

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

PROGRESS REPORT

Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
New England Association of Schools and Colleges

- Implementing the assessment of student learning outcomes across the curriculum
- Fully implementing the doctoral program in instructional leadership

Danbury, Connecticut
October 15, 2006

Table of Contents

Institutional Overview	1
Progress Reports:	
I. The Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Across the Curriculum	2
Appendix A. Assessment by School and Program	6
Appendix B. Policy and Administration	17
Appendix C. The Busy Person’s Guide to Assessment	23
II. Full Implementation of the Ed.D.....	34
Appendix A. Faculty Qualifications for Teaching or Advising.....	48
Appendix B. Workshop Topics for Doctoral-Level Faculty	50
Appendix C. CV’s of Major Advisors in the Program	51
Appendix D. The Comprehensive Examination for the Ed.D	80

Institutional Overview

Western Connecticut State University, founded in 1903, is a comprehensive state university of 6,000 students located in Danbury, Connecticut. It offers 53 degree programs, from the associate to the doctoral level, with approximately 85% of students enrolled for undergraduate degrees. The university works closely with a dynamic service and business community and collaborates with local, state, and regional community agencies and institutions.

The mission of the university is to serve as “an accessible, responsive and creative intellectual resource for the people and institutions of Connecticut.” By providing liberal arts and professional programs of high quality, it prepares students “to be successful in their chosen careers and to be productive members of society.”

The university’s Carnegie classification is Master’s “L.” Its undergraduate programs are classified as “professions plus arts and sciences,” and its graduate programs as “education dominant.” It offers several Master’s-level programs in the arts and sciences, education, business, and justice administration; M.F.A.’s in the visual arts and professional writing; and the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership.

Western Connecticut State University was reaccredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges in 2003. A number of significant changes have taken place since that time. Dr. James W. Schmotter succeeded Dr. James Roach as President in 2004. The dual position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs was created, and Dr. Linda K. Rinker, first to hold the title, took office June 30, 2006. With new leadership the university community has engaged in a Values and Vision strategic planning process, with action teams addressing such issues as student success, enrollment management, and community partnerships. A recommendation to be implemented in fall 2006 is the formation of a new School of the Visual and Performing Arts, comprising the departments of Art, Music, and Theatre Arts. The new school will take its place with the Ansell School of Business, the School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Professional Studies as the fourth school of the university. Planning led by a Strategic Planning Steering Committee continues in the 2006-07 academic year.

NEASC requested that the university prepare two progress reports before the next scheduled comprehensive evaluation in 2013:

- (1) By Fall 2006 a report on the assessment of student learning outcomes across the curriculum and full implementation of the Ed.D. program.
- (2) By Fall 2008 a report on developing and integrating a comprehensive planning process and integrating part-time faculty into academic life.

The following is the university’s response to the request for a report in Fall 2006.

Western Connecticut State University

Implementing the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Across the Curriculum

Prepared as a Progress Report for NEASC, October 15, 2006

Relevant Background

Western Connecticut State University has been engaged in the assessment of student learning outcomes since 1988. Beginning in 2001, the Vice President for Academic Affairs required departments to submit plans for the assessment of student learning outcomes. All new program proposals submitted to governance review were also required to include assessment plans. The Assessment Committee developed guidelines, reviewed the plans, and issued a report of good practices in several departments. In most cases, however, there was little or no evidence of assessment-based change for improvement of learning. In 2004, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education commended the University for the in-depth assessment practices undertaken by its programs that hold specialized accreditation. However, the Commission concurred with the visiting team that WestConn had yet to develop a “University-wide conversation on assessment.” The fall 2006 report provides an opportunity to report on the University’s success in developing and implementing a comprehensive approach to the assessment of student learning.

Efforts Made to Address Specified Concerns

The University has worked consistently and successfully to implement the assessment of student learning outcomes across the curriculum as stipulated by the NEASC reaccreditation report of March 2004. A plan assigning responsibility for assessment policy and administration was adopted and implemented in the fall of 2004 (see Appendix B). To assist faculty and deans, an assessment coordinator was appointed for each of the three schools and the Division of Graduate Studies, and a special allocation of \$25,100 was made for training and expenses. The Busy Person’s Guide to Assessment was distributed to provide guidelines for faculty and department Chairs (see Appendix C). Several meetings were convened to clarify what constitutes evidence of student learning, and what is necessary to document faculty reflection on assessment results.

Deans and coordinators stressed the necessity of reporting all five stages of the assessment cycle:

1. Determining program goals and objectives
2. Gathering direct evidence of student learning outcomes
3. Interpreting the evidence
4. Making changes for improvement
5. “Closing the loop” by gathering information on the effectiveness of changes and/or by focusing on different objectives and repeating the process.

Each academic dean was charged with the responsibility of: (1) reviewing the assessment status of all programs in the school or division; (2) providing copies of the NEASC statements on evidence to all department chairs; (3) asking departments which were already successful in assessing learning outcomes to agree on a common format for reporting assessment results; (4) conferring with the chairs of departments judged to be in need of assessment and explaining the procedures; and (5) ensuring annual reporting of assessment findings, including changes in instruction and curricula.

Current Situation

As a result of intensive efforts, 50 degree programs have implemented assessment plans (14 graduate and 36 undergraduate). Only the A.S. degree program in Liberal Arts and the M.A. program in Earth and Planetary Sciences are missing assessment plans. Work on assessment of the A.S. program is underway. The M.A. program has offered no coursework for two years and is being reviewed for continuance. The latest annual assessment reports were submitted to Academic Affairs in May and June 2006. Faculty have set goals, collected and analyzed assessment data for at least one year, discussed the findings in department meetings, and proposed curriculum modifications. Some recommendations can be implemented immediately, for example, standardizing syllabi across all sections of an introductory course, increasing emphasis on topics that prove most difficult for students in capstone courses, and advising students of alternatives to previously recommended junior-level courses. Other proposals include changing course prerequisites and designing new courses. As might be expected, scoring rubrics and other measurement instruments have been revised if found to be vague or otherwise inappropriate. The next section summarizes implementation in each of the three schools.

Examples of the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Each School

In order to summarize trends in the implementation of assessment of student learning, we created a typology of outcomes and applied it to each degree program: (1) analyses were conducted and no substantive changes are considered necessary; (2) changes in instruction were implemented as a result of review of assessment findings; and (3) changes in curriculum were implemented as a result of review of assessment findings. This section contains a review of trends in each of the three schools, and Appendix A contains more detailed descriptions of recent assessment activities for each degree program.

School of Arts and Sciences. Eleven programs were in the “analysis” category (1): American Studies BA; Medical Technology BS; Chemistry BA; English Literature BA; Professional Writing BA; Mathematics MA; Meteorology BS; Social Sciences BA; Anthropology/Sociology BA; Political Science BA; and Economics BA. Seven programs were in the “instruction” category (2): Art BA; Visual Arts MFA; Communication BA; Mathematics BA; Psychology BA; Earth and Planetary Sciences BA; and Theatre Arts BA. Seven programs were in the “curriculum” category (3): Biology BA; Biology and Environmental Science MA; Computer Science BA; English MA; History BA; History MA; and Spanish BA. Additionally, the new Professional Writing MFA program has plans to conduct a portfolio review in 2006-07.

Three examples of changes in Arts and Sciences programs. First, as a result of analysis of assessment data from the capstone course, the department of Biological and Environmental Sciences is revising the senior research project structure to better address several objectives, including: (1) design and execution of experiments; (2) understanding of the scientific process and methodology; (3) application of quantitative methods; and (4) demonstration of independence, creativity, and initiative in scientific design. Additionally, the course in Scientific Communication will be reorganized, expanded, and offered earlier in the course sequence for majors. Second, the B.A. program in History was evaluated by sampling final papers from 2002 through 2005 from the Senior Seminar. Analysis of the papers revealed proficiency in the students’ choice of appropriate topics and in the quality of scholarship, but the building of arguments was somewhat weaker. In response to these findings, the department is developing more rigorous writing requirements in two required courses, Introduction to Historical Research and Historiography. Third, the Theatre Arts senior portfolio (BA), comprising a written proposal, oral presentation, and written final paper, was used to assess three objectives: (1) students will perform competently on creative projects, technical

projects, or theatre management; (2) communicate clearly orally and in writing; and (3) apply relevant theories and develop research tools. All full-time theatre faculty evaluated 13 portfolios using a department-developed rubric. Faculty concern focused on areas where substantial numbers of portfolios were rated below the “proficient” level. After discussion of the assessment findings, faculty resolved to implement four recommendations: (1) tell students to begin assembling the portfolio earlier in the semester; (2) integrate a greater diversity of plays across the curriculum; (3) develop a handbook to aid students develop a style of presentation; and (4) begin assembly of production books for all main-stage shows as a resource for students.

Ancell School of Business. Two programs were in the “analysis” category: Master of Health Administration and Management Information Systems BBA. Five programs were in the “instruction” category: Accounting BBA; Finance BBA; Management BBA; Justice and Law BS; and Master of Justice Administration. Two programs were in the “curriculum” category: Marketing BBA and Master of Business Administration.

Three examples of changes in the Ancell programs. First, authentic assessment of the Finance BBA program focuses on two types of portfolio management: an Internet investment simulation in Investment Analysis and Portfolio Management, and case studies in the capstone course, Cases in Managerial Finance. Changes to instruction include increased emphasis on cash flow analysis and problem solving, in response to demonstrated weaknesses in student projects. Second, in the Justice and Law Administration BS program, a sample of ten papers was selected randomly and student identification was redacted. Each of the papers was rated by three faculty members using the same rubric. Nine of the ten papers revealed an adequate understanding of concepts and eight demonstrated competent research skills. However, four papers were judged less than competent in written communication, and five were judged less than competent in critical thinking. To address the two areas of weakness, faculty will be encouraged to add writing components, put more emphasis on APA formatting, and stress critical thinking in each course. Third, the Marketing BBA program has a capstone course in which students are expected to develop a comprehensive marketing plan. One of the student learning outcomes is to transform the strategies into marketing programs that can be implemented. The plans are examined annually, both by faculty in the department and by external evaluators. Faculty review is documented in minutes of department meetings. External evaluators, most of whom are marketing plan clients, complete a rating instrument with several criteria. Instructional changes include an increased emphasis on secondary marketing research sources, data acquisition, analysis and statistics. Curricular changes include a two course sequence in Marketing Communications.

School of Professional Studies. Seven programs were in the “analysis” category: Elementary Education BS; Secondary Education BS; Counselor Education MS; Community Health BS; Music Education BS; Nursing BS; Nursing MSN. Four programs were in the “instruction” category: Education MS; Ed.D in Instructional Leadership; Music Education MS; and Social Work BA. Three programs were in the “curriculum” category (3): Health Education BS; Music BM; and Music BA. Additionally, the new BS program in Health Promotion has a well-developed plan for data collection and analysis.

Three examples of changes in Professional Studies programs. First, evaluation of the MS program in Education focused on two goals: (1) students in all options will demonstrate the ability to be both consumers of information and producers of educational research through the use of inquiry, critical analysis and synthesis; and (2) students will become proficient in the use of assessment techniques and analysis of student learning. Direct measures were applied to research papers produced in Introduction to Educational Research and to three assignments in Measurement and Evaluation. Two curricular changes were made as a result of reflection on the findings: (1) Introduction to

Educational Research and the Educational Research Seminar have been redesigned to relate more directly to classroom practices; (2) although the combination of activities offered in Measurement and Evaluation satisfies the state and national standards for measurement and evaluation, all sections of the course do not emphasize the same concepts and outcomes. The course focus will be realigned across sections to ensure that students have a successful course sequence. Second, to measure changes in student abilities to assess individual and community needs for Health Education (BS), faculty devised a pretest-posttest approach. Content drawn from eight required courses was used to construct a test item bank. A 50-item pretest is given to all incoming students, and a posttest of similar difficulty will be given to all completers of degree programs. The pretest revealed a need for making two courses required instead of electives: Mental Health and Human Sexuality. Third, the Music and Music Education department maintains policies and procedures that contribute to the learning and assessment of its students. These include: (1) juries at the end of each semester for students enrolled in Applied Music; (2) upper division applied jury for students in Music Education, Performance and Jazz Studies; (3) interview for admission to the professional semester in music education, prior to junior year; and (4) ensemble auditions. Each of these performances provides opportunities for the collection of assessment data. One result of faculty reflection on assessment results is the adoption of stricter standards for admission to the B.M.-Jazz program as well as the sophomore barrier assessment prior to enrollment in upper division music courses. Another finding is that one-fifth of incoming majors were required to take Music Essentials. Because faculty consider this an unacceptably large proportion, plans are underway to implement an online theory assessment which will include tutoring in basic fundamentals.

Systemwide Changes. On June 10, 2005, the Connecticut State University (CSU) Board of Trustees adopted a resolution requiring the assessment of student learning for educational improvement at all CSU institutions, and annual reports from the presidents to the Chancellor. Additionally, the Board and Chancellor encouraged assessment efforts by providing funds for faculty assessment grants beginning with the 2003-04 academic year. Grant recipients are expected to present their findings at a system-wide assessment conference the following spring. A total of eight proposals from WCSU faculty have received funding.

Plans for the Future

After the Assessment Committee issued recommendations for the annual reporting of assessment plans and results, an Action Plan for implementation was approved by the Academic Council in 2004. Accordingly, every department with degree programs will continue to issue an Assessment Update as part of its annual report each spring. The Assessment Committee will continue to review plans and reports and issue recommendations for modifications of assessment practices throughout the University. The newly-formed General Education Committee, also a standing committee of the University Senate, will assume responsibility for the assessment of the general education curriculum.

Appendix A

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes by School and Program

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Art. Faculty focused on two learning objectives for students in the Visual Arts BA program. At the senior thesis exhibition, 25 students were assessed using a department-developed rubric. Evaluations of “proficient” or “superior” were given to 92% of the students on the first objective, “ability to craft work in a quality manner.” Evaluations of “proficient” or “superior” were given to 88% of the students on the second objective, “acquisition of compositional skills.” As a result of the assessment, the department will consider implementing a screening instrument such as portfolio review. The core of the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Visual Arts program is the student’s individual portfolio developed over four semesters of increasing intensity designed to develop individual originality and enhance expertise of technique and expression. Student portfolios are evaluated weekly by resident faculty and biweekly by visiting artists. Day-long midterm and final group critiques are conducted with resident faculty. The culmination of the program is a public thesis exhibition, which is open to peer review by visiting artists, advisory board members, university officials, faculty, students, media representatives, and the public. A curriculum modification initiated in 2005-06 was an exhibition of graduate work in New York. This external review has been formally added to the program. In 2006-07 faculty will work on tying evidence to specific measures and refining a standardized rubric for critiques.

