipated that the graduation rate will continue to hover regularly around 100% in the Ed.S. program.

The high graduation rates in Educational Leadership since the inception of the cohort approach to delivery are result from the fact that cohort members are required to complete the same courses at the same time, and because failure to participate in required courses can delay graduation by up to a year. When students are selected and admitted to the Ed.S. cohort, they understand that they must make a commitment of 15 months in order to complete the course of study. If they are unable to complete the course of study

with their initial cohort, they are required to reapply to the next cohort being offered the following year.

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Early Childhood Education	31%	100%	100%	0%
Educational Leadership	30%	112%	62%	92%
Middle Grades Education	37%	33%	100%	33%
School Counseling	70%	100%	57%	60%
Secondary English	0%	100%	0%	25%
Secondary Mathematics	25%	29%	63%	40%
Secondary Science	100%	33%	100%	0%
Secondary Social Science	0%	0%	100%	0%

Table 3.4 Graduation Rate

It is projected that the high completion/graduation rate will continue as failure to complete courses as scheduled result in significant delay in graduation for a candidate. Additionally, Educational Leadership staff register all candidates resulting in full course participation by those who have declared an Educational Leadership major.

III D. Efficiency & Clarity of the Program's Course Requirements

The Ed.S. Program in Educational Leadership requires a professional core of 9 credits and a concentration core of 27 credits. Course requirements are listed below:

Area 1: Professional Core (9 hrs.)

EDUF 7116 Action Research: Research Methods (3)

EDUL 6279 Capstone Course (3)

EDUF 6795 Seminar: Foundations of Collaborative Student Support (1)

EDUT 7795 Technology Practices for Effective Management (2)

Area 2: Concentration (27 hrs.)

EDUL 7105 The School Improvement Plan (3)

EDUL 7106 Curriculum Design for School Achievement (3)

EDUL 7107 School Reform and the Change Process (3)

EDUL 7793 Organizing and Implementing a Framework for Data Driven Learning Communities (3)

EDUL 7794 System Level Policy, Governance, and Ethics (3)

EDUL 7796 Team Building and the Communication Process (3)

EDUL 7797 Budget Alignment to School Mission (3)

EDUL 7698 Internship/Specialist Portfolio (6)

The requirements and course descriptions for the Educational Leadership program are contained in the Columbus State University Course Catalog. Additionally, course requirements, cohort tentative schedule for the entire program, and all course syllabi are posted on the program website. The program coordinator serves as advisor to candidates

in the Ed.S. program. Orientation for prospective candidates begins during the recruiting process and extends to the interview process. Faculty work to ensure that each candidate meets program requirements and, at the same time, that the program itself meets the needs and requirements of prospective candidates. Once candidates are selected for the program, a program-specific orientation is held prior to the beginning of the first semester of study. Thereafter, candidates are briefed regularly by email and during classes regarding program specific issues and events. The cohort structure lends itself to regular communication with candidates.

III E. Frequency and Sequencing of Course offerings Required for Program Completion.

Table 3.5 illustrates the number of sections offered during each semester. From 2001-2004, courses were offered in a distance learning format where students could register for courses they wished to take and attend class at remote sites. In Summer 2004, the program delivery format changed from a distance learning format to a cohort structure where students are admitted at the same time to the program and attend class together in a cycle that is established fifteen months in advance.

Number of Sections Per Semester													
	F 01	Sp 02	Su 02	F 02	Sp 03	Su 03	F 03	Sp 04	Su 04	F 04	Sp 05	Su 05	F 05
EDUF 7116	7	5	3	6	2	2	4	2	2		1	2	1
EDUF 6795										1	1	1	1
EDUL 6279				2	3	3		3	4			2	
EDUL 7000	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
EDUL 7105						2	3			4		1	1
EDUL 7106				2	3		3			3		1	
EDUL 7107					1			4			1	1	
EDUL 7793													
EDUL 7794		2	4				1	2			1	1	
EDUL 7795	3		6	3	2	2		3			2		
EDUL 7796	4	2	2	2		3	3	1		2	1		
EDUL 7797		4	3	2		2		3	3	1			2
EDUL 7698	5	8	5	4	10	8	8	5	3	3	2	1	2
EDUT 7795			2	1		3	1	1	1	1	1	3	

