

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

**Columbus State University
September 2005**

Executive Summary for the M.Ed. 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.

Overall, the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership is very strong and prepares school leaders among administrative ranks and in the classroom who have a high degree of expertise in school improvement, action research, and professional learning. The transition from a distance learning instructional delivery format to a cohort structure where instruction is delivered on campus has significantly strengthened the program both in terms of quality of instruction and in candidate potential.

Program Productivity: Strong

The average number of M.Ed. candidates in the Educational Leadership program (2001-2005) is 47.25. This is the highest of any M.Ed. program offered at the College of Education with the exception of the Middle Grades Education program where the enrollment numbers are comparable. The Educational Leadership program has changed from a program where candidates registered for courses as 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. This has resulted in an increased graduation rate. The number of M.Ed. degrees conferred through the Educational Leadership program is the highest for any M.Ed. program 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 M.Ed. level.
- The implementation of an assessment instrument is being 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 that are being collected at the end of each semester (fieldwork assessments for M.Ed., assessment of dispositions, candidate satisfaction surveys).

- 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 M.Ed. 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 M.Ed. program.
- Continue to improve the M.Ed. internship so that students are immersed in the actual work of the school leader in area schools. This will attract students who desire to participate in experiences enabling them to effect improvement in student achievement.
- Continue recruiting initiatives to increase the numbers of students in the program. These efforts 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

The M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership fills a need in the immediate service area and in the region. The number of applicants indicates a strong need for school leaders in the partner school area served by the unit. Interest in the CSU program from area administrators, superintendents, and assistant superintendents 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.

Faculty in the Educational Leadership Program contribute to the partnership with K-12 schools in the area by working with them in consulting and research 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 involving 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 M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership has been strengthened in terms of rigor, in terms of collaboration with the community and partner schools, and in terms of admission standards. At the same time, numbers, after an initial decrease, are increasing and the graduation rate for those who are admitted approaches 100%.

Program Improvement Plan

In response to the findings of the Comprehensive Program Review, the faculty members and administrators of the M.Ed. 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 Educational Leadership 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. Implement and further refine the rubric developed to assess candidate performance in fieldwork	Quality	2006-Ongoing
4. Implement and further refine the assessment instrument designed to gather candidate performance data on impacting P-12 student achievement after completion of two years in a leadership role	Quality	2006-Ongoing
5. Continue to use PRAXIS II/GACE results to inform program improvement	Quality	2006-Ongoing
6. Refine the cohort structure to maximize efficiency and effectiveness	Productivity Viability	2006-Ongoing
7. Refine and assess the quality of EDUF 6795: Collaboration for School/Student Improvement	Quality	2006-Ongoing

The Interim Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs have reviewed the plan and will commit financial and personnel resources to accomplish priorities 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 for program improvement. Resources from external funding will be necessary to support priority 2. 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*

It is the recommendation of the faculty that the program be maintained and strengthened. The program has been evaluated by the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners and determined to be extremely strong. Numbers of participants in the program are among the highest in the College of Education. Graduation rates for the program in 2004-2005 are at 97%. The present cohort beginning in 2005 has 100% of its students on track to graduate.

Program Overview

The M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership prepares transformational leaders who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effect improvement in learning and student achievement P-12. Transformational leaders developed by this program understand that effective practices that ensure student achievement are inextricably connected with their personal and professional development and that of their staffs. Program faculty have established entry requirements in terms of knowledge, skills, and dispositions evaluated during the entry phase into the program. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed during the program are evaluated at the end of the program with a comprehensive exit exam administered after the last course in the program. Throughout the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership, candidates 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 candidate performances through problem-based assessments, simulated experiences, the development of artifacts documenting candidate expertise, and candidate performance on a comprehensive exit exam.

Candidate 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).

Graduates will be able to promote 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 instructional and administrative programs and fostering the use of technology.

Coursework in the M.Ed. 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; obtaining a passing score on the Educational Leadership exit examination; 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.