Biological and Environmental Sciences. As a result of analysis of assessment data from the capstone course, the department is revising the senior research project structure to better address several objectives, including: (1) design and execution of experiments; (2) understanding of the scientific process and methodology; (3) application of quantitative methods; and (4) demonstration of independence, creativity, and initiative in scientific design. The course in Scientific Communication will be reorganized, expanded, and offered earlier in the course sequence for majors. In June 2006, three faculty members were awarded a CSU Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement Grant for the "Pilot Project to Measure Student Achievement and Learning Gains in the B. A. Biology Degree Program." The ETS major field test in Biology will be used to measure content knowledge.

The B.S in Medical Technology (MT) program focused on three key objectives for student learning in 2005-06. First, successful placement in a hospital internship program was assessed by examining data for 25 students over a decade. All were successfully placed in professional settings. Second, a survey invited hospital supervisors to rate each intern’s analytical and critical thinking skills as well as technical competence. Only one major had an internship in 2005-06. Third, certification and employment data were used to track 25 students over 10 years, and all were found to be certified and/or employed as medical technicians. Because of the small number of MT majors, it is advisable to combine several years of data before making recommendations for changes in curriculum and/or instruction. No program changes are considered necessary at this time.

The M.A. program in Biological and Environmental Sciences has five learning objectives: (1) the student will demonstrate an understanding of the scientific process and be able to apply it to the design and analysis of biological experiments; (2) demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the factual and theoretical bases of one or more areas of biology; (3) be able to communicate effectively in both oral and written presentations; (4) demonstrate the continuing ability to acquire the specific knowledge and understanding appropriate to a professional career; and (5) develop the computer and library skills necessary to continue learning beyond the M.A. degree. A committee examination

assesses the first four goals, and the graduate seminar assesses the first, third, and fifth goal. Preliminary results of a review of the M.A. program in Biological and Environmental Sciences indicate that more laboratory courses are needed (e.g. Advanced Molecular Biology). Faculty will address gaps in the rubrics for the evaluation of the seminar and the comprehensive exam in 2006-07. The format of the comprehensive exam is also undergoing revision.

Chemistry. The department continues to comply with the standards of its accrediting body, the American Chemical Society. Independent laboratory research evaluations measure both student technical competence in laboratory practice and application of principles to research. Co-op evaluations, in conjunction with a literature research project, are used to evaluate three objectives: (1) appropriate use of scientific literature; (2) quality of scientific writing; and (3) accuracy of verbal presentation.

Communication. Fifty undergraduate student theses were rated by a faculty committee in 2005-06 using a department-developed rubric. The use of the senior thesis and capstone course for program evaluation is new to the department, and faculty plan to refine the process. Specifically, three changes are planned for 2006-07: (1) assessment will be integrated into the teaching of Senior Thesis rather than occurring at the end of the semester; (2) students who do not complete theses in the prescribed time frame will be included in the analysis in an effort to discover reasons for non-completion; and (3) in order to generate better recommendations for each option within the major, the department will undertake separate analyses of student theses representing each program/option: Elementary Education; Media Arts option; Human Relations option; and General Communication option.

Computer Science. Faculty focused on three student learning objectives for assessment of the B.A. program: (1) students will understand the facts, concepts, principles and theories relating to computer science; (2) in-depth understanding of software applications; and (3) develop abilities to design and implement computer programs. The scoring rubric has specific criteria which should allow different coders to agree on scoring. Four faculty members rated student programming assignments. The methodology involves sampling student programming assignments from three courses. Bar graphs allow the reader to compare seven dimensions of student learning in the three courses. Two dimensions, Completeness and Testing, were shown to have lower mean scores for students in Software Engineering than in Web Applications Development. After reflecting on data collected in 2004-05, the faculty implemented several changes to instruction and curriculum. For example, a special session on testing and documentation was added to the early required course, Data Structures, and two alternatives to the Software Engineering course were developed. Data from the two alternative courses will be analyzed in 2006-07 to determine whether student deficiencies have been addressed.

English. Student attainment of four key learning objectives was measured: (1) ability to organize a lengthy piece of writing; (2) appropriate academic documentation; (3) maintain own voice while incorporating research; and (4) mastery of standard English. Analysis focused on the application of a rubric to student work sampled from baseline courses and compared to work sampled from advanced courses. Faculty concluded that the rubric needs to be customized for each program/option in order to make specific recommendations. For example, the American Studies rubric should be different from the rubrics for Literature and Professional Writing. Moreover, the choice of baseline courses needs to be reconsidered. The relatively small sample sizes should be expanded next year to allow for more detailed comparisons of student attainment of the learning objectives. The M.A. degree program has three primary learning objectives: (1) students will demonstrate knowledge of key literary periods and authors; (2) demonstrate historical, philosophical and social influences; and (3) demonstrate strong writing and critical thinking skills.

A faculty review of exams and theses was conducted in December 2005. Beginning in Fall 2006, there will be a portfolio requirement for degree completion. During 2006-07 the M.A. program will establish a plan for review of portfolios.

The Master of Fine Arts (MFA) program in Professional Writing was begun in August 2005 and does not yet have any graduates. There are three main objectives for student learning: (1) students will display competence in one creative and one practical genre; (2) students will improve their skills through hands-on experience in practica and internships; and (3) students will produce publishable work in each genre. Faculty review of student portfolios will address the first goal, while a sample of theses will address the first and third goals. Writing mentors will submit written evaluations of student work for goals (1) and (3), and internship supervisors will submit evaluations for goal (2).

History. The B.A. program was evaluated by sampling final papers from Fall 2002 through Fall 2005 from the capstone course (Senior Seminar). Analysis of the papers revealed proficiency in the students' choice of appropriate topics and in the quality of scholarship, but the building of arguments was somewhat weaker. In response to these findings, the department is developing more rigorous writing requirements in two required courses, Introduction to Historical Research and Historiography. Candidates for the M.A. degree in History have the option of a comprehensive essay examination or a thesis. After reviewing recent essays and theses, faculty identified student deficiencies in research and writing. As a result of discussions within the department, three curricular changes are underway: (1) revising standards and procedures for the comprehensive exam; (2) adding a required seminar in Research and Historiography; and (3) strengthening the area of United States history with four new courses.

Mathematics. In May 2004, three faculty members received a CSU grant for "Assessment in Mathematics." Three key learning objectives were addressed in the analysis of course projects: (1) written mathematical communication; (2) problem solving; and (3) technology related to mathematics. Projects were sampled from a range of courses: Calculus I; Intermediate Statistics; and Numerical Analysis. Writing skills were somewhat below the "proficient" level, but with evidence of greater proficiency in advanced courses. The rubric for problem solving proved to be inadequate; therefore, rubrics will be reviewed before they are applied next year. After discussing the findings, faculty approved a departmental writing guide for use in all courses that have a written project component. Recent assessment of the M.A. program focused on comprehensive examinations and research papers graded by three faculty members to assess the two main goals: (1) ability to understand and apply theoretical concepts of mathematics; and (2) develop skills necessary for business, teaching, or doctoral programs. The graduate committee will continue to meet annually to review the comprehensive exam results, written paper grades, and oral defense results.

Psychology. A departmental examination was used to evaluate two main objectives: (1) student proficiency in experimental and statistical methods; and (2) knowledge of content areas of Psychology. Of 50 students sampled, 68% were judged "superior" or "proficient" on both objectives, and 32% were judged "less than proficient." In response to the findings, faculty recommended increased standardization of the introductory course. Eight topics are now mandatory, and breadth requirements were increased from four to five.

Physics, Astronomy and Meteorology. Students in the B.S. program in Meteorology presented weekly television weathercasts and faculty judged their proficiency on three main objectives: (1) processing weather graphics; (2) forecasting and assessing weather situations; and (3) oral communication. An end of semester discussion and presentation was also used to assess forecasting proficiency, written communication skills. In addition, students prepared daily forecasts for a

national contest. All but one student on one objective was judged to be “moderately proficient” or better. Students in the B.A. Earth and Planetary Sciences Astronomy option and the B.S. Earth Science-Secondary Education program were evaluated according to three main objectives: (1) conceptual understanding; (2) ability to develop original research; and (3) appropriate utilization of computer technology. Pre- and post-testing in the General Astronomy course showed satisfactory growth in competencies. Student research reports in the same course showed appropriate levels of performance. Reports on observatory service showed that more structure was needed in the kinds of service required. Accordingly, specific requirements and training procedures will be developed. Finally, student research reports in Solar and Planetary Astronomy showed weaknesses in methodology. Faculty recommended improvements in methodology preparation in General Astronomy to better prepare students for Solar and Planetary Astronomy.

Social Sciences. Four objectives are assessed for each of the degree programs in the Social Sciences: (1) appropriate use of theories and concepts; (2) knowledge and use of research methodologies; (3) application of skills and behaviors; and (4) information technology and literacy. The portfolio requirement is new, with the first portfolios collected in May 2006. Pretest-posttest comparisons of knowledge and skill self-assessment approach were administered to students in Researching Social Issues and the Social Sciences Research Seminar. All four objectives showed adequate growth in the dimensions of competence from pretest to posttest.

Theatre Arts. The senior portfolio, comprising a written proposal, oral presentation, and written final paper, was used to assess three objectives: (1) students will perform competently on creative projects, technical projects, or theatre management; (2) communicate clearly orally and in writing; and (3) apply relevant theories and develop research tools. All full-time theatre faculty evaluated 13 portfolios using a department-developed rubric. Faculty concern focused on areas where substantial numbers of portfolios were rated below the “proficient” level. After discussion of the assessment findings, faculty resolved to implement four recommendations: (1) tell students to begin assembling the portfolio earlier in the semester; (2) integrate a greater diversity of plays across the curriculum; (3) develop a handbook to aid students develop a style of presentation; and (4) begin assembly of production books for all main-stage shows as a resource for students. In June 2006, three faculty members were awarded a CSU Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement Grant for “Assessment Rubrics for the Theatre Arts Department’s New Performance and Design/Technology Outcomes and a Curriculum Chart for Implementing a Process for Evaluating Learning Outcomes at Specified Markers within the Degree Program.”

World Languages and Literature. Student writing samples from Spanish conversation and literature courses were evaluated using a department-developed rubric based on national guidelines. Three key learning objectives were addressed: (1) variety in sentence components; (2) support of opinions; and (3) transitions between subtopics and distinctions between principal and secondary ideas. Student performance improved from 100% below proficiency at the beginning level to 70-90% “proficient-to-superior” evaluations at the upper level, depending on objective. After reflecting on the results of the assessment, faculty recommended more complex writing assignments for beginning level students. SPA 203, currently a conversation course, is being modified to include composition in 2006-07. Moreover, a research paper will be required in all 300-level courses, and there will be ongoing assessment of writing proficiency at all levels.

Academic Advisement Center (AAC). For the second successive year, the AAC has used assessment data to guide the development of its services. By University policy, Exploratory Studies majors (previously known as “Arts and Sciences Undeclared” students) are expected to choose disciplinary majors before completing 60 credits of coursework. They are also expected to make satisfactory academic progress – maintaining better than a 2.00 grade point average and completing

24 credits each academic year. All Exploratory majors were contacted by the AAC and offered advisement. The “Peer to Peer” (P2P) mentoring program was initiated in Fall 2005. Students on probation and others considered at risk of dropout were contacted biweekly and their progress was monitored by AAC staff. An electronic portfolio pilot program, “Major Discoveries,” was implemented in spring 2006. Students were guided by an advisor to develop ePortfolios that would help them to assess their interests and abilities. Seven students completed ePortfolios, and all of them declared majors by the end of the semester. One of the Assistant Directors was awarded a grant of \$2,750 from the Connecticut Distance Learning Commission to support an ePortfolio project during 2006-07.

ANCELL SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Accounting. Faculty improved the assessment grid for the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) program by mapping learning objectives to the required courses in which attainment of the objectives is to be demonstrated. Analysis of the results of a comprehensive exam revealed a clear pattern of lesser competence in areas of cost behavior, job order, and process costing. These topics will receive greater emphasis in 2006-07. Supervisors rated the oral and written communication skills of 22 interns on a four point scale. The same set of internship evaluations revealed that all interns were rated competent or highly competent in computer technology skills. In 2006-07 the department will meet to discuss implications of the comprehensive exams for curricular change, as well as possible improvements to the internship program.

Finance. Authentic assessment focuses on two types of portfolio management: an Internet investment simulation in Investment Analysis and Portfolio Management, and case studies in the capstone course, Cases in Managerial Finance. Beginning in 2004, these projects were reviewed by faculty. The rubric for evaluating the presentation of case studies has six items, including knowledge of the financial topic, analytical competency, and ability to solve a financial problem. Each item may be judged inadequate, adequate, or proficient. More specific examples would help to clarify distinctions between adequate and proficient performances. In addition, student projects in Financial Decision Models and Quantitative Methods in Finance are reviewed by faculty teams. Changes to instruction include increased emphasis on cash flow analysis and problem solving, in response to demonstrated weaknesses in student projects.

Justice and Law Administration (JLA). The final research paper in the Research Seminar in Justice and Law was used to measure student attainment of four key learning objectives, including: (1) communicates effectively in written composition; (2) understands concepts of Justice and Law Administration; (3) exhibits critical thinking within the discipline; and (4) demonstrates research capabilities. A sample of ten papers was selected randomly and student identification was redacted. Each of the papers was rated by three faculty members using the same rubric. Nine of the ten papers revealed an adequate understanding of concepts and eight demonstrated competent research skills. However, four papers were judged less than competent in written communication, and five were judged less than competent in critical thinking. To address the two areas of weakness, JLA faculty will be encouraged to add writing components, put more emphasis on APA formatting, and stress critical thinking in each course.