Table 3.5 Frequency of Course Offerings

Table 3.5 illustrates the fact that beginning Summer 2004, fewer courses were offered. However, numbers of students in courses offered after Summer 2004 are substantially higher making the courses more cost effective from an operations standpoint. Improvements to the program include organization of coursework, accurate projections of attendance for the coming year, hiring faculty, faculty advance preparation, and collaboration between the Ed.S. cohort and the M.Ed. cohort.

III F. Enrollment in the Program's Required Courses

Table 3.6 illustrates the average number of students per course. The table reflects the fact that as fewer courses were offered with the initiation of the cohort structure beginning Summer 2004, average numbers of students enrolled in courses increased. This is due to the fact that courses are offered only once per 15 month cycle. Because there are few courses with low enrollment, the courses are more viable from a cost standpoint.

Average Enrollment Per Section													
	F 01	Sp02	Su 02	F 02	Sp 03	Su 03	F 03	Sp 04	Su 04	F 04	Sp 05	Su 05	F 05
EDUF 7116	6.2	6	10	6.2	13.5	11	6.3	3.5	12.5		13	18.5	3
EDUF 6795									8	35	12	16	65
EDUL 6279				5.5	10.3	7		5.3	11.8			19.5	
EDUL 7000	5	13	33	32	9	15	5	17	22				
EDUL 7105						10.5	8.3			9.8			15.5
EDUL 7106				2.5	9.7		11.7			5		19	
EDUL 7107					7			11.8			3	21	
EDUL 7793													
EDUL 7794		10	11.8				28	10.5			11	17	
EDUL 7795	7.3		7	5	12.5	12.5		8.7			14		
EDUL 7796	8	7	9	8.5		8.7	9	1		6	19		
EDUL 7797		14.3	8.7	12		13		6	7.7	20			16
EDUL 7698	6.4	6.1	5.2	14.3	4.7	3.4	4.4	4	4.7	8	11.5	20	16
EDUT 7795			26.5	14		21.3	4	28	18	8	17	16.7	

Table 3.6 Average Enrollment in the Program's Required Courses

Cost effectiveness will increase with subsequent cohorts because there are no longer students from previous delivery cycles who require that courses be scheduled in order for them to graduate.

III G. Diversity of the Program's Majors and Graduates

Table 3.7 illustrates the diversity of the Ed.S. program's majors and graduates. For the period covered by the table, the Ed.S. students were predominantly female. Female students apply for admission to the program in similar ratios, owing to the fact that the field of education is comprised of a high number of female educators. Numbers in the Educational Leadership program reflect the numbers of female educators in the area served by the university.

The numbers of minority students in the program reflect similar percentages in the teaching ranks of the schools served by the university. Faculty have made and will continue to make substantial effort in recruiting minority students to the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership including recruiting trips to area schools, recruiting trips to area universities, use of area newspapers and media outlets to publicize the program, and participation in area forums to include the Chamber of Commerce fair, the Muscogee County School District job fair, and area career fairs.

Gender	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Female	44 (73%)	46 (69%)	50 (77%)	27 (73%)
Male	16 (27%)	21 (31%)	15 (23%)	10 (27%)
Ethnicity				
Asian	0	0	0	0
Black	11 (18%)	18 (27%)	21 (32%)	5 (14%)
Hispanic	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)	0
American Indian	1 (2%)	0	0	0
Multi-Racial	0	1 (2%)	0	0
White	47 (78%)	48 (71%)	43 (66%)	32 (86%)

Table 3.7 Ethnic and gender diversity among Ed.S. Educational Leadership majors

Table 3.8 illustrates the ethnic and gender diversity among graduates of the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership. For the years 2001-2005, the overall graduation rates are 30%, 112%, 62%, and 92%. The figure for 2002-2003 (112%) reflects an unusual situation where the number of students who graduated that year was larger than the number enrolled in Fall 2002. When students were able to choose when they registered for specific courses, there was fluctuation in numbers of students from one semester to the other. The graduation figure from 2004-2005 accurately reflects graduation percentage because 100% of the cohort that began in 2004 graduated in Summer 2005. The cohort attended class at the same time as the last students who were completing the program under the previous organizational structure. Not all students who had applied in the previous structure graduated, resulting in an overall graduation rate of 92%.