Each course in the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership has at least 30 hours of fieldwork embedded. Opportunities are provided for candidates to observe, attend and participate in education-related community events. Field experiences reflect the University's Conceptual Framework. Leadership candidates develop the content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in the MBPTS Core Assumptions, the INTASC Principles and the Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (SAPEL).

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 M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership is reflected in Table 3.1 (below)

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Full-Time	9	9	6	11
Part-Time	41	43	45	25
<i>Total</i>	50	52	51	36

Table 3.1 Number of Declared Majors in M.Ed. in EDUL – Fall Semester

The number of M.Ed. candidates enrolled in 2004-2005 as recorded during Fall 2004 semester decreased 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 as they appeared in a cycle to a program with 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. Enrollment numbers during Summer semesters under the cohort structure are higher than those reflected in Table 3.1 because incoming and graduating cohorts are both enrolled during the summer.

Table 3.2 outlines enrollment in all M.Ed. programs in the College of Education.

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	Average
Early Childhood Education	26	25	24	22	24.25
Educational Leadership	50	52	51	36	47.25
Health & Physical Education	10	13	11	11	11.25
Middle Grades Education	29	50	53	58	47.5
School Counseling	39	30	24	36	32.25
Secondary English	9	24	33	27	23.25
Secondary Mathematics	12	13	21	20	16.5
Secondary Science	13	22	20	17	18
Secondary Social Science	7	19	22	15	15.75
Special Education – Behavioral Disorders	15	15	18	16	16
Special Education – Learning Disabilities	22	33	28	31	28.5
Special Education – Mental Retardation	10	17	8	8	10.75

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

The numbers of candidates in the Educational Leadership program have been higher than those in other programs with the exception of Middle Grades Education where the enrollment numbers are comparable.

Reasons for the numbers of candidates enrolled in the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership include the availability of the distance learning instructional format until 2003-2004. With the advent of the cohort structure, there was 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).

III B. Annual Degree Productivity of the Program

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

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Early Childhood Education	12	9	11	11
Educational Leadership	9	28	16	37
Health & Physical Education	1	3	6	6
Middle Grades Education	10	10	10	26
School Counseling	16	8	4	8
Secondary English	7	3	6	16
Secondary Mathematics	5	1	4	3
Secondary Science	1	4	6	10
Secondary Social Science	1	4	5	2
Special Education – Behavioral Disorders	7	5	8	3
Special Education – Learning Disabilities	10	8	13	7
Special Education – Mental Retardation	3	3	1	3

Table 3.3 Number of Degrees Conferred –Fiscal Year

The number of degrees conferred in the Educational Leadership program reflects the availability of graduate courses provided by the distance learning format. Whereas candidates in other M.Ed. programs were required to travel to the Columbus State University campus in order to attend class, the distance learning format made it possible to attend class in a remote location. This made participation in graduate courses without travel possible for candidates living more than fifty miles from the university campus.

With the initial decrease in enrollment brought about by a transition to 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.

III C. Program Completion Efficiency & Graduation Rate

Table 3.4 reflects graduation rates for programs in the College of Education with graduation rates for the Educational Leadership program highlighted. Through 2003-2004, the Educational Leadership program allowed participation in graduate programs that resulted in add-on certification. Although the number of candidates attending classes in order to attain add-on certification are reflected in enrollment numbers (Table 3.1), that number is not reflected in the figures for degrees conferred. Because of this fact, the program completion and graduate rate figures do not reflect candidates who attended class for certification only as program completers.

Program	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Early Childhood Education	46%	36%	46%	50%
Educational Leadership	18%	54%	31%	97%
Health & Physical Education	10%	23%	55%	55%
Middle Grades Education	34%	20%	19%	45%
School Counseling	41%	27%	17%	22%
Secondary English	78%	13%	18%	59%
Secondary Mathematics	42%	8%	19%	15%
Secondary Science	8%	18%	30%	59%
Secondary Social Science	14%	21%	23%	13%
Special Education – Behavioral Disorders	47%	33%	44%	19%
Special Education – Learning Disabilities	45%	24%	46%	23%
Special Education – Mental Retardation	30%	18%	13%	38%

Table 3.4 Graduation Rate

The program completion/graduation rate in 2004-2005 for the Educational Leadership program (97%) represents a tremendous increase over the rates for the previous three years. During the 2004-2005 fiscal year, the Educational Leadership program was in transition from a program that was offered in a distance learning format where candidates chose when to participate in the required coursework to a program that was offered on campus in a cohort structure. Those students who were completing the program as offered in previous years attended classes that were offered in a tightly structured schedule intended to enable the transition to the cohort structure. Those students who had enrolled in Summer 2004 participated in the cohort.