In May 2005, one faculty member was awarded a CSU Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement Grant for “Using the Final Graduate Research Project as a Tool for Student Learning Assessment.” A set of seven rubrics was developed for reviewing ten final research projects of candidates for the Master of Science in Justice Administration (MSJA). With some minor exceptions in the areas of leadership and political advocacy, all MSJA students demonstrated strong proficiency in each of the areas studied. The reviewer met with the professor who is currently

teaching the research course. He will ensure that all of the rubric areas are reviewed with students early in the research class, and that the research papers will address each area.

Management. The department focused on two objectives for its BBA program in 2005-06. First, faculty developed and revised a class presentation instrument and administered it to students in the Current Issues in Management course. The primary purpose was to assess written and verbal communication skills for professional business settings. Second, faculty developed a Team Effectiveness Critique for application to group projects. Each team member was asked to rate 11 dimensions of effectiveness for its team. Endpoints of the scale were specific statements, such as “One person dominates...” and “There is full participation in leadership...” Curriculum mapping was also utilized to gather information on the methods for assessing student learning in all six program objectives. Plans for 2006-07 include working with the Career Development office to enhance students’ understanding of internship and co-op opportunities. Alumni surveys indicated that these forms of service learning were extremely beneficial. The department is also considering the development of a course embedded assessment for its capstone experience.

Candidates for the Master of Health Administration (MHA) degree are required to complete a final project in conjunction with the capstone course, Strategic Management in Health Care Organizations. Examinations and case analyses are also used to assess student attainment of three primary goals: (1) students will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the concepts, tools, and techniques of health services finance; (2) in-depth knowledge of the history and development of the American health care system; and (3) an understanding of health services management practices. In the spring of 2006, outside evaluators were chosen from the university and a nearby hospital. An assessment rubric was used both for peer review and external review, and the scores were examined for consistency. No program changes are considered necessary.

Management Information Systems (MIS). Three key objectives of the BBA program in MIS have been assessed in recent years: (1) students will be able to assume responsible MIS roles in public and private sectors; (2) students will display strong communication and teamwork skills; and (3) students will be able to solve business problems using analytical and computer skills. By mapping these objectives to the course sequence, faculty made explicit the assignments and projects designed to strengthen the appropriate skills. The Career Development Center provides feedback from employers and supervisors of co-op students. In the past two years, MIS majors were rated as “competent” or “highly competent” in oral communication, critical thinking, problem solving, group work, and productivity.

Marketing. The BBA program has a capstone course, Marketing Management, in which students are expected to develop a comprehensive marketing plan. One of the student learning outcomes is to transform the strategies into marketing programs that can be implemented. The plans are examined annually, both by faculty in the department and by external evaluators. Faculty review is documented in minutes of department meetings. External evaluators, most of whom are marketing plan clients, complete a rating instrument with several criteria, including thoroughness, usability, situational analysis, and plan integration. Aggregate ratings are converted to 100 point scales, and displayed as bar graphs for the criteria in two years. The capstone assessment method has been in place for five years. Several changes to both instruction and curriculum have been implemented based on the findings. Instructional changes include an increased emphasis on secondary marketing research sources, data acquisition, analysis and statistics. Curricular changes include a two course sequence in Marketing Communications, and specific prerequisites for the capstone course. Major revisions to the curriculum were implemented beginning in 2003 in order to strengthen the research, technology, and communication skills of marketing majors. In May 2004, the department chair was awarded a CSU Assessment Grant for “The Development of a Quantitative Instrument and Methods

for the Assessment of Interactive Objectives for a Capstone Course Project.” The department has also monitored the performance of student interns since 1999. Supervisors consistently give excellent ratings to interns, judging them either competent or highly competent on all criteria. However, there is room for improvement in the area of written communication. The department continues to make written communication an important aspect of all Marketing courses and monitor the intern evaluations.

Master of Business Administration (MBA). Two key learning objectives for MBA students were assessed in 2005-06: (1) students will demonstrate knowledge of the fundamental business and organizational functions and activities, and (2) students will demonstrate ability to think strategically about business and organizational problems. The capstone course, Strategic Management, provided opportunities for faculty and external reviewers to evaluate student projects. Five faculty members served as evaluators of capstone projects in spring 2005, and gave each project a rating on a 100-point scale for each of 14 dimensions, including “understanding company needs” and “implementation detail.” Faculty will continue to refine the capstone rubrics as needed. After discussion of the project ratings, faculty modified the course sequence to strengthen students’ quantitative skills. Specifically, two prerequisites were mandated: (1) Statistics will be a prerequisite for Economic Analysis for Managers; and (2) either Statistics or Economic Analysis for Managers will be a prerequisite for Managerial Finance.

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Education and Educational Psychology. The department offers B.S. degrees in elementary and secondary education, M.S. degrees in Education and Counselor Education, and an Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership. Accredited by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the department is in the second year of a four-year plan to achieve NCATE accreditation. Accordingly, NCATE standards are used to evaluate student teacher competencies. Some work remains to be done in operationalizing NCATE standards and aligning them with state requirements. In May 2004, two faculty members were awarded a CSU Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement Grant for “Assessment of the Dispositions of Teacher Candidates.” In June 2006, one faculty member was awarded a CSU Assessment Grant for “Assessment of Teaching: The BEST Portfolio.”

Three instruments were used for program evaluation of undergraduate elementary education. Two of the instruments, PRAXIS I and II, were designed and administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). PRAXIS I measures the level of candidate proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics. A passing score is required for admission to the Professional Development School experience (PDS). PRAXIS II measures knowledge and understanding of curriculum, instruction and assessment in language arts, mathematics, social studies and science. The third instrument is the state Student Teacher Evaluation Instrument (STEI). This instrument was designed to assess how well students accomplish their initial teaching experiences in actual classrooms around Connecticut. It is based on the Common Core of Teaching established by the state. For example, the question, “How did the teacher communicate with students about assessment and evaluate student performance?” is addressed by four performance indicators, each of which is rated on a continuum indicating levels of proficiency. PRAXIS II results for 2004-05 revealed that 96.4% of undergraduate elementary education candidates were proficient or better in language arts, mathematics, and science. Similar results were obtained using the STEI: 20.4% proficient and 79.6% superior in language arts, mathematics, and science. Similar results were obtained for undergraduate secondary education candidates. Based on the evidence of student proficiency, no changes in either curriculum or instruction are warranted at the present time.

Evaluation of the M.S. program in Education focused on two goals: (1) students in all options will demonstrate the ability to be both consumers of information and producers of educational research through the use of inquiry, critical analysis and synthesis; and (2) students will become proficient in the use of assessment techniques and analysis of student learning. Direct measures were applied to research papers produced in Introduction to Educational Research and to three assignments in Measurement and Evaluation. Two curricular changes were made as a result of reflection on the findings. First, Introduction to Educational Research and the Educational Research Seminar have been redesigned to relate more directly to classroom practices. In an effort to avoid conducting research with human subjects, the content of projects has tended to move away from action research to projects based on aggregate data which can be less meaningful for the student teacher. To counter this trend, an action research approach will be re-infused into the course sequence. Second, the combination of activities offered in Measurement and Evaluation satisfies the state and national standards for measurement and evaluation. However, all sections of the course do not emphasize the same concepts and outcomes. The course focus will be realigned across sections to ensure that students have a successful course sequence.

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) provides standards for the assessment of student learning in the M.S. program in Counselor Education. Site supervisor evaluations of practica and internship experiences are used to measure the development of experiential skills important for the functioning of professional counselors. Student video sessions and clinical folders are reviewed for evidence of knowledge of the concepts, theories and practices of counseling. Results of the National Counselor Exam (NCE) are used to assess the students' preparation for certification in counseling. Finally, faculty evaluation of the practicum research paper provides additional evidence of all of the competencies described above. All evidence gathered to date supports the efficacy of the program as designed and currently implemented.

The Ed.D. program in Instructional Leadership was designed to provide K-12 educators with the content knowledge and process skills to: (1) assume leadership roles; (2) become lifelong consumers and producers of scholarly research; (3) develop and implement innovative curricula; (4) implement school-wide professional development activities; and (5) implement activities consistent with emerging national standards. Evidence is being gathered to assess student expertise in four areas. First, all students have submitted Leadership Plans, and each plan was evaluated for content expertise. In addition, comprehensive exams will be conducted in the summer of 2006 and electronic portfolios will be evaluated. Second, all students have produced posters of their proposed research and program evaluation proposals. These materials will be evaluated for process expertise. In addition, dissertation proposals will be evaluated in December 2006 and defenses conducted in December 2008. Third, all students have developed plans to improve the use of higher order thinking skills in the classroom. These plans will be evaluated for curriculum development expertise. Fourth, all students have completed Professional Development Plans for their schools, and these plans will be evaluated using scoring rubrics. Even though no candidates have graduated yet, several changes have been made as a result of assessment activities. For example, a follow-up of the Leadership Plan is being incorporated into the comprehensive exam. Rubrics are being developed for program evaluation and professional development plans. The higher order thinking skills project is being revised to explicitly include a field experience component.

Health Promotion and Exercise Science (HPX)

The HPX department offers a B.S. degree in Health Education, a B.S. in Community Health, and, beginning in Fall 2006, a B.S. in Health Promotion Studies. The department received Connecticut Department of Higher Education approval in January 2006 for the Health Promotion Studies

Program, with options in Wellness Management and Community Health. In preparation for the new degree program, two faculty members applied for and were awarded a CSU Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement Grant for “Assessing Senior Seminar Performance: Designing a Pilot Evaluation Program” (June 2006). Rubrics are being developed for assessment of student progress in key learning objectives, and implementation will begin in 2006-07. Students completing the degree in Health Education should be able to integrate the National Health Education Standards for students with relevant health content into a competency-based curriculum. Faculty are collaborating with the Connecticut State Department of Education in a student teacher pilot program. Internal and external assessments continue to evolve as necessary to keep state and national standards in alignment.

To measure changes in student abilities to assess individual and community needs for health education, faculty devised a pretest-posttest approach. Content drawn from eight required courses was used to construct a test item bank. A 50-item pretest is given to all incoming students, and a posttest of similar difficulty will be given to all completers of degree programs. First administered in January 2006, the pretest revealed a need for making two courses required instead of electives: Mental Health and Human Sexuality. The addition of a nutrition course as a major requirement is pending in the undergraduate curriculum committee. The same objective is also measured using evaluation forms completed separately by each student teacher and the supervising teacher. After completion of the student teaching assignment, each student has an exit interview with the faculty coordinator. The cooperating teacher assessment of the student’s performance is compared to the student teacher’s self-evaluation. The student’s strengths, weaknesses, and career goals are discussed during the exit interview. All eight student teachers were judged competent on all aspects of the Fall 2005 performance evaluation.

Music and Music Education. The department completed its fourth year as an accredited member of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The department’s programs comprise a Bachelor of Music with Classical and Jazz Studies options, a B.A. in Music, a B.S. in Music Education, and an M.S. in Music Education. Key objectives of the B.A. program include: (1) performance ability, assessed at the end of each semester of applied study during jury exams; (2) knowledge of music history, theory, and analysis, measured during four semesters of music theory and two semesters of music history; and (3) skill-based areas, measured daily during four semesters of ear training and sight singing. At a jury exam, each student performs repertoire specific to his or her instrument or voice type. In addition, all students sight-read and perform rudiments (scales, arpeggios, percussion). There is a rubric for each area of competency.

Similar learning objectives exist for the professional degree programs (B.S. and B.M.). In addition, students enrolled in the B.M.-Jazz and B.M.-Classical programs perform recitals at the end of their junior and senior years. These recitals are evaluated by a faculty panel, and include extensive program notes which give the student an opportunity to display his or her theoretical, analytical and musicological knowledge of the works being performed. Students in the B.S. and the B.M.-Classical programs take a capstone course, Musical Form and Analysis, for which they are required to analyze 15 musical compositions and provide stylistic, theoretical and historical views of each work. Finally, B.S. students must demonstrate competence in planning, instructing and assessing the learning of K-12 students. They must also pass the PRAXIS I and II exams before receiving provisional certification (see the Education section of this document for details).

The department maintains policies and procedures that contribute to the learning, assessment, retention, and graduation of its students. These include: (1) juries at the end of each semester for students enrolled in Applied Music; (2) upper division applied jury for students in Music Education, Performance and Jazz Studies; (3) interview for admission to the professional semester in music

education, prior to junior year; and (4) ensemble auditions. Each of these performances provides opportunities for the collection of assessment data. One result of faculty reflection on assessment results is the adoption of stricter standards for admission to the B.M.-Jazz program as well as the sophomore barrier assessment prior to enrollment in upper division music courses. Another finding is that one-fifth of incoming majors were required to take Music Essentials. Because faculty consider this an unacceptably large proportion, plans are underway to implement an online theory assessment which will include tutoring in basic fundamentals. Some work remains to be done before comprehensive assessment results are available. Jury sheets, currently hand-scored, are being adapted to scanner technology to facilitate analysis. The conversion should be fully implemented in 2006-07. Similarly, there is a proposal to administer the Advanced Measures of Audiation, a tool to measure music aptitude in adults, predict program success, and facilitate advising and placement.

The M.S. program in Music Education has three key learning objectives: (1) students will demonstrate proficiency in the teaching of music; (2) develop lifelong advocacy for music and the arts; and (3) develop the skills to be able to pursue advanced degrees in music and the arts. After review of student recitals, theses, and comprehensive examinations, faculty recommended one curricular change: the final project in the Music Department Seminar will include specifically the concepts and lessons learned in Introduction to Educational Research.

Nursing. The department continues to meet the standards of its national accrediting body, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education. The revised undergraduate assessment plan for the department encompasses two programs: (1) The B.S. program graduates nurses who have not yet obtained their RN licensure; and (2) The RN-B.S. program is for Registered Nurses who have been licensed and have completed an Associate degree program at another school. Both programs grant the same B.S. degree and have the same goals: graduates will be able to think critically, communicate effectively, and perform nursing interventions appropriate to their practice roles. Three types of direct measure of student learning are utilized: Preceptor Evaluation; Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT); and Cumulative Professional Portfolio (CPP, for RN-B.S. only).