Gender	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Female	16 (77.8%)	50 (66.7%)	31 (77.5%)	26 (76.5%)
Male	2 (11.1%)	25 (33.3%)	9 (22.5%)	8 (23.5%)
Ethnicity				
Asian	0	0	0	0
Black	3 (16.7%)	22 (29.3%)	13 (32.5%)	10 (29.4%)
Hispanic	1 (5.6%)	0	0	0
American Indian	0	1 (1.3%)	0	0
Multi-Racial	0	1 (1.3%)	0	0
White	14 (77.8%)	51 (68%)	27 (67.5%)	24 (70.6%)

Table 3.8 Ethnic and gender diversity among Ed.S. Educational Leadership graduates

When graduation rate is reviewed in terms of the diversity of program graduates, the figures show that the graduation rate for both black and white students are representative of the percentages from each ethnic group who are Ed.S. majors. In 2004-2005, the percentage of black students who graduated exceeded the percentage of students in that ethnic group who initially registered in Fall 2004 (and thus were counted as Ed.S. majors). The explanation for this figure lies in the fact that numbers of students from the

previous (non-cohort) organizational structure completed coursework and graduated at the same time that the initial Ed.S. cohort graduated.

Table 3.9 represents age diversity among Ed.S. Educational Leadership students. The largest number of students in the Ed.S. program are in the 31-40 age group with the second largest group in the 41-50 age group. It is interesting to note that the second largest age group in the M.Ed. program was in the 26-30 age range. It is apparent that those beginning the Ed.S. degree program often begin at a later age than those beginning the M.Ed. program owing to the necessity of having completed the M.Ed. degree prior to consideration for admission to the Ed.S. program.

Age	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
21-25	0	1	0	1
26-30	8	15	15	3
31-40	28	32	28	16
41-50	18	15	16	14
51-60	6	4	6	3
<i>Total</i>	60	67	65	37
<i>Average</i>	39.6	36.9	37.3	39.6

Table 3.9 Age diversity among Ed.S. Educational Leadership students

Students admitted to the Ed.S. program are required to undergo a rigorous selection and admission process where their leadership attitudes and dispositions are assessed. Years in the field of teaching are often necessary to build the requisite number of experiences that yield those attitudes and dispositions necessary for success in a leadership role at the school or district level.

III H. Cost-Effectiveness of Instructional Delivery in the Program's Home Department

As shown below in Tables 3.10 and 3.11, the budget for the Department Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Professional Studies represented approximately 4% of the total instructional costs for Columbus State University (CSU) from 2001 to 2004. In 2004-2005, the department budget represented 4% of the total instructional costs at CSU.

For the graduate programs in Educational Leadership and Counseling, the cost per major averaged \$3,456.00 from 2001-2005. During the same period, the average per capita cost for the university as \$3,744.57. In 2004-2005, the cost per credit was \$260.00 compared to \$162.15 for the institution. The higher cost per credit is due to the smaller number of students enrolled in graduate courses.

In regards to the Educational Leadership Program, there was an initial decrease in the number of students in the Educational Leadership Program due to the transition from a distance learning delivery format to an on-campus instruction through a cohort structure. It is anticipated that there will be an accompanying initial decrease in degrees conferred by the Educational Leadership program. However, numbers of students in Educational

Leadership programs have doubled from 2005-2005 to 2005-2006. It is anticipated that the increase in numbers of students in the Educational Leadership Program will make the program more cost effective.