The high completion/graduation rate is due to several factors. Since all cohort members are required to complete the same courses at the same time, failure to participate in required courses can delay graduation by up to a year. The initial commitment to the course of study results in commitment throughout the fifteen months required to complete the program. The non-cohort candidates who were completing the program were advised by the program coordinator and were required to complete courses offered. Had they not

completed the program as scheduled, they would have been required to reapply to the next cohort being offered (up to a year in the future).

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

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

The M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership requires a professional core of 7 credits and a concentration core of 29 credits. Course requirements are listed below:

Area 1: Professional Core (7 hrs.)

EDUF 6116 Action Research: Research Methods (3)

EDUF 6115 Educational Psychology: Achievement for Diverse Students (3)

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

Area 2: Concentration (29 hrs.)

EDUL 6225 A Vision for Learning (Strategic) (3)

EDUL 6226 Curriculum Design: Student Achievement (4)

EDUL 6227 Obtaining and Using Resources Wisely (Finance) (3)

EDUL 6235 Research-Based Instructional Strategies (Instructional) (4)

EDUL 6245 Organizing and Managing the Learning Environment (Organizational) (3)

EDUL 6255 Collaboration for Improved Student Achievement (Community) (3)

EDUL 6275 Public Policy and Ethics in Education (4)

EDUL 6279 Capstone Course (3)

EDUT 7795 Technology Practices for Effective Management (2)

EDUL 6000 Exit Exam

The requirements for the courses are contained in the Columbus State University Course Catalog. Course descriptions are contained in the catalogue. 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 M.Ed. 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 represents the number of sections offered each semester. Beginning in Summer 2004, courses were offered in a cohort structure where each course was offered one time each academic year. This innovation resulted in fewer courses being offered but in increased enrollment in each course. Additionally, projections could be made a year in advance regarding course enrollment and requirements for the hiring of faculty.

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 6115	5	1	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	2	2	2	2
EDUF 6116				6	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	2
EDUF 6795										1	1	1	1
EDUL 6225	2		3		2		3		1	3		1	
EDUL 6226				3		3			3	1			1
EDUL 6227								3			1		
EDUL 6235	3		2	3						1			
EDUL 6245	1	3	2	1		3	3	3		3	1		
EDUL 6255	3	2			2	2			4				
EDUL 6265		1	2										
EDUL 6275			3	1	3	3			3			1	
EDUL 6279				2	3	3		3	4			2	
EDUL 6698	3	3	3	4									1
EDUT 7795			2	1		3	1	1	1	1	1	3	
EDUL 6000	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 3.5 Frequency of Course Offerings

Moving to a cohort structure has resulted in significant improvements in the program in terms of organization, projections for the coming year, hiring faculty, faculty preparation and collaboration.

III F. Enrollment in the Program’s Required Courses

Table 3.6 reflects the average number of students per course. The move to the cohort structure increased average numbers of students per course in that each course has been offered one time per academic year. This has increased the cost effectiveness of the program because there are very few courses offered with low enrollment.

The few courses with low enrollment that have been offered since the inception of the cohort structure have been scheduled to provide an avenue for students who enrolled in the Educational Leadership Program before the implementation of the cohort structure. It is predicted that the cost effectiveness of the program will continue to increase as additional numbers of students are recruited for the program.