The preceptor evaluation was designed to be administered at the end of the capstone course (NUR 375). The CAT test is a standardized mock exam designed to prepare students to perform well on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN). CAT measures several dimensions of nursing competency, including pharmacological therapies, reduction of risk potential, physiological adaptation, safety and infection control, and basic care and comfort. One measure of the success of CAT and coursework is the 100% NCLEX-RN pass rate for WestConn students graduating in 2004 and 2005. In addition, all degree candidates scored 90% or better on CAT. The rubric for the Cumulative Professional Portfolio operationalizes the broad program goals. For example, critical thinking comprises use of the process of scientific inquiry and research findings to improve nursing care, in addition to implementing and evaluating the care provided to individuals families and communities. Application of the nursing process is also evaluated using reflective writing samples, including the capstone experience.

A survey of recent graduates provides indirect measures of student learning, including self-assessments of the same areas assessed in the Cumulative Professional Portfolio. Concurrently, a survey is mailed in to employers of graduates from the previous two years. Employers are also asked to rate the same skills and competencies used in the CPP. Over several years, one can compare the perceptions of faculty, employers and graduates to see the extent of agreement. During department meetings, faculty have reviewed recent results of preceptor evaluation, CAT, CPP, employer surveys, and alumni surveys. Nearly all measures reveal that graduates possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and values. However, the department is considering offering incentives to improve the return rates of the employer and alumni surveys. These programs continue to

conform to the standards of the national accrediting body, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education.

The M.S. program in Nursing (MSN) is designed to prepare nurses for leadership roles as advanced practice nurses, with an option to prepare for certification as adult nurse practitioners. Theses and certification examination pass rates constitute the primary evidence for assessment of the following student learning objectives: (1) students will be able to use evidence-based nursing interventions to generate research for the purpose of expanding nursing science; (2) demonstrate expertise in the provision of care to individuals and groups from diverse backgrounds; (3) function competently in a variety of roles, collaborating with other disciplines to improve patient care outcomes; (4) continuously evaluate their nursing practice in relation to professional standards; (5) demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of policy formation and its impact on nursing practice and health care delivery; and (5) analyze ethical issues as they affect communities, society, the health professions, and their own practice.

Social Work. The department continues to meet the standards of its national accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education. In 2005-06 the department focused on three student learning outcomes mandated by CSWE: (1) students will understand personal, professional, organizational and client system values and practice in a manner consistent with the NASW Code of Ethics; (2) use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues and communities; and (3) use supervision and consultation appropriate to social work practice. Each of the outcomes is measured by three instruments: (1) the Final Senior Field Practicum Evaluation (FSFPE); (2) assessments by field agency personnel; and (3) the Baccalaureate Social Work Education Assessment Package Exit Survey (BEAP). FSFPE, completed by instructors of the field practicum, evaluates student performance across nine areas in the two-semester practicum. This evaluation is conducted at the end of spring semester of senior year. Self-study data from 2003 compared to 2005 indicate that field instructors continue to give high ratings to students' understanding of values and ethics, as well as communication and supervision/consultation skills. Assessments by field agencies are similar to internship evaluations used to evaluate of the degree programs. Every other year the department mails surveys to field agency personnel, including 15 items measuring students' functioning in the context of program objectives. Nearly all agency staff (94%) responded that students "usually" or "consistently" applied professional values and standards to practice; and similar results were obtained for effective use of supervision and consultation (98%). However, the results for communication skills were somewhat less positive: 86% of agency staff who supervised seniors reporting that those students "usually" or "consistently" applied communication skills appropriately; and only 75% of agency staff whose observations were based on juniors reported the same levels of communication skills. After discussing these findings, faculty recommended keeping course content as designed but with more emphasis on exploring student perspectives on the scope and nature of all types of communication.

Appendix B

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

(Plan approved by Academic Policy Committee - 8/17/04)

The Assessment Committee

WestConn is able to draw on its Assessment Committee, a standing committee of the University Senate, for policy recommendations on the assessment of student learning outcomes. Members of the Assessment Committee are representative of faculty across the university, with leadership by Dr. Jerry Wilcox, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment.

This has meant that over the past decade--intensively since the bylaws were strengthened in March 2000--the Committee has advised and updated the university community on assessment needs and procedures. It has issued progress reports and critiqued department plans. It has endorsed Dr. Wilcox's informative handbook for faculty, *The Busy Person's Guide to Assessment*. Its key recommendations include providing an assessment update as part of the annual report of every academic department and writing an assessment requirement into every new program proposal. The Assessment Committee has met its responsibilities with distinction and has proved itself essential to the assessment of student learning outcomes at WestConn.

Governance and Administration

As a standing committee of the Senate, the Assessment Committee is part of university governance. This means that like UPBC, CUCAS, and the Graduate Council, it reviews and advises on policy, recommends to the Senate, and disseminates information. It is deliberative and advisory. It does not have the administrative function of implementation. UPBC, CUCAS, and the Graduate Council do not, as committees, implement the proposals they recommend. Proposals are generated by faculty within the academic structure of departments and schools. After governance approval, programs are implemented by academic administration.

The Assessment Committee has significant responsibilities in governance and must continue to fulfill these. Department Chairs, Deans, and the office of Academic Affairs are responsible for implementation.

NEASC Requirement

By Fall 2006 WestConn must report to NEASC on the assessment of student learning outcomes across the curriculum.

The reason why NEASC is requiring this special report is the Commission's concern that WestConn "has not formalized the implementation of student learning assessment across all programs and services." Only a number of programs subject to external professional accreditation are exempted from this criticism. Effective implementation of assessment is needed in all others.

We have a little over two years to meet this requirement.

MEEETING THE REQUIREMENT

Point of Departure

The assessment of student learning outcomes is already satisfactory in a number of WestConn programs, primarily those subject to external professional accreditation. The NEASC visiting team and the Commission took note of this fact. Assessment of student learning outcomes is required in all programs, however, not in only a few. Policies for assessment of learning outcomes in all programs have already been recommended by the Assessment Committee. To meet the NEASC requirement, these policies must be implemented university-wide.

Who Is Responsible?

- Department Chairs
- Deans
- Vice President for Academic Affairs

The assessment of student learning outcomes can be implemented through the existing structure of academic administration. The Assessment Committee recommended as early as 2001 that an annual update on assessment be made a regular section of each department's annual report. This places assessment among the responsibilities and actions that departments report to the Dean, and it recognizes the Dean's obligation to receive and study the data. Since annual reports are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the obligation extends university-wide.

What Gets in the Way?

- Time
- Complexity
- Poor fit

Time and complexity can make assessment a burden. The process can be extremely complex, to be sure, and administrators and faculty, as good academics, are reluctant to adopt an idea or a procedure without examining its full implications. Complexity is not mandated, however, either by Assessment Committee guidelines or by NEASC. Departments can meet basic requirements with a simple plan, provided it gives evidence of assessing student learning outcomes in each program, responding to data that shows a need for curricular change, and repeating the assessment cycle for continuous improvement.

Poor fit becomes an obstacle when lock-step assessment measures are mandated across the curriculum. One size/one style does not fit all. "Measurement" can be qualitative as well as quantitative. NEASC recognizes a broad range of valid options (see Attachment B). For satisfaction and success, departments should choose options appropriate for their programs.

IMPLEMENTATION

Administrative implementation of policy on learning outcomes assessment begins with the Academic Dean, is carried out by department Chairs, is reported to the Dean, and finally goes to the Academic Vice President, with a copy to the Assessment Committee for policy review.

1. Academic Dean

- Review the assessment status of all programs in the school or division.
- Give the Chairs of departments already successfully assessing learning outcomes copies of the NEASC statements on evidence (Attachment B). Agree on format for the Assessment Update to be included in each department's annual report.
- Confer with the Chairs of departments whose programs need better assessment. Explain how policies can be implemented. Give the Chairs copies of NEASC guidelines and agree on format for the Assessment Update to be included in the department's annual report.

2. Department Chair

- Departments will start at different points in the cycle, depending on how far they have already progressed in assessment. Chairs will work with their program faculty at every stage of development. Some Chairs, especially at the graduate level, may delegate responsibilities to program coordinators. However, the Chair remains responsible for the department's annual report.
- Assessment Guidelines for Departments (Attachment A) should be helpful as Chairs and their faculty begin, complete, and resume the five-stage assessment cycle:
 1. Determining program goals and objectives
 2. Gathering direct evidence of student learning outcomes
 3. Interpreting the evidence
 4. Making changes for improvement
 5. "Closing the loop" of the cycle

It is critical that departments complete and report on all five stages and not stop short.

The only way to make assessment effective is to complete the cycle.

- As recommended by the Assessment Committee, a separate Assessment Update section will be included in each department's Annual Report to the Dean.

3. Academic Dean

- Review the annual reports of departments. Check to be sure that each includes a complete Assessment Update section. If needed elements are missing, return reports to departments for completion.
- Submit completed reports, with the Dean's report, to the Academic Vice President.
- Submit copies to the Assessment Committee for governance review and recommendations.
- Work with departments to continue the effective assessment of student learning outcomes.

4. Academic Vice President/Assessment Committee

- The Vice President reviews the reports for academic standards and compliance
- The Assessment Committee reviews the reports for implementation of policy

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTS

The following guidelines should help academic departments and their Chairs to implement Outcomes Assessment policy in compliance with NEASC standards. Department Chairs lead their faculty in the five-stage assessment cycle. Departments which offer more than one degree program should use the cycle to assess learning outcomes in each program. For each program it is essential that *all five* of the following areas be addressed:

1. What are the goals and objectives of the program?

Suggestions:

- a. Review previously stated goals and objectives. If there has been no recent review, consider goals published in the 1992 *Biennial Assessment Report* and *Expected Outcomes* listed in the Undergraduate Catalog. Which are still valid? Make any necessary changes.
- b. Select no more than 3-5 major goals (broad learning outcomes) and related objectives (specific knowledge and skills).
- c. Prioritize. It is acceptable to concentrate on one goal per year and to add others as the assessment cycle resumes.

2. What direct evidence do you have of student learning outcomes?

Suggestions:

- a. Determine which two or three kinds of evidence are most appropriate for this program (see Attachment B for list of methods suggested by NEASC as direct evidence).
- b. Select methods, assign responsibilities to program faculty, establish a time frame.
- c. Report the evidence you have obtained.

3. As you interpret the evidence, what does it show?

Suggestions:

- a. Ensure that representative program faculty commit to the work of interpretation.
- b. Establish guidelines and a time frame.
- c. What does the evidence show as to strengths and weaknesses in meeting program goals?

4. What changes, based on assessment, are you making to strengthen the program?

Suggestions:

- a. Describe any assessment-based changes of past years and their present status.
- b. Describe at least one change, approved by program faculty, based on this year's evidence.
- c. If the new change requires governance approval, where does it stand in that process?
- d. When this change is in place, how will it be assessed for improvement of learning outcomes?

5. Have you closed the assessment loop?

“Closing the loop” means completing the assessment cycle, from goals through program change, then resuming the cycle for continuous improvement year by year. Assessment truly benefits student learning only when faculty are willing to make changes and then change again if there is evidence of need.

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

(from NEASC *Self-Study Guide*)

Some Methods that Provide Direct Evidence of Student Learning

Locally developed tests
Standardized tests
Pre- and post-tests
Essay tests blind scored across units
Internal juried review of student projects
External juried review of student projects
Externally reviewed internships
Performance on national licensure examinations
Student work samples
Collections of student work (e.g., Portfolios)
Course-embedded assessment
Observations of student behavior

Some Methods that Provide Indirect Evidence of Student Learning

Alumni, employer, student surveys
Focus groups
Exit interviews with graduates
Graduate follow-up studies
Percentage of students who go on to graduate school
Retention and transfer studies
Job placement statistics

Methods that do NOT Provide Evidence of Student Learning

Faculty publications (unless students are involved)
Courses selected or elected by students
Faculty/student ratios
Percentage of students who study abroad
Enrollment trends
Percentage of students who graduate within five to six years
Diversity of the student body
Size of endowment
Number of books in the library

ASSESSMENT RESOURCES FOR REFERENCE

All WestConn departments, even those which have not yet closed the assessment loop, have strong resources and past practice to draw upon for help. The items below provide points of reference. All are available either electronically or in hard copy if not easily accessible in department files.

DOCUMENTS/WEBSITES

1. NEASC Standards
 - a. Standard II, Planning and Evaluation
 - b. "Note on Institutional Effectiveness," *Self-Study Guide*
2. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
The Busy Person's Guide to Assessment, J. Wilcox
3. CSU Assessment Conference 4/30/04: *Program-Based Review and Assessment* (UMass)
4. www.aacu.org/ Ass'n of American Colleges & Universities (general ed)
www.aahe.org/ American Ass'n for Higher Ed
www.sc.edu/fye/ Nat'l Resource Center for the First-Year Experience

PRACTICE AT WESTCONN

1. Institutional Assessment Plan, 1988
Seven areas identified for collecting data on "student outcomes" (broadly interpreted)
2. Biennial Assessment Reports, 1992/1994
 - a. Program assessment reports from all academic departments
 - b. Program goals, objectives, measures, and time frame reported
 - c. No evidence of use of data to improve student learning
3. Departmental plans to Assessment Committee, beginning Spring 2001
4. Recommendations of the Assessment Committee (2001)
 - a. Assessment update as section of each department's annual report
 - b. All new program proposals submitted to governance review include assessment plans
5. Annual review and critique of plans by Assessment Committee, beginning Fall 2001
 - a. Commendations: Ancell: all departments; Prof Studies: Nursing; A & S: CTA
 - b. Deficiency noted: Evidence of assessment-based change for improvement of learning
6. Proposals by eight departments, Spring 2004, for CSU assessment grants (one in Ancell, two in Professional Studies, five in A & S). Three proposals funded--one in each school.

Appendix C

THE BUSY PERSON'S GUIDE TO ASSESSMENT

Introduction

Assessment of student learning outcomes is mandated by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), the CSU Board of Trustees, the Connecticut Legislature, and many professional organizations. The following set of questions and answers is provided by the WCSU Assessment Committee as a brief guide for reviewing, implementing, and reporting your department's assessment program. If you're extremely busy, start with Part II.