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Department Budget	\$871,463	\$1,193,163	\$1,038,656	\$977,689
Cost Per Major (M.Ed. & Ed.S. Educational Leadership and Counseling) <i>(Pro-Rated Expenditures/Number of Declared Majors)</i>	\$1,823	\$5,029	\$2,686	\$4,286
Credit Hours Taught Fall and Spring (M.Ed. & Ed.S. Secondary Education majors)	1,047	867	792	1,203
Cost per Credit (M.Ed. & Ed.S. Educational Leadership and Counseling)	\$192	\$690	\$393	\$260

Table 3.10 Instructional Costs for the Department of Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Professional Studies

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Instructional Costs	\$23,311,457.76	\$23,963,598.65	\$23,784,544.59	\$25,240,030.43
Total Credit Hours	116,543	133,777	148,797	155,654
Cost per Credit	\$200.02	\$179.13	\$159.85	\$162.15

Table 3.11 Total Instructional Costs at CSU

III I. Program's Responsiveness to State Needs and Employer Demand for Program Graduates

Faculty teaching in the Ed.S program in Educational Leadership have made a commitment to meeting the needs of the state and employer demand for program graduates. Following a review conducted during the 2003-2004 academic year, faculty re-aligned coursework for the Ed.S. program with the Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs In Educational Leadership (SAPEL). Additionally, faculty participated actively in state Educational Leadership conferences to study current standards and leadership practices for inclusion in the Ed.S. curriculum. Among practices implemented in the Ed.S. program at CSU is the electronic portfolio that documents student knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the classroom and during internship. Another practice implemented at CSU includes an internship that immerses students in the work of the educational leader at the school level.

Interest in the CSU program from area administrators, superintendents, and assistant superintendents is at a high level. This fact is reflected by their willingness to participate in the program, not only in an advisory capacity, but in actively working with faculty during the student selection and admission process. During the 2004-2005 academic

year, area superintendents worked with program faculty in order to ascertain areas for program improvement. An increased emphasis on student work at the school and district level, the development of additional programs for students, and increased emphasis on practical application of knowledge gained in the classroom was the result of this work.

Area superintendents and principals participated actively in the selection and admission process for the Ed.S. cohorts. During the selection process, interview teams were established where faculty members were teamed with area superintendents and principals. Students were selected for the program based on recommendations of these teams, performance on a written interview evaluated by a faculty team, performance in previous graduate work, and performance on the Graduate Record Exam.

Faculty continue to develop partnerships with area schools and school systems where they support school leaders in the field. Examples of faculty support for working school leaders include working with them in research and consulting capacities. Faculty members from the program work with Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) Better Seeking Teams in partner schools, leadership teams in elementary and middle schools, research teams from other area universities (Troy State and Auburn University) aimed at improving student achievement, and in a research initiative with an area school system targeting leadership dispositions that contribute to school improvement.

In terms of preparing leaders for employment by area schools, it is significant that the number of graduate degrees conferred through the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership is the highest in the College of Education. Since the inception of the cohort structure, the percentage of students who begin the program and graduate is 92%. With the 2005-2006 cohorts, numbers have doubled from the previous year with an attrition rate of only 1.9% (one student).

Programs in Educational Leadership have been strengthened in terms of rigor, collaboration with the community and with partner schools, and admission standards. At the same time, numbers, after an initial decrease, are increasing and the graduation rate for those who are admitted approaches 100%.

III J. Position of the Program's Annual Degree Productivity Among Comparable USG Programs

Table 3.12 represents the Ed.S. Educational Leadership degrees conferred by institution. The Columbus State University Educational Leadership program ranks first along with Albany state among the eleven universities that confer Ed.S. degrees in Educational Leadership. CSU is the only Georgia university within 90 miles that offers this degree. The number of degrees that will be conferred in the coming year will be consistent with this figure.