Average Enrollment Per Section													
	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 6115	8.4	26	13	13	13.5	15.5	11.5	10	15.3	22.5	18.5	14	19.5
EDUF 6116				7	13	16	13.5	19	18	25.5	14.6	17	21
EDUF 6795									8	35	12	16	65
EDUL 6225	7.5		6.7		10.5		9		9.7	4.3		16	
EDUL 6226				5.3		8.3				9			14
EDUL 6227								10.3			9		
EDUL 6235	9		9	4.3			9.7	7.3		8			14
EDUL 6245	1	7.7	18	5		9.3	5.5			7.6	9		
EDUL 6255	6.7	5.5			10	5			12.3				
EDUL 6265		14	5										
EDUL 6275			7.7	16	5.3	5.6			9.7			11	
EDUL 6279				5.5	10.3	7		5.3	11.8			19.5	
EDUL 6698	4	3.7	2	3									14
EDUT 7795			26.5	14		21.3	4	28	18	8	17	16.7	
EDUL 6000	10	15	19	22	22	26	15	7	19	13	5	12	2

Table 3.6 Average Enrollment in the Program's Required Courses

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

Table 3.7 provides figures for the diversity of the M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership. From 2001–2005, the majority of students have been female. A reason for this fact is that the number of female students in the program reflects the percentage of female faculty in schools in the region served by the Columbus State University Educational Leadership Program. In fact, the percentages of female faculty members in the region served by the program far exceed those reflected in the program itself.

The numbers of black students in the M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership reflect similar percentages in the schools in the region served by the Columbus State University Educational Leadership Program.

Gender	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Female	30 (60%)	28 (54%)	29 (57%)	23 (64%)
Male	20 (40%)	24 (46%)	22 (43%)	13 (36%)
Ethnicity				
Asian	0	0	0	0
Black	18 (36%)	9 (17%)	13 (25%)	10 (28%)
Hispanic	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
American Indian	0	0	0	0
Multi-Racial	0	0	0	0
White	31 (62%)	43 (83%)	37 (73%)	25 (70%)

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

Faculty in the Educational Leadership Program have made significant efforts to increase the numbers of black students in the program. Efforts to increase these numbers 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.

Table 3.8 reflects the ethnic and gender diversity among graduates of the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership. The overall graduation rates for the years 2001-2005 are: 18%, 54%, 31%, and 97%. The program completion/graduation rate in 2004-2005 for the Educational Leadership program represents a tremendous increase over the rates for the previous three years. When reviewed in terms of the diversity of program graduates, the figures show that graduation numbers for black and white students represent an increase over the rates for the previous three years that followed the pattern of the overall graduation rate.

Gender	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Female	3 (33.3%)	17 (60.7%)	6 (37.5%)	21 (56.8%)
Male	6 (66.7%)	11 (39.3%)	10 (62.5%)	16 (43.2%)
Ethnicity				
Asian	0	0	0	0
Black	2 (22.2%)	3 (10.7%)	4 (25%)	8 (21.6%)
Hispanic	0	0	0	0
American Indian	0	0	0	0
Multi-Racial	0	0	0	0
White	7 (77.8%)	25 (89.3%)	12 (75%)	29 (78.4%)

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

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the Educational Leadership program was reorganized into a cohort structure where all cohort members are required to complete the same courses at the same time. This reorganization had the effect of increasing graduation percentages. In the new Educational Leadership Program, all cohort members are required to complete the same courses at the same time. Failure to participate in required courses can delay graduation by up to a year. The initial commitment to the course of study results in commitment throughout the fifteen months required to complete the program. This has had the effect of increasing graduation rates for students from various ethnic groups. The M.Ed. cohort that began in Summer 2005 presently has 100% of its students on track to graduate.

Table 3.9 represents age diversity among M.Ed. Educational Leadership students. The largest numbers of students in the M.Ed. program is in the 31-40 age group, with the second largest numbers of students in the 26-30 age group. There are very few students in the 21-25 age group. An explanation for this fact is that students are admitted to the M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership through a combination of admission criteria.