QUESTIONS

Part I

1. What is a departmental assessment program?
2. What should be included in the department's list of educational objectives?
3. Who should be assessed?
4. How can we ensure that all students are assessed? What if students don't want to participate?
5. What if an appropriate nationally normed test of achievement in the major is not available?
6. Can you be more specific about acceptable and unacceptable measures of student learning?
7. Is one good measure of student learning enough to satisfy the assessment requirement?
8. Whatever happened to "value-added" assessment?
9. Can you be more specific about standards? How do you set up and apply standards in assessment?
10. How can we add assessment to the busy schedules of faculty and students?
11. When and where do we report the results of assessment?

Part II

12. What should be included in the assessment report?
13. Who will read my assessment report?
14. If the office of Institutional Research and Assessment already has the department assessment plan on file, then why do I need to include it in the annual report?
15. Are there required formats for reporting data?
16. What do you mean by analysis and interpretation?
17. Do we have to use assessment results for the purpose of improvement?

APPENDIX

- A. Format for Reporting Data
- B. Departmental Assessment Grid

ANSWERS

Part I

1. What is a departmental assessment program?

A departmental assessment program evaluates the effectiveness of its programs in terms of measurable student learning outcomes. The program consists of

- a) lists of educational objectives for each of the department's major programs expressed in terms of student learning outcomes
- b) measures of student achievement for each of the objectives
- c) methods of collecting data, realistic timetables, and needed resources
- d) procedures for involving departmental faculty in reviewing and using the results of assessment to improve student learning -- including program revision and revision of the assessment plan when necessary
- e) annual collection, analysis, and reporting of the results of assessment.

2. What should be included in the department's list of educational objectives?

The list of educational objectives for each academic program in the department may include knowledge, skills, competencies, conduct, and values specific to the major. The department should identify not more than 3 to 5 principal objectives and may concentrate on meeting one specific objective in a given year. It should be feasible to assess every stated objective. Formulate each objective so that there is a credible connection between the objective and the method of assessing it.

3. Who should be assessed?

All majors should be assessed, typically as they near completion of their program. Voluntary testing in which only some majors participate is not advisable. Some departments may wish to assess the learning of non-majors in their service courses and the learning of students transferring from other colleges and universities. However, the focus of assessment should be on graduates from the department's major programs.

4. How can we ensure that all students are assessed? What if students don't want to participate?

The most viable solution is to integrate assessment into the curriculum. For example, a department might do one or more of the following:

- a) design internship evaluations so that they provide useful information about student performance on key objectives
- b) incorporate projects and exit exams into a capstone course
- c) pre-test students in an introductory course.

Students will engage in assessment activities that are an integral, logical part of their education. Since voluntary participation is highly unlikely to produce satisfactory levels of student involvement, both the benefits of participating and the costs of abstaining need to be made evident to the students in terms that make sense to them.

5. What if an appropriate nationally normed test of achievement in the major is not available?

Departments are not required to use nationally normed tests. In fact, we discourage the use of nationally normed tests if they do not provide relevant information about student achievement in the major. One advantage of nationally normed tests is that they provide a comparative standard of performance. A disadvantage is that they often do not relate directly to a department's program objectives. Popular alternatives to the nationally normed exam are locally developed exams and performance-based assessments (including capstone projects, portfolios, and recitals). Locally developed exams are scored objectively. Performance-based assessments typically use a criterion-referenced scoring guide -- a set of guidelines for distinguishing levels of excellence, sometimes called a "rubric."

6. Can you be more specific about acceptable and unacceptable measures of student learning?

Acceptable measures can be divided into direct and indirect measures of student learning.

Direct measures include

- a) the capstone experience
- b) portfolio assessment
- c) standardized tests
- d) certification and licensure exams
- e) locally developed exams
- f) essay exams blind scored by multiple scorers
- g) juried review of student performances and projects
- h) external evaluation of student performance in internships.

Indirect measures include

- a) surveys (Survey of Graduates, National Survey of Student Engagement, etc.)
- b) grade point averages (GPA)
- c) grades in the major
- d) exit interviews
- e) placement and graduate program acceptance data.

Unacceptable measures include

- a) SAT scores, Accuplacer scores, or other tests administered to entering students (unless accompanied by comparable post-test scores)
- b) faculty/student ratios
- c) curriculum review documents
- d) accreditation reports
- e) retention and transfer rates
- f) graduation rates and length of time to degree
- g) demographic, biographic, and administrative data.

7. Is one good measure of student learning enough to satisfy the requirements?

No. Departments should use multiple measures of student learning. Over several years a department might employ a combination of the following methods in its assessment plan.

- a) a capstone project, thesis, or other culminating experience
- b) internship evaluations
- c) writing test scores
- d) Academic Profile pre-test and post-test scores
- e) Graduate school placement and acceptance data
- f) Surveys, interviews and/or focus groups with alumni or students in their last semester

Once a measure has been shown to be valid and reliable, evaluators will look for consistency in its use and interpretation. Using one method for a year and then switching to another without good reason raises a “red flag” for evaluators.

One measure can be used for several objectives. For example, a capstone project might be used to measure knowledge in the major, research skills, and communication skills. Departments are especially encouraged to use several measures for one objective. For example, skill in writing, might be measured by

- a) juried review of portfolios of writing samples taken from courses over several years
- b) performance on a capstone project
- c) grades of the department’s majors compared with other students in writing intensive courses.

8. Whatever happened to “value-added” assessment?

“Value added” is still with us. We can demonstrate value added by testing both entering and exiting students. However, pre-testing is not necessary if one is highly confident that students know little or none of the content they are to master through completing the degree program. Pre-testing is particularly appropriate for transfer and graduate students, but the ongoing assessment of majors through various levels of development is always impressive. More fundamental than demonstrating growth, however, is the need to measure student achievement against clearly stated standards. Though it is difficult to demonstrate that a department’s programs are the primary contributor to student learning, it is less difficult to show that students are completing the department’s programs having reached an acceptable level of achievement relative to specific educational objectives.

9. Can you be more specific about standards? How do you set up and apply standards in assessment?

Standards constitute performance goals and should be defined in terms appropriate to the relevant method of measurement. Where comparative data are available, a department might define standards in terms of the percentage of students at or above a particular percentile. A department might state that all of its students should score above the 70th percentile on a standardized test in the major -- provided that this is a meaningful expression of standards. Departments with licensure exams might want to state that no fewer than 95% of their students will pass the exam on the first attempt. Moreover, departments with a criterion-referenced capstone project (or internship evaluations) might want to state that all students will receive at least a satisfactory score in each substantive area, with 30% performing at a level higher than satisfactory.

Performance-based assessments present specific problems. Although standards are usually written into scoring criteria, performance-based assessments have little credibility unless results are analyzed by comparison to performance of students outside the department, by external review, or through conscientious discussion among faculty of the relative strengths and weaknesses of student performance. An evaluation of projects would be strengthened by the use of external judges.

Similarly, evaluators would look favorably upon a department that identifies areas of weakness indicated by particular measures and proposes actions to strengthen them (for example, holding a faculty workshop on teaching a particular method). Whatever your approach, remember that statements such as “All graduating students passed the department’s exit exam” are not credible indicators of standards unless supplemented with appropriate analysis, interpretation and follow-up.

10. How can we add assessment to the busy schedules of faculty and students?

To the extent that one can incorporate assessment into daily practice, assessment will not appear as an additional burden. We need to find creative ways to incorporate assessment into curriculum and instruction so that it is part of our normal workload. The burden will seem unbearable to a chairperson who tries to pull together disparate elements of an uncoordinated assessment program on the weekend before the departmental annual report is due. For the chairperson who plans ahead and fully involves faculty in the collection, interpretation, and use of assessment data, the burden will be less onerous.

11. When and where do we report the results of assessment?

- A. The annual assessment update should be a separate section of each academic department’s annual report, beginning on a new page and clearly labeled "Assessment Update." When the annual report is sent from an academic department to the dean’s office, the annual assessment update section should be sent to the office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA). The IRA director will be responsible for delivering copies to the Assessment Committee.
- B. When a new or revised program or option is proposed, the appropriate assessment documents should be included in the proposal for review by CUCAS or the Graduate Council. At the same time, a copy of the proposal should also be forwarded to the director of Institutional Research and Assessment for review.

PART II

12. What should be included in the assessment report?

The four areas A through D below should be addressed in the annual assessment update.

- A. EXPECTED EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES -- Goals for Student Learning
 1. Define each goal so that it is specific and measurable.
 2. Include an action verb in each goal statement. Indicate what you intend for students to know, do, or value when they have completed the program -- e.g., skills, competencies, attitudes, behaviors, etc.
 3. It may be useful to state the source of your goals. For example, some goals are implicit in our mission statement and General Education program, while others are mandated by outside agencies or associations (e.g., professional accreditation standards).
- B. PLAN -- For Gathering Information to Measure Student Attainment of Each Goal
 1. For each goal, specify the timetable, procedures, and indicators. These may vary dependent upon the goal.
 2. If pre-test and post-test data are needed, a schedule for obtaining the necessary data should be included.
 3. There should be evidence that the methods chosen are both valid and reliable. Methods may be qualitative and/or quantitative.
- C. RESULTS – Progress Made in Implementing the Plan
 1. List the results of the information you gathered on student attainment of the goals.
 2. Information collected during the current academic year should be interpreted in the context of goals which your department has set during the previous five years or more.
 3. You may also include material not directly related to student learning outcomes -- such as alumni surveys and input from advisory boards.
- D. ACTIONS – The Feedback Loop
 1. What changes have you made in response to the information gathered in step C? For example, what are the changes or recommended changes in goals, programs, options, and/or instruction?
 2. Are the assessment methods you are using adequately measuring what you want to measure? If not, what measures do you plan to introduce?
 3. Describe the use of findings on student learning in your curriculum review process.
 4. What is the timetable for implementing proposed changes?
 5. List specific examples of changes, or report that changes were judged to be unnecessary after departmental review of the findings.

13. Who will read my assessment report?

The annual Assessment Update is similar to other planning and assessment documents. Summaries and recommendations will be provided to members of the university community. In addition, summaries of assessment reports will be used in the Self-Study for NEASC reaccreditation, as well as Performance Measures reports to the CSU System Office, the Department of Higher Education, and the state legislature.

14. If the office of Institutional Research and Assessment already has the department assessment plan on file, then why do I need to include it in the annual report?

Plans previously filed provide baseline information. Most departments have refined their assessment plans since the initial filing in 2000-01. Please be sure that the plan now on file for your department is current and representative of the approaches you use to assess student learning in all of your programs. You should confirm the validity of this plan by the end of the fall 2005 semester. Thereafter, beginning in May 2006, your Assessment Update should include only revisions to the plan and/or actions taken as a result of assessment evidence.

15. Are there required formats for reporting data?

No, but Appendices A and B of this report contain formats strongly recommended for reporting both quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning outcomes. Members of the Assessment Committee and staff in the office of Institutional Research and Assessment can provide examples of exemplary practices.

Data should be collected so as to supply credible information about student achievement and to identify relative strengths and weaknesses. Numerous styles of table are possible depending on the nature of the data to be reported. Tabular summaries of data should also support longitudinal comparison of departmental graduates and show how close the department is to assessing all of its graduates with that particular measure. Most data can be reported in tables if they are being analyzed within an explicit conceptual framework. Tables help the reader digest the assessment results at a glance. However, tables should not be inserted into your report without comment. Analysis and interpretation are essential components of assessment, and the reader will want to know what you make of the data in the tables.

Please note that a section on analysis of the data is essential. No standard format is prescribed for this, but it is your analysis and interpretation that will lead to program improvement, the objective of assessing student learning outcomes.

16. What do you mean by analysis and interpretation?

Analysis helps the reader understand the data by describing general trends in the data and pointing out differences and similarities among data points. Interpretation relates data to the objectives they are supposed to measure, explores the relationships between multiple measures of an educational objective, qualifies, amplifies, draws inferences, and evaluates.

Analysis and interpretation address questions such as the following.

- What do the data say about your students' mastery of subject matter, of research skills, of writing and speaking, and so on?
- What do the data say about your students' preparation for taking the next step in their careers?
- Are there respects in which your students are outstanding?
- Do they consistently score at the 85th percentile or above on certain subjects in the MFAT?
- Do they receive high praise from internship supervisors?
- Are they consistently weak in some respects?
- Are many of them getting good jobs, being accepted into good graduate programs, reporting that they are satisfied with the education they have received from your department?
- Does their performance on capstone projects indicate that the research skills of your students are relatively weak? Are there areas where their performance is adequate but undistinguished?

An attempt to address such questions through analysis and interpretation is an essential piece of any conscientious assessment program.

17. Do we have to use assessment results for the purpose of improvement?

- ❑ Yes. The purpose of student learning outcomes assessment is to improve programs.
- ❑ It is recognized that in any given year it may not be necessary or appropriate to launch a program improvement initiative based on assessment results. However, evaluators consistently fault assessment programs when the results are not being used to improve curriculum and instruction.
- ❑ We expect to see a significant increase in the number of departments using assessment for improvement.
- ❑ If there are any efforts to improve programs on the basis of assessment information, then the progress of those efforts should be recognized, supported, and reported.
- ❑ Reports of efforts to improve programs are telling indicators of a vital, ongoing assessment program.
- ❑ If your assessment program is not giving you useful information for program improvement, then the assessment program should be improved to yield results.
- ❑ Even disconcerting results are better than non-results, provided that they are discussed in the department and used to make recommendations for program improvement.

Note: The primary source of the structure and content was the Office of the Provost, Southeast Missouri State University. This document was edited and tailored to WestConn's needs by Carol Hawkes, Jerry Wilcox and members of the Assessment Committee.

Format for Reporting Data

Western Connecticut State University

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Department _____ Program _____

Time period _____ (e.g. 2005-06 academic year, or graduates from Aug. '05 through May '06)

Student Learning Objectives for Assessment in 2005-06 (or stated period)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

I. Testing Instrument (if used)

Name of Instrument _____

Number of Program Completers _____ Number Assessed _____

Mean _____ (and standard deviation _____) on a quantitative instrument

Objective 1	Percentage judged
Less than Proficient	_____
Proficient	_____
Superior	_____
Objective 2	Percentage judged
Less than Proficient	_____
Proficient	_____
Superior	_____ ... etc.