Institution	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Average
State Universities					
Albany State University	23	20	50	65	39.5
Augusta State University	7	10	12	13	10.5
Columbus State University	25	18	75	40	39.5
Georgia College and State University	22	18	10	52	25.5
Kennesaw State University (New Program)	0	0	0	0	0
North Georgia College and State University	0	34	24	21	19.75
State University of West Georgia	12	19	19	55	26.25
Regional/Research Universities					
Georgia Southern University	13	14	22	17	16.5
Valdosta State University	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia State University	12	12	6	10	10
University of Georgia	38	6	14	14	18

Table 3.12 Ed.S. Degree in Educational Leadership Conferred by Institution

III K. This Program's Contribution to Achieving CSU's Mission

The mission of Columbus State University is to promote educational, economic, social and cultural growth in Georgia and beyond. The university is dedicated to excellence in teaching in a student-centered environment, research and creative activities, service to the region and the state, and community engagement through university-community partnerships. The university strategic plan outlines six select mission areas. One of the six select mission areas is educator preparation. The mission of the College of Education is congruent with and complements that of Columbus State University. The College of Education has adopted as a guiding principle, "Creating Opportunities for Excellence," to support its mission: ". . . to achieve excellence by guiding individuals as they develop the proficiency, expertise, and leadership consistent with their professional roles as teachers, counselors, and leaders." By creating opportunities for excellence, the College of Education prepares highly qualified teachers, counselors, and leaders who promote high levels of learning for all P-12 students by demonstrating excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism.

With the present climate of accountability, there is a significant demand for school leaders who have a high degree of expertise in school improvement, action research, and professional learning. The Columbus State University College of Education is committed to the development of school leaders with this level of expertise, a commitment consistent with the three pillars of excellence that support the COE Conceptual Framework: excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. The development of leaders with the skills necessary to improve student achievement in schools is critical given the need for leadership frameworks, curriculum models, and instructional practices that improve student learning. Each community, school system, and school is different in terms of demographics, population, needs, and goals. Leaders in different environments must be able to identify practices, rigorously test those practices, and ascertain best practices to implement in a specific setting. The Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership develops leaders with this level of expertise in school and school system improvement.

Coursework in the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership provides candidates in Educational Leadership the knowledge critical to their work of leading others in improving student achievement. Candidates are required to successfully complete 12 courses (36 semester hours) in which the focus is improvement of student achievement through work at the school system level. The responsibilities of candidates enrolled in the Educational Leadership Program include the following: completing all Educational Leadership specialist program degree requirements; maintaining a GPA of 3.0 on all graduate work; completing a structured internship comprised of an action research project, submitting an acceptable program portfolio; defending the portfolio in a faculty forum by successfully completing a verbal analysis and review process; completing three (3) years of successful teaching experience; earning a passing score on the Praxis II Educational Leadership Examination; and applying for certification to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission.

In the program for the Ed.S. degree in Educational Leadership, content knowledge is assessed in the following ways: (1) field experiences; (2) problem-based assessments; (3) simulated experiences; (4) real-life experiences.

Among field experiences where candidates work to effect a positive school environment are the following: reviewing data relative to learner differences; gathering data at the system level, analyzing data, and developing a presentation; researching and investigating local, state, federal and norm-referenced test standards; creating and submitting a strategic plan for a local school system; developing a system-level budget; conducting a clinical supervision project with a colleague; collecting data from local school systems, analyzing data, developing goals, objectives, and action plans in a comprehensive system improvement plan; involving staff at a local schools in conducting operations and setting priorities using appropriate and effective needs assessment, research-based data, and group process skills to build consensus; communicating and resolving conflicts in order to align resources with the organizational vision; and meeting with members of the school community in order to gather data to be utilized in communication and engagement plans.

Through experiences in the classroom and in the field, the Ed. S. program in Educational Leadership prepares leaders who have a high degree of expertise in school improvement, action research, and professional learning that is consistent with the missions of the university and the College of Education.