Age	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
21-25	3	2	7	3
26-30	15	15	14	10
31-40	22	23	19	11
41-50	8	10	10	9
51-60	2	2	1	3
<i>Total</i>	50	52	51	36
<i>Average</i>	34.8	35.3	34.0	36.0

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

Among these criteria are written and verbal interviews that ascertain leadership dispositions. Often, these dispositions are present in educators who have had a number of years in the teaching field. There is also very little interest in the program on the part of those new to the teaching field. Those who apply for the M.Ed. program are those students who are interested in taking on additional challenges in terms of leadership.

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 of Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Professional Studies represented approximately 4% of the total instructional costs for Columbus State University (CSU) from 2001 to 2004.

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.

	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

There was an initial decrease in numbers 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 2004-2005 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.

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

The M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership has undergone significant redesign since 2004. The recent PSC/NCATE program evaluation completed by faculty, Board of Regents evaluations of the program, changing national standards, and input from graduates, advisory council, and partner schools have all contributed to the redesign of the program.

Beginning in 2004, faculty met weekly in order to align courses with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (SAPEL). During this alignment process, the focus of some courses was changed and two new courses were designed and added.

Based on input from the Board of Regents, the self-study for NCATE accreditation, and significant input from area superintendents, principals, and teachers, the internship for Educational Leadership was redesigned. During the years 2001-2004, the internship for the M.Ed. program was either action research-based or embedded in coursework field experiences. The new internship begun in 2005 immerses students in the work of leadership in the field under the supervision of partner school principals. Internships of students living within a 50 mile radius of the university are performed in partner schools where the leadership has assisted the Educational Leadership Program in designing the internship. It is anticipated that a large number of the graduates of the program will be employed by the partner school systems whose leaders have had a part in designing the internship and other aspects of the program.

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

Table 3.12 represents the M.Ed. Educational Leadership degrees conferred by institution. The Columbus State University Educational Leadership program ranks seventh out of the eleven universities that confer degrees in Educational Leadership. CSU is the only Georgia university within 90 miles that offers this degree.

Institution	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Average
State Universities					
Albany State University	4	11	41	25	20.25
Augusta State University	15	21	15	6	14.25
Columbus State University	9	9	28	16	15.5
Georgia College and State University	40	41	32	26	34.75
Kennesaw State University (New Program)	0	0	0	42	10.5
North Georgia College and State University	0	0	0	0	0
State University of West Georgia	48	54	67	35	51
Regional/Research Universities					
Georgia Southern University	32	29	22	18	25.25
Valdosta State University	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia State University	31	19	31	42	23.75
University of Georgia	38	33	32	20	30.75

Table 3.12 M.Ed. Educational Leadership Degrees 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.

Consistent with the missions of CSU and the COE, the Educational Leadership program prepares graduates to meet the demand for school leaders with 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 M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership develops leaders with this level of expertise in school improvement.

Coursework in the M.Ed. 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; obtaining a passing score on the Educational Leadership exit examination; 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.

Candidates in the M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership participate in (1) field experiences, (2) problem-based assessments, (3) simulated experiences, and (4) real-life experiences. Candidates complete 300 clock hours of field experiences where they demonstrate professional knowledge and skills in a variety of settings. Field projects completed by candidates in Educational Leadership include school improvement plans, principal handbooks, strategic planning projects, fieldwork in assessing extent of collaboration between school and parents, sample school budgets, data analysis projects, and other pertinent artifacts demonstrating professional knowledge and skills in practical application.

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 local school 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; developing a school budget; conducting a clinical supervision project with a colleague; involving staff at a local school 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.

Dispositions for candidates for the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership are assessed through the utilization of a disposition assessment evaluation instrument and a disposition

assessment self-evaluation instrument. During Spring 2004, these instruments were piloted. The evaluation instruments will be utilized by instructors in subsequent semesters and the self-evaluation instruments will be administered in all M.Ed. classes in Educational Leadership. Members of the Educational Leadership team will meet to review the disposition assessment instruments in order to assess the program and make decisions regarding the program and candidates in the program.