II. Capstone Project or Culminating Experience (if used)

Academic Year	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Program Completers	n	n	n	n	n
Number Assessed	n	n	n	n	n
<u>Objective 1:</u>	_____.				
Less than Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Superior	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Objective 2:</u>	_____.				
Less than Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Superior	%	%	%	%	%

etc.

III. Internship Evaluations (if used)

Academic Year	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Program Completers	n	n	n	n	n
N with Internship Evaluations	n	n	n	n	n
<u>Objective 1:</u>					
Less than Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Superior	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Objective 2:</u>					
Less than Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Proficient	%	%	%	%	%
Superior	%	%	%	%	%

etc.

ANALYSIS:

1. Attach page(s) explaining your rating system (rubric), and summarizing student achievements and deficiencies revealed by assessment.
2. What changes in the curriculum or academic procedures will you make to improve student learning? When will these changes be made? If governance approval is required, when will the process begin?
3. If you plan to make no changes, please explain.

Departmental Assessment Grid

Western Connecticut State University

Department: _____.

Degree Program _____.

Expected Educational Outcomes	Indicators and Procedures	Timetable for Gathering Data	Curriculum Changes
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

Western Connecticut State University

Fully Implementing the Doctoral Program in Instructional Leadership

Prepared as a Progress Report for NEASC, Oct. 15, 2006

The Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership: Program Description

About This Program

In keeping with its century-long tradition of preparing outstanding teachers for Connecticut's elementary and secondary schools, Western Connecticut State University (WestConn) designed its doctoral program to prepare qualified teachers for instructional leadership. We are concerned that professional advancement in the schools has too often taken able teachers out of the classroom or has not given able instructional leaders the opportunities to impact directly classroom, school-wide, and district practices. We seek to prepare instructional leaders with a commitment to create innovative learning environments; to respond positively to reform at the national, state and local levels; to apply assessment techniques that determine and improve learning outcomes; and to transform their educational organizations through a variety of collaborative initiatives.

The fact that our degree programs in Education present a continuum of instructional and curricular experiences supports this mission. We maintain no separate graduate faculty but offer to all Education faculty members the opportunity to teach at every level for which they are qualified. This means that we set our standards high in both scholarship and teaching. It means also, since most qualified faculty teach at more than one level, that both graduate and undergraduate students can benefit from working with faculty who meet doctoral-level standards.

WestConn's Ed.D. program in Instructional Leadership is the only doctorate of its kind in Connecticut. Unlike other programs that focus on administrative skills and strategies, WestConn prepares its candidates to be peer leaders in their PK-12 educational settings.

Our Focus

The Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership at WestConn has three major components:

- **Leadership Theory and Foundation.** In one of the first courses of the program, students participate in a leadership exercise and construct an individualized Leadership Development Plan with a faculty advisor. This plan acts as a blueprint for the acquisition and enrichment of leadership behaviors and skills. Additionally, students develop individual, group and organizational competencies through planned study in these areas.

- **Area of Specialization in Curriculum and Instruction.** Students investigate cognitive-developmental theories and data-based strategies to design and modify classroom curricula and create professional development experiences in schools.
- **Inquiry Strategies and Dissertation Sequence.** Doctoral students interpret and apply a full complement of in-depth research strategies to educational settings. Students develop skill and knowledge in evaluation, interpretation, and research implementation.

Program Specifics

- In order to maintain a low student-faculty ratio, class size is limited to cohorts of fifteen to twenty-five.
- Classes are scheduled to accommodate the needs of the working educator. Two evening courses meet once a week each fall and spring semester. One to two courses are scheduled each summer.
- Guided dissertation support is provided for each student throughout the 4.5-year, 60-credit program.
- In addition to learning from our own outstanding faculty, students are taught by leading members of the educational community.

The first cohort of students was selected in the fall of 2003. The Ed.D. program had just commenced at the time of the NEASC visit for the 10-year reaccreditation of the university. In the winter of 2004, Cohort I, with a total of 26 students, began taking classes. Over the next three years, three students left the program for personal reasons and one took a 1-year Leave of Absence. With 22 students presently in Cohort I, there is an 85% retention rate.

In order to be certain that enough Major Advisors would be available for Cohort II students, fewer students were selected for the program in 2005. The admissions committee determined that 15-20 students should be selected. Therefore, Cohort II began in the Fall of 2005 with 17 students. During the first year of the program for Cohort II, one student resigned from the program. Since the student who took a Leave of Absence from Cohort I joined Cohort II, the total number of students remains at 17 (100% retention). Cohort III is scheduled to begin in the Fall of 2007. The target number of students will again be 15-20. Please refer to the tables below for descriptions of the timeline with respect to Cohorts I and II.

Cohort I

Timeline	Activity	Number of Students
Fall 2003	Cohort 1: 26 Students Selected	26
Winter 2004- Summer 2004	5 Courses	24
Fall 2004- Summer 2005	6 Courses	23 1 Student received a one-year Leave of Absence

Timeline	Activity	Number of Students
		beginning Summer 2005
Fall 2005- Summer 2006	4 Courses; Comprehensive Exams	22 Student on Leave Joined Cohort 2
Fall 2006- Summer 2007	3 Dissertation Seminars; Proposal Defense	22
Fall 2007- Spring 2008	2 Dissertation Seminars; Dissertation Defense	22

Cohort II

Timeline	Activity	Number of Students
Spring 2005	Cohort 2: 17 Students Selected	17
Fall 2005- Summer 2006	6 Courses Completed	17 1 Student Left the Program; 1 Student from Cohort 1 Joined Cohort 2
Fall 2006- Summer 2007	6 Courses Completed	17
Fall 2007- Summer 2008	4 Courses Completed; Comprehensive Exams	17
Fall 2008- Summer 2009	3 Dissertation Seminars; Proposal Defense	17
Fall 2009- Spring 2010	2 Dissertation Seminars; Dissertation Defense	17

Resources for Program Quality

This report addresses the many resources, human and material, needed to initiate and operate a doctoral program. Human resources relate to faculty, support staff, and administration; material resources include research facilities, library support, technology, and funding. The faculty as a resource is discussed in the next section, Faculty Staffing. Other resources are described in this section.

Administration. Structurally within the School of Professional Studies and the Department of Education and Educational Psychology (E&EP), the Ed.D. Program is headed by a Coordinator, Dr. Marcia Delcourt. Dr. Delcourt works with the Dean of Professional Studies on faculty workload during the fall and spring semesters. She works with the E&EP department Chair on issues such as scheduling, and she works with the Dean of Graduate Studies and External Programs, Dr. Ellen Durnin, on curriculum and academic standards. Dean Durnin provides overall program advisement to the Ed.D. Organizational Committee and load credit

distribution for faculty during summer and intersession courses. Staff of the Graduate Studies office assist doctoral students and faculty. This is appropriate, since the E&EP secretary is primarily responsible for supporting the undergraduate and master's level programs of the department. Dean Durnin's administrative assistant provides clerical and administrative support for the Ed.D, and Graduate Studies staff members provide admissions and registration support.

To coordinate program activities, an Ed.D. Organizational Committee convenes every 2-4 weeks. This committee consists of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Ed.D. Coordinator, all full-time faculty members in the Ed.D. program, the Chair of the Education and Educational Psychology Department, and an E&EP faculty representative. This committee develops recommendations on policy and procedures for presentation to the E&EP department.

University senior administrators, including the President, the Provost-Vice President, the Dean of Graduate Studies and External Programs, and the Dean of the School of Professional Studies, have made the Ed.D. a high priority and visible entity at WestConn. These administrators have supported 3-6 credits/semester of reassigned time for the scholarly activities of full-time faculty in the program and for the advisement outlined in the following section. The Program Coordinator receives 3-6 credits for administration of the program.

Library Resources and Research. The WestConn Libraries provide print and online resources and services for reference and research, available 24/7 from campus and remote locations. Print and multimedia are supplemented by extensive online database resources, including periodicals, monographs, and reference materials in education, educational psychology, and the social and behavioral sciences.

Since the Ed.D. at WestConn is not relegated to a separate school but heads a continuum of education programs at every level, doctoral students and faculty have access to the full range of Library resources. Additionally, recognizing the special requirements of doctoral research, a special "seed money" allocation was established in Fall 2003 for development of an Ed.D. collection. Over a period of three years, this allocation has been used to establish a strong collection of print monographs and other resources to support coursework and research in instructional leadership. At the close of fiscal year 2006, a total of \$55,000 had been expended. A continuation of this practice is anticipated.

The following table documents, for the period 2003-06, the annual allocation for the Ed.D. program, combined funding for the B.S. and M.S. in Education, the allocation for the Education Librarian, total Library support for Education programs, and the total University allocation to WestConn Libraries.

Academic Year	Education Allocation (Ed.D.)	Education Allocation (B.S. & M.S.)	Education Librarian Allocation	Total Education Allocation	WCSU Libraries Budget Allocation
2003-04	\$15,000	\$9,400	\$1,700	\$26,100	\$563,214
2004-05	\$20,000	\$9,400	\$3,400	\$32,800	\$663,214
2005-06	\$20,000	\$9,400	\$3,400	\$32,800	\$683,100
Total	\$55,000				

Comparisons are difficult, since the WestConn Libraries do not have full access to the budget process at their sister CSU institutions. So far as could be determined, SCSU made only small allocations specifically for the Ed.D., while CCSU made generous allocations which have now been discontinued. Both of these institutions are almost twice the size of WestConn. While larger allocations are always welcome, the WestConn Libraries have used funding judiciously to provide a substantial foundation for doctoral research.

Highlights of the collection for the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership include video seminars by prominent curriculum expert Lynn Erickson, state-of-the-art training modules, and recent scholarly monographs in such areas as leadership, educational reform, action research, peer mentoring, emerging educational technologies, and education research methodologies. Publications include those of leading associations such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and titles from major publishers such as Jossey-Bass, Allyn & Bacon, and the Teachers College Press.

The reference print collection includes approximately 15,000 volumes of encyclopedias, dictionaries, indexes, bibliographies, handbooks, and guides. Approximately 8% of the annual allocation of \$30,000 is used to purchase titles in education and educational psychology. The Libraries subscribe to 41 print and online education periodicals at an annual cost of approximately \$6,800.

The Library website is gateway to an extensive collection of online database resources, providing access to periodicals, monographs, and reference sources. During the last fiscal year, out of a total budget of \$683,100, the Libraries spent approximately \$117,000 on online database subscriptions alone. Databases in the area of education and educational psychology include *ERIC*, *Professional Collection*, *PsycINFO* and *PsycArticles*. Other databases supporting education research include *Social Sciences Citation Index* and *Dissertations* through FirstSearch. Some of these databases are licensed exclusively through WestConn, while some are purchased through the CSU System Office, and others are partially funded through iCONN (Connecticut Digital Library). The CSU System Office purchases access to *Social Sciences Citation Index* and *PsycArticles* in part to support Ed.D. programs on three of the campuses. These databases are supplemented by multi-disciplinary collections such as *JSTOR*, *Academic Search Premier* through Ebsco, and *ArticleFirst* through FirstSearch. Access to electronic journals in the field of education is facilitated through Ebsco's *Electronic Journal Service*. Through the use of web linking technology, access to full text or an interlibrary loan form is readily available to remote users. Many articles can be delivered to the user online and in full text through *Illiad*.

The University Computing Department assists with software purchases, resulting in improved statistical packages and programs for qualitative data analysis. These programs are available in faculty offices, in the E&EP computer lab, and at designated stations in the student computer lab on the Westside campus.

Finally, the Education Librarian, a library faculty member assigned as liaison to education programs, provides important support to the Ed.D. The support includes library

instruction sessions, research and reference consultations, collection management and the creation and management of web-based and print library research guides. This librarian is available to doctoral students on an individual basis. Working with the Ed.D. Program Coordinator, she has designed a research website specifically for the doctoral program

Faculty Staffing

Full-time permanent doctoral faculty. From the beginning it was planned that a new permanent full-time faculty member would be added to the doctoral program with every new cohort for the first four cohorts. Cohorts are added to the program every other year (fall 2005, fall 2007, etc.). To date, two permanent full-time members have been appointed. Two additional members are scheduled for recruitment in the fifth (2007-2008) and seventh (2009-2010) years of the program, as the third and fourth cohorts begin. These members will teach, advise students as major and secondary advisors, and develop and promote the program. The number to serve as full-time permanent faculty for the program was recommended by the Department of Higher Education, State of Connecticut, in their initial program accreditation visit.

As for specific appointments, when the program began the Interim Coordinator was assigned as the first member of the full-time permanent doctoral faculty. A second full-time member was added as a one-year appointment at the start of Cohort II. A search for a permanent full-time member, conducted during the 2005-2006 academic year, led to the tenure-track appointment of Dr. Karen Burke as Associate Professor. Dr. Burke came to WestConn with experience from another program in Instructional Leadership in the Northeast. She has highly rated credentials to teach in our program and to advise students at the doctoral level.

Faculty who teach courses within the Ed.D. program. When specific expertise is needed for a course in the program, faculty from the Department of Education and Educational Psychology or faculty outside the department may apply to teach the course. For example, the course ED 801: *Group Leadership, Group Processes, and Team Building in Education* was taught by a professor in WestConn's School Counseling Program.