IV. Conclusion about the Program's Viability at CSU

In February 2005, the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners evaluated the Ed.S. program and judged the quality to be extremely high in terms of the national standards articulated in the ISLLC Standards (now ELCC/SAPEL). In addition, program quality is enhanced by strong partnerships with area schools where students can gain valuable field experiences with educational leaders who helped in the development of the internship.

Faculty in the Educational Leadership program contribute to the partnership with K-12 schools in the area by working with them in research and consulting capacities. Faculty members from the program work with Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) Better Seeking Teams in partner schools, leadership teams in elementary and middle schools, research initiatives with other area universities (Troy State and Auburn University) aimed at improving student achievement, and in a research initiative with an area school system targeting leadership dispositions that contribute to school improvement.

The number of degrees conferred through the Educational Leadership program is the highest in the College of Education. Since the inception of the cohort structure, the number of degrees granted to participants in the graduate program is 97%. With the 2005-2006 cohorts, numbers have doubled from the previous year with an attrition rate of only 2%.

Based on faculty review of the program to include alignment of the program with state and national standards and a review of student performance in the classroom, the Ed.S. program was redesigned in terms of selection and admission procedures, coursework and delivery of instruction. During that transitional phase, the number of degrees conferred through the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership was the highest in the College of Education. Even more significant is the fact that, despite increased rigor in selection and admission and in the classroom, the percentage of degrees granted to participants in the Ed.S. program has increased to 92%. After an initial decrease in cohort numbers in 2004-2005, numbers of students in the Ed.S. program have doubled from the previous year with an attrition rate of only 2%.

V. Program Improvement Plan

Faculty recently conducted a review of graduate programs in Educational Leadership before, during, and following a visit for NCATE accreditation. The area targeted for improvement in both the M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs was assessment. Most in need of

improvement is a redesign of the plan for assessing student knowledge, skills and dispositions.

Faculty have designed and implemented several assessment tools to include assessments of candidate strengths prior to selection and admission. Once selected, students are administered entry assessments to include a leadership questionnaire and surveys to assess dispositions. These assessments are administered prior to graduation and the results studied to ascertain areas for program improvement. A goal for the 2005-2006 academic year is to study corporate dispositional models and review the potential for application in the educational setting.

During the previous academic year, faculty re-aligned coursework for the Ed.S. program with the Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs In Educational Leadership (SAPEL). These standards were formerly designated as ISLLC. This year, student performance will be assessed to ascertain if the objectives for each course are being met. Courses and instructional methods will be continuously improved in order to meet and exceed the national standards.

Other plans for improvement include:

- The implementation of a rubric and assessment for candidate performance during the internship.
- The development of an assessment instrument to gather data regarding graduate performance in effecting school and system improvement after assuming a leadership role in a school or district.
- The improvement of collaboration among the different programs housed in the College of Education to include the design of courses where students from different programs work together in simulated school and system environments.
- The assessment of electronic portfolios documenting work during internships as well as artifacts from courses representing levels of student knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- Increased emphasis on recruiting efforts to include recruiting trips to area schools, recruiting trips to area universities, use of area newspapers and media outlets to publicize the program, and participation in area forums to include the Chamber of Commerce fair, the Muscogee County School District job fair, and area career fairs.
- The development of a computer laboratory where a “virtual school system” may be implemented in order to significantly improve the verisimilitude of training.

- The continued review of state level assessments of student performance in order to gauge the effectiveness of the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership in terms of Georgia performance standards.

VI. Summary Recommendation

Recommendation: Maintain and Strengthen the Program

The Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership has been and continues to be a program that serves a high number of graduate students. Preparing leaders for work at the school and system level in areas served by Columbus State University, the Educational Leadership program has seen an increase in the rate of graduation that approaches 100%. After an initial decrease in Fall enrollment following a transition to a cohort structure that admits students once a year, numbers in the program have increased for the 2005-2006 academic year. Numbers enrolled in the program during summers when cohorts are ending and beginning simultaneously actually exceed the numbers reported in Table 3.2.

It is the recommendation of the faculty that the program be maintained and strengthened as partnerships with area schools and systems continue to improve and as numbers of students continue to increase.