Dispositions are assessed and/or enabled in accordance with procedures for Disposition Evaluation/Development for the Department of Counseling, Educational Leadership and Professional Studies (CELPS) during the admission screening process, graduate orientation, program courses, faculty mentoring, program faculty review, internship field experiences, exit activities, and post-graduation assistance by instructors in the Educational Leadership Program.

IV. Conclusion about the Program's Viability at CSU

The M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership fills a need in the immediate service area and in the region. The number of applicants indicates a strong need for school leaders in the partner school area served by the unit. Interest in the CSU program from area administrators, superintendents, and assistant superintendents 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.

In February 2005, the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners evaluated the M.Ed. program and judged the quality to be extremely high in terms of the national standards articulated in the ISLLC Standards (now ELCC/SAPLEL). 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 junior high 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 1.9% (one student).

The M.Ed. Program in Educational Leadership has been strengthened in terms of rigor, in terms of collaboration with the community and with partner schools, and in terms of

admission standards. At the same time, numbers, after an initial decrease, are increasing and the graduation rate for those who are admitted approaches 100%.

V. Program Improvement Plan

Grades in coursework for the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership indicate that the weakest area in the program is in collaboration for school improvement. Other areas needing improvement include organizing and managing the learning environment. Although 82% of program completers passed the Praxis II test, a review of performance data indicated that the weakest area of performance was in the area of curriculum.

Faculty recently conducted a review of both the M.Ed. and the Ed.S. programs in Educational Leadership as they prepared a report for the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). As faculty conducted this review they targeted the assessment of skills and dispositions as an area for improvement, particularly in terms of data collection and storage, graphic representation and the documentation of program review through data analysis, and program improvement based on that data analysis.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, faculty aligned M.Ed. coursework with the Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (SAPEL). These standards have been incorporated into course syllabi and serve as course objectives. Coursework in the M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership addresses knowledge and skills articulated in the standards from a problem-based standpoint using scenarios, fieldwork and projects resulting in the production of artifacts as a means of ensuring learning.

Based on the review conducted by faculty, a decision was made to meet regularly each semester in order to evaluate the dispositions of each candidate in Educational Leadership. Faculty members in the program are currently studying corporate dispositional models and reviewing the potential for application in the educational setting. Accordingly, the rubric and assessment form for dispositions will be reviewed and revised in light of the findings of this study.

Other plans for program improvement include:

- The implementation of a rubric and assessment developed for candidate performance in fieldwork at the M.Ed. 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 EDUF 6795 Collaboration for School/Student Improvement, a new course where candidates from the educational leadership,

counseling, and teaching programs work together in devising collaborative strategies for improving schools and student achievement.

- The continued strengthening of the cohort structure. Data relative to the performance of cohort candidates in the initial semester has been analyzed. Indications are that candidate performance was high in terms of skills, knowledge and dispositions as measured by student grades and by the quality of student projects. Faculty teaching the cohort during the initial semester (Summer 2004) reported high levels of student engagement in coursework and high quality of products created by students.
- The strengthening of assessment components collected at the end of each semester (fieldwork assessments for M.Ed., assessment of dispositions, candidate satisfaction surveys).
- 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.
- Continued use of individual reports on Praxis II test results to identify areas of weakness in the program.

VI. Summary Recommendation

Summary Recommendation and Supporting Rationale

Recommendation: Maintain and Strengthen the Program

It is the recommendation of the faculty that the program be maintained and strengthened. The program has been evaluated by the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners and determined to be extremely strong. Numbers of participants in the program are among the highest in the College of Education. Graduation rates for the program in 2004-2005 are at 97%. The present cohort beginning in 2005 has 100% of its students on track to graduate.

At the same time, faculty members are working to strengthen the program by adding components that immerse students in the work of leadership at the school level. Plans for the program include strengthening the internship portion of the program, incorporating work with school leadership teams and Better Seeking Teams, and strengthening the assessment model used to evaluate students and the program.

Faculty members in the Educational Leadership Program are working closely with the Board of Regents, the Professional Standards Commission, and the Georgia Leadership

Institute for School Improvement in order to develop leaders who can impact student achievement at the school level.