The following table shows the teaching assignments of full-time permanent doctoral faculty members and full-time members of the E&EP faculty, who have taught or may teach courses in the program, from Winter 2004 to projected staffing in Summer 2009:

Faculty Staffing for the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership Program

Timeline	Staff	Cohort 1	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 2	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 3	Number of Courses/ Sections
Winter 2004- Summer 2004		5 Courses					
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	1.50				
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Aslanian	0.50				
		Dr. Gilles	0.50				
		Dr. Caruso	1.00				
		Dr. Cordy	1.50				
	Total		5.00				
Fall 2004- Summer 2005		6 Courses					
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	3.00				
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Stambler	1.00				
		Dr. Campbell	1.00				
	Adjunct Fac.	Dr. Kay	1.00				
	Total		6.00				
Fall 2005- Summer 2006				6 Courses			
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	2.00	Dr. Delcourt			
		Dr. Koster (1- Year Apt.)		Dr. Koster (1- Year Apt.)	2.00		
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Cordy	1.00	Dr. Aslanian	1.00		
		Dr. Wilson	1.00	Dr. Cordy	2.00		
				Dr. Campbell	1.00		
	Total		4.00		6.00		
		Advising					
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	2.00				
		Dr. Koster (1- Year Apt.)	2.50				
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Campbell	2.50				
		Dr. Cordy	2.50				
		Dr. Duncanson	2.50				

Timeline	Staff	Cohort 1	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 2	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 3	Number of Courses/ Sections
		Dr. Wilson	2.50				
	Total		14.50				
Fall 2006- Summer 2007		Advising: 3 Courses/15 Sections	5 Courses				
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	3.00	Dr. Delcourt	1.00		
		Dr. Burke	3.00	Dr. Burke	2.00		
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Campbell	3.00				
		Dr. Cordy	3.00				
		Dr. Duncanson	3.00				
		Dr. Wilson	3.00				
	Adjunct Fac.			Dr. DeLo	1.00		
				Dr. Kay	1.00		
	Total		18.00		5.00		
Fall 2007- Summer 2008		Advising: 2 Courses/10 Sections		4 Courses		6 Courses	
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.	Dr. Delcourt	2.00	Dr. Delcourt	2.00	Dr. Delcourt	
		Dr. Burke	2.00	Dr. Burke	2.00	Dr. Burke	
				New Hire		New Hire	3.00
	E&EP Fac.	Dr. Campbell	2.00			Dr. Aslanian	1.00
		Dr. Cordy	2.00			Dr. Campbell	1.00
		Dr. Wilson	2.00				
	Adjunct Fac.					Dr. DeLo	1.00
	Total		10.00				6.00
				Advising			
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.			Dr. Delcourt	2.00		
				Dr. Burke	2.50		
				New Hire	2.50		
	E&EP Fac.			E&EP Fac.	2.50		
Fall 2008- Summer 2009				Advising: 3 Courses/15 Sections	5 Courses		

Timeline	Staff	Cohort 1	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 2	Number of Courses/ Sections	Cohort 3	Number of Courses/ Sections
	Permanent Ed.D. Fac.			Dr. Delcourt	3.00	Dr. Delcourt	
				Dr. Burke	3.00	Dr. Burke	3.00
				New Hire	3.00	New Hire	2.00
	E&EP Fac.			E&EP Fac.	3.00		
	Total				12.00		5.00

Faculty Qualifications and Appointment. Recruitment of full-time permanent faculty for the Ed.D. program is conducted by a Search Committee in compliance with state and university requirements. Qualifications established by the E&EP department are rigorous, including the terminal degree, publications, relevant experience, and evidence of educational leadership (see Appendix A). The criteria are based on NEASC and NCATE recommendations and on a pilot survey of other New England universities with doctoral programs.

The criteria apply not only to candidates for permanent appointment but also to faculty interested in teaching a course in the program or becoming an advisor. These faculty are screened by an appointment procedure established by the E&EP department and carried out by the department's Faculty Qualifications Review Committee (FQRC), reporting to the department Chair:

1. The FQRC has three members: (1) the Ed.D. Coordinator, (2) a member of the Ed.D. or department faculty, and (3) a department faculty member. Any faculty member from the E&EP department may volunteer to serve (must be confirmed by vote). It is understood that all Committee decisions will be made in accordance with the regulations of the CSU/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. The Committee informs members of the E&EP faculty of the dates and times of Ed.D. courses open for teaching assignment.
3. If interested, a faculty member informs the department Chair and submits a detailed CV as evidence that the criteria have been applied.
4. The FQRC reviews the information and submits a recommendation to the Chair.
5. If the Chair approves, the name of the faculty member is sent for approval to the Dean of Graduate Studies and External Programs and to the Provost-Vice President for Academic Affairs.
6. If selected, the member is given an orientation to the Ed.D. as requested by the Connecticut Department of Higher Education (see Appendix B).

Including the two full-time permanent doctoral faculty members appointed to date, a total of ten faculty members within the E&EP department and seventeen members university-wide, as of fall 2006, meet the qualifications for teaching or advising in the program, sharing their expertise with students. For example, Dr. Michael Wilson of the E&EP department has extensive background as a statistical consultant and is available to meet with students about many research questions. Dr. Sandra Kay, an adjunct professor with nationally recognized expertise in the field of creativity, taught the course Models of Creative Thinking. Dr. Marcia Delcourt, Program Coordinator, has taught and advised doctoral students at two research institutions (the University of Virginia and McGill University) and has been a principal investigator and evaluator for a national research center and for numerous state and federal grants. Dr. Karen Burke, newly hired in 2006, has strong background in quantitative and qualitative analysis and has taught and advised many doctoral students at St. John's University in Queens, NY. All major advisors from WestConn have taught a research methods course as a culminating activity for M.S. in Education students.

Advisors. Major advisors play a vital role within the program. They provide key support and guidance for the foundation and evolution of students' dissertation projects. The number of students supported by the program requires that major advisors have expertise with the

constructs related to student dissertation topics and with research methodologies. They must be selected by the FQRC process, and within the last five years they must have

- a. Taught and advised doctoral students, OR
- b. Taught ED 501 and ED 590 or their equivalents at least three times each, OR
- c. Completed the faculty development workshops

Major advisors are compensated on the basis of one credit/student/semester when students are registered for their doctoral seminars.

In Fall 2005 six major advisors began advising students on a weekly basis (Delcourt, Koster, Campbell, Cordy, Duncanson, and Wilson). Two of the advisors were full-time doctoral faculty members, and the four others were faculty of the E&EP department. The advisors were selected based on the fact that they all had content area and methodological expertise to assist the doctoral students and were approved using the procedures described in Appendix A. CV's of these major advisors for the past five years appear in Appendix C. All of them have taught at least one course in the Ed.D. Program except Dr. Duncanson, who could not be spared from the undergraduate program to teach an Ed.D. course. His strength is that he is constantly in schools, working with classroom teachers and teacher certification candidates and is therefore an excellent advisor for doctoral students working on topics related to classroom practices.

Doctoral students must also have two secondary advisors and one outside reader for their dissertations. Advisors and readers must have a doctorate and be able to contribute to the dissertation with content and/or methodological expertise. Students and their major advisors select and contact the secondary advisors and readers from the WestConn faculty, faculty from school districts, or faculty from other universities. Policies and procedures for advisement and for selecting outside readers for dissertations were developed and approved during the fall of 2005.

In addition to meeting with each doctoral advisee on a regular basis throughout the semester, advisors meet on a monthly basis to discuss student progress and expectations, to prepare guidelines for the comprehensive examination, and write the examination itself. The examination was administered to Cohort I on two Saturdays, July 22 and 29, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.. Two professors were assigned to each question. After assessing the responses, each team developed criteria to assess each question. These criteria were translated into a 4-point response format, where a score of 1 meant that a student needed to retake or revise that question, a 2 indicated a pass, a 3 was above average, and a 4 was excellent. Guidelines and results of the Comprehensive Examination appear in Appendix D.

Faculty Workload and Development

The university's expectations for faculty research productivity in the doctoral program include publication and evidence of leadership in appropriate professional organizations. These expectations exceed those for undergraduate and master's level faculty, which emphasize teaching and service as stipulated in the CSU/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement. To facilitate research and scholarship, the teaching loads of full-time permanent doctoral faculty are reduced by 3 to 6 credits/semester or 6 to 12 credits/year of reassigned time. Usually, 3 credits of released time/semester have been assigned. The reassigned time has been used well by

current full-time permanent faculty.

- Dr. Delcourt used her reassigned time this year to complete a co-authored book about inquiry practices in education; co-write a Teacher Quality Partnership grant with colleagues from the Department of Education and Educational Psychology and the Science Department at WestConn; complete an article about learning outcomes from programs in gifted education for a peer-reviewed journal; submit two other articles for publication; and work in schools to develop programs that develop children's talents. Beyond her administrative responsibilities as Coordinator, Dr. Delcourt has maintained active scholarship and professional engagement in her field; since the start of the program in 2003 she has published 15 articles, books, chapters; worked on eight grant projects; and made fifteen local, state and national presentations. (refer to her 5-year CV in Appendix C for details).
- Since Dr. Burke is just beginning her appointment to the full-time permanent doctoral faculty, her productivity cannot be assessed in terms of reassigned time at WestConn. However, within the time frame of her CV, she completed research that includes ten publications and seventeen presentations since 2004.. This is the type of scholarship we would like to see from permanent faculty in the Ed.D. program. The challenge to the university will be reconciling this with the more general categories of teaching, creative activity, service to the university and the community, and professional activities specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Faculty who teach or advise in the program, but have the remainder of their responsibilities in E&EP or another department of the university do not receive reassigned time for research but are compensated in credits toward their standard workload, as required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Those who meet the Ed.D. qualifications are professionally engaged, however, and have records of publication and leadership (see the CV's of Kathryn Campbell, Thomas Cordy, Edward Duncanson, and Michael Wilson in Appendix C).

Workload limits and compensation have been established for the major advisors of doctoral students. Beginning Fall 2006, a major advisor will work with no more than four doctoral students at a time; each advisor will receive 1 workload credit/semester/student; and advisors will participate in departmental work such as assessing comprehensive exams. This policy agrees with that of Central Connecticut State University.

Secondary advisors drawn from the faculty at WestConn receive the equivalent of .5 workload credits upon a student's completion of the dissertation defense. Secondary advisors not employed by the university will receive an equivalent honorarium. Again this is a policy which corresponds with one adopted by Central Connecticut State University.

Evidence of student achievement.

We are presently compiling data points representing the assessment plan developed for NEASC, NCATE and the Connecticut State Department of Education. An important component of that plan is the doctoral candidate's professional performance. This performance can be seen in candidates' professional activities while in the program. The students in Cohort I entered the program in Winter 2003 with a scheduled completion date of Spring 2008. Over the last two and a half years many of these student-educators have been recognized for their leadership abilities

and subsequently selected for leadership positions in their schools and/or given assignments related to instructional leadership. To date, more than half (61%) of the first Cohort were promoted, cited with awards, assigned leadership tasks, or completed their own initiatives. In other words, students who have not yet completed the program are already advancing to leadership roles in their schools and districts. A brief description of their accomplishments is listed in the following table:

Evidence of Student Achievement - Cohort I Students - Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership

	Position at Entry into the Program	Changes in Roles since admission to the Ed.D. program
1.	Social Studies Teacher	Head of High School Social Studies Department
2.	Music Teacher	Head of the Music Department for Ridgefield Public Schools
3.	World Languages Teacher	Selected as Instructor for New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) Effective Teaching Program; Lakeland Education Foundation Teacher Honoree; Lakeland Education Grant Recipient, as a result of work conducted in one of the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership courses
4.	Principal, Bethel Elementary School	Principal of Bethel High School; Vice-President of PDK, WestConn Officer for Membership
5.	Teacher	
6.	Resource Teacher	Instructional Coordinator for Special Education at Bethel High School
7.	Chairperson for High School Guidance Center	Awardee from the American School Counselor Association Secondary School Counselor of the Year; Member of NY State Education Department's Advisory Committee for the Academic Intervention Services; featured in the NYS Union of Teachers Magazine and the American School Boards Journal
8.	Art Teacher	New Art Position at Naugatuck High School, Teacher
9.	Special Education Teacher	Literacy Specialist
10.	Head of the English Department	Newspaper article for best English Blog
11.	High School Science Teacher	CT Teacher of the Year; Developed and evaluated new Science Research Program at Newtown High School; Awardee for best Science Blog
12.	Media specialist	
13.	Teacher	
14.	Literacy Specialist	
15.	Art Teacher	Chair of High school Curriculum Council; NEASC Steering Committee Member; Founder of a Chapter of the National Art Honor Society at Danbury High School
16.	Elementary School Teacher	

	Position at Entry into the Program	Changes in Roles since admission to the Ed.D. program
17.	Elementary School Teacher; Writing Coordinator	
18.	High School Teacher	Instructional Leader of the Mentoring program at Wilton High School
19.	Elementary School Teacher	
20.	High School English Teacher	
21.	Health Education Teacher	
22.	Elementary School Teacher	Master Mentor
23.	High School Spanish Teacher	NEASC Coordinator

Future Directions

We will meet with a consultant this year to gather information to strengthen the program, especially in the areas of faculty, curriculum, and community outreach. Dr. Dennis Shirley of Boston College and two other prospective consultants are under consideration. The consultant chosen will assist the process of self-study by focusing on the areas specified for improvement. The Department will also review its assessment of student learning outcomes and take action as indicated.

We will strengthen faculty staffing as the Ed.D. expands to include two additional permanent full-time faculty members to work with the two members presently in the program. Hiring these faculty will be a priority as Cohorts III and IV are admitted. We will continue to build resources for research, and we are enhancing curriculum by means of a proposed certificate program for Intermediate Administration or Supervision, to be available within the Ed.D. This proposal entails collaboration with Central Connecticut State University's Department of Educational Leadership. An accreditation site visit from the Connecticut State Department of Education for the new certificate program is scheduled for February 21, 2007.

Our Distinguished Lecture series provides community outreach to members of the Greater Danbury area. In addition, we plan to highlight the work of our doctoral candidates, who serve their communities in a variety of leadership capacities. The students are initiating a forum for exhibiting their work in anticipation of an NCATE visit in 2008. At present, the students are collaborating with faculty on a variety of projects, including CDs with curricular activities, a website, and an electronic-journal.

The quality of the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership and achieving NCATE accreditation are the current priorities of Education programs at WestConn.

Appendix A

Revised February 9, 2005, E&EP Department Meeting, adopted 020905

Faculty Qualifications for Teaching in or Advising Students for the Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership

Department of Education and Educational Psychology

Based on the meeting of 9/24/03 when a faculty qualifications matrix was created, it was discussed that the key characteristic of a professor for teaching or advising students in the Ed.D. Program was expertise. This expertise has two components: content knowledge and the ability to convey that knowledge through high quality teaching. These guidelines should be paramount when appointing faculty, but it should also be kept in mind that there are multiple ways to demonstrate these competencies. Therefore, the following matrix was composed.

Criteria	NCATE Competencies	NEASC Competencies	E&EP Criteria
1. Expertise	Earned doctorate in a specified field of expertise or a field related to the area of expertise; demonstrated expertise that can include a Masters degree or professional experience	Advanced degrees held	Earned doctorate in a specified field of expertise or a field related to the area of expertise; demonstrated expertise that can include a Masters degree or professional experience
2. Scholarship/ Creative Activity	Meaningfully engage in related scholarship; They are actively engaged in inquiry that ranges from knowledge generation to exploration and questioning of the field	Evidence of scholarship; Creative activity	Publications: Articles published in refereed journals, articles published in non-refereed journals, online publications, chapters in books, books, published curriculum, research reports, monographs, published proceedings Presentations: Refereed paper presentations at research conferences, paper presentations, round table sessions, poster sessions, general presentations Grants: PI, consultant, evaluator School and/or community initiatives: School-based initiatives, community initiatives related to your line of research and/or teaching
3. Life-long Learner/ Additional training	Continuous learners; Continuous professional development	Advanced study; Training	Conference attendance that is used to improve scholarship and teaching, workshop attendance
4. Supervision and/ or Advisement	Contemporary professional experience for supervisory/advisory responsibilities	Relevant professional expertise	Advisement, program coordinator, Professional Development School supervision, student teaching supervision, counselor supervision
5. Credentials	Holds credentials recognized for competence in a particular field	Credentials such as teacher certification, administrative certification (092)	Has held, holds, or is eligible for education certification of counseling license, or holds credentials recognized for competence in a particular field

Process for selecting faculty to teach in the Ed.D. Program

1. The Faculty Qualifications Review Committee (FQRC) will consist of the 3 people who advise the Chair: Ed.D. Coordinator, a member of the Ed.D. faculty or a dept. faculty member, and a dept. faculty member
Any dept. faculty member will be a volunteer (confirmed by vote) from the E&EP dept.
2. The Faculty will be informed of the dates and times for the courses.
3. A Faculty member will let the Chair know of his or her interest in teaching the course and submit a detailed CV to have evidence for the DHE that the qualifications have been applied.
4. The FQRC reviews the information and submits results to the Chair.
5. The Chair appoints the faculty member.
6. Selected member receives an Ed.D. orientation, as requested by the DHE (see attached).
7. All decisions will be made in accordance with the regulations in the CBA.

Appendix B

Workshop Topics for All Doctoral-Level Faculty

1. Your area of expertise, ways to contribute to the program
2. Continuing your line of research
3. Scholarship: Presentations, publishing standards, etc.
4. Doctoral program standards and goals
5. Writing standards
6. Program philosophy
7. The sequence of courses for the Ed.D.
8. The future of instructional leaders
9. Program overview
10. Program evaluation process
11. The admissions process
12. Developing a doctoral-level syllabus
13. The doctoral research process
14. Level of expected outcomes
15. Program bibliography
16. Admission vs. candidacy for the degree
17. Policies and procedures pertaining to doctoral students
18. Roles of the academic advisor at the various stages of the doctoral program
19. Comprehensive exams
20. Role and selection of the doctoral dissertation committee

Appendix C: Curriculum Vitae for the past 5 years for Major Advisors in the Ed.D. Program

Dr. Marcia A. B. Delcourt- 2001-2006 Coordinator, Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership Program

Education

- 1984-1988 Doctor of Philosophy, Educational Psychology/Special Education, concentration in Measurement and Evaluation and Gifted and Talented Education, The University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, Date of Completion- Spring 1988
- 1987 Educational Administration, General Certification
- 1979-1980 Master of Arts, Special Education, Concentration in Gifted and Talented Education, The University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut
- 1979 Elementary Education, Certified Nursery, K-8 in Pennsylvania and Connecticut
- 1975-1978 Bachelor of Science, Special Education, concentration in the Physically and Mentally Handicapped, Bloomsburg State University, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, Dean's List Award, participated in an exchange program- Liverpool, England

Work and Related Experience

- 2005-present Part-time Professor, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology
- 2004-present Coordinator, Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership, School of Professional Studies, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT
- 2003-2004 Interim Coordinator, Doctorate of Education in Instructional Leadership, School of Professional Studies, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT
-served on a organizational committee to develop Ed.D. program mission, goals, objectives, curriculum and evaluation design
- 2002-2006 Adjunct Professor of the Doctoral Faculty of The Graduate School and University Center's Ph.D. Program in Criminal Justice, The City University of New York, NY
- 1999-present Professor, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT, Education and Educational Psychology Department
- Summer 2000 Adjunct Professor The University of Connecticut, Storrs CT, taught doctoral level course in research methodology
- 1997-1999 Associate Professor, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT, Department of Education
- 1997-1999 Part-time Associate Professor, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology
- 1996-1999 Program Evaluator, Project CUE- Creating Urban Excellence, District #9, Claremont Community School, #42, 1537 Washington Avenue, Bronx,

- New York
- 1993-1997 Assistant Professor, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology (on leave 1996-1997)
- taught courses in measurement and evaluation, educational psychology, program evaluation, curriculum development, special education, and gifted education to graduates and undergraduates
 - oversaw special activity projects, including the placement of graduate students in local classrooms
 - advised students in M.Ed., M.A., and Ph.D. programs
- 1990- 1993 Principal Investigator, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Virginia, Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education
- 1988-1993 Assistant Professor, The University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, Department of Educational Studies, advised students in M.A. and Ph.D. programs

Publications

- Delcourt, M.A.B. (in press). The effects of programming arrangements on the achievement and self-concept of gifted elementary school students. Gifted Child Quarterly.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (accepted). Project C.U.E.: Creating urban excellence through talent development. Gifted Child Quarterly.
- Delcourt, M. A. B., & Carkner, P. A. (under revision). Student and teacher participation in an inquiry-oriented learning program. *Roeper Review*.
- Shore, B. M., Aulls, M. W., & Delcourt, M. A. B. (Eds.) (in press), Inquiry: Where ideas come from and where they lead: Erlbaum.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (in press). Creative Productive Behavior and Self-Regulation: Keys to Developing Projects in the Natural and Social Sciences In B. M. Shore, M. W. Aulls, & M. A. B. Delcourt (Eds.), Inquiry: Where ideas come from and where they lead: Erlbaum.
- Shore, B. M., Delcourt, M. A. B., Syre, C. A., & Shapiro, M. (in press). The phantom of the science fair. In B. M. Shore, M. W. Aulls, & M. A. B. Delcourt (Eds.), Inquiry: Where ideas come from and where they lead: Erlbaum.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (2004, Summer Issue). Journal for Secondary Gifted Education: Special Issue on Science (editor)
- Renzulli, J. S., & Delcourt, M. A. B. (2004). The legacy and the logic of research on the identification of gifted persons. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), Identification of Students for Gifted and Talented programs. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (2003). Five ingredients for success: Two cases of effective advocacy at the state level. Gifted Child Quarterly 47(1), 26-37.
- Cray, M., Delcourt, M. A. B., Smith, N. C. (2002). Improving schools study. Portsmouth, NH: Center for Resource Management. Submitted to: Teachers Center Consortium, New York State Education Department, Board of Education of the City of New York, New York, NY.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. (2001). Effects of talent development on science process skills. In F. A.

Dixon & C. M. Adams (Eds.), Research Briefs of the Division of Research and Evaluation of the National Association for Gifted Children. pp.150-165, Washington, DC: The National Association for Gifted Children.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (2001). Journal for Secondary Gifted Education (editor)

Delcourt, M. A. B. (2001, September). The qualitative reader: More than just stories. Ohio Association for Gifted Children Review, 6-7 and 12-14.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (2001). Message from the chair: Our strength rests in our members. QUEST 12 (2), 1-5.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (2001). Message from the chair. QUEST 12 (1), 1-3.

Grants Accepted for Funding

- 2006 Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant: WestConn's Institute for Science Teacher Research (WISTR), PI: Pinou, T. (Science Department, WCSU), Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B., Norwalk Public Schools, New Haven Public Schools (18 months)
- 2005 Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Act, Project POTENTIAL, Peekskill City School District, Project Co-Directors: Baum, S. & Barthelmes, K., Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B. (3 years)
- Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Act, The Early College Academy, Bard High School Early College (BHSEC) and The Island School/PS 188, NYC, NY; Project Director: Slatin, B.; Project Coordinator: Peterson, R.; Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B. (3 years)
- 2004 Mentoring Program: Mentor Works, U. S. Department of Education, Director: Gia Dardani, Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B. (3 years).
- Providence, RI High School Reform initiative, Carnegie Evaluation Component, Project Director: Lachat, M., CRM: Center for Resource Management, Evaluation Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B.
- 2003 Mathematics Continuous Content Improvement Institute (MCCII) sponsored by the 2003 Teacher Quality Partnership Grants, Connecticut State Department of Education, Division of Education Partner: PI-Marcia A. B. Delcourt; School of Arts and Sciences Partner: PI-Ron Kutz; School/District Partner: PI-William Glass (19 months)
- 2002 Title II Grant, Connecticut State Department of Education; PAM: Performance Assessment in Mathematics, PI: Burns, D., Co-PI: Delcourt, M. A. B.
- Improving Schools Study, The New York State Education Department's Research Study on Building and Monitoring School Success, PI: Cray-Andrews, M., CRM: Center for Resource Management, Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B.

Providence, RI High School Reform initiative, Carnegie Evaluation Component, Project Director: Lachat, M., CRM: Center for Resource Management, Evaluation Consultant: Delcourt, M. A. B.

Presentations at Professional Conferences

2006 Delcourt, M. A. B., Berman, K., Kase, S., Baum, S. M. (November, 2006). Project POTENTIAL: Using the curriculum to inform G/T identification. Presentation at the fifty-third annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Charlotte, NC.

Delcourt, M. A. B., Dai, D. (October, 2006). Motivation, cognition, and Affect: Outcomes of student learning in programs for the gifted and talented. Presentation at the Roeper School Conference, Birmingham, MI.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (April, 2006). Learning Outcomes of Students in Gifted Programs: Are We Meeting the Needs of Gifted Minority Students? Presentation at the 20th Annual AEGUS Conference, The College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, NY.

2004 Delcourt, M. A. B., Robinson, G., & Neu, T. (October, 2004). Talent development in science. Presentation at the AGATE (Advocacy for Gifted and Talented Education in New York) Conference: “No Gifted Child Left Behind,” College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, NY.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (October, 2004). Evaluating gifted/talented programs: Are we meeting the needs of gifted minority students? Presentation at the AGATE (Advocacy for Gifted and Talented Education in New York) Conference: “No Gifted Child Left Behind,” The College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, NY.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (November, 2004). Qualitative research techniques. Presentation at the fifty-first annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (November, 2004). Linking concept-based curriculum development with performance assessment. Presentation at the fifty-first annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (April, 2004). Panel on Assessment Issues. 2004 CSU Faculty Research Conference, Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, CT.

Roach, J., Greenbaum, S., Campbell, K., Davis, E., Delcourt, M. A. B.,

- Durnin, E., Goetz, J., Bernstein, W., & Shaw, D. (March, 2004). Emerging leadership roles in education. Panel presentation at the Western Connecticut state University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, Danbury, CT.
- 2003 Delcourt, M. A. B. (November, 2003). Creating Performance Assessment Tasks for High Ability Students. Presentation at the fiftieth annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- 2002 Burns, D., & Delcourt, M. A. B. (December, 2002). *PAM: Performance Assessment in Mathematics*. Connecticut State Department of Education, New Britain, CT.
- Delcourt, M. A. B., & Baum, S. M. (November, 2002). Talent development in an urban setting. Presentation at the forty-ninth annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Delcourt, M. A. B. et al (November, 2002). Research symposium. Presentation at the forty-ninth annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Robinson, A., Moon, S. M., Grantham, T., Hertzog, N. B., Delcourt, M. A. B., Gonzales, J. (November, 2002). Special Session- Advocacy: Lessons from research and action. Presentation at the forty-ninth annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- 2001 Delcourt, M. A. B., & Tolle, K. (November, 2001). The effects of talent development on science process skills. Presentation at the forty-eighth annual convention of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Doctoral Advisement

- 2006-present Katie Saunders, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada.
- 2005-present Frank LaBanca, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT.
- 2005-present Christine Salon, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT.
- 2005-present Deborah Hardy, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT.
- 2005-present Billie Woodel, Department of Education and Educational Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT.
- 2003-2006 George Kain, *The effects of service learning for university students participating in a criminal justice course*. The Graduate School and University Center's Ph.D. Program in Criminal Justice, The City University of New York, NY, Defense date: September, 2004.

- 2000-2004 Leah Seidner, Department of Educational Leadership, The University of Connecticut, May, 2004.
- 1998-2001 Sandra Kase, Department of Educational Leadership, Fordham University, January, 2001.

Professional Activities and Services (elected/appointed positions in the past year)

- 2005-2006 Western Connecticut State University:
 Coordinator for the Doctoral Program in Instructional Leadership,
 Department of Education and Educational Psychology
 Organizational Team Member for the CSU Faculty Research Conference
 Member of the Committee for Danbury's Magnet School
 Member of the University's Advancement Committee
 Chair, Departmental Evaluation Committee
 Member of the Departmental Assessment Committee
 Member of the Departmental Graduate Curriculum Committee
 Member of the Graduate Council
 Member of the Graduate Council Assessment Committee
 IRB Committee
 Member of the Organizational Committee for the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership
 University Liaison for the Western Connection Grant

Professional Activities and Services

Member:

- American Educational Research Association
 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
 Council for Exceptional Children
 High Ability and Inquiry Research Group, Faculty of Education, McGill University
 International Reading Association
 National Association for Gifted Children
 Phi Delta Kappa
 Phi Kappa Phi

Reviews

- 2003-present Roeper Review- Advisory Board Member
 2003-present Journal for Secondary Gifted Education- Editorial Review Board Member
 2001-present Parenting for High Potential, Editorial Advisory Board Member
 2000- 2003 Co-editor- Journal for Secondary Gifted Education
 1995-present Gifted Child Quarterly- Editorial Review Board Member
 1991-present The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Research-Based Decision Making Papers

KAREN BURKE, CSJ, ED. D.

105 BROADFIELD ROAD
HEMPSTEAD, NY 11550
917-353-5135 OR 516-505-1878
KBURKE105@MSN.COM

EDUCATION

Doctoral Degree in Instructional Leadership, St. John's University, New York (1998)

New York State Certification in Ed. Administration, **College of New Rochelle, New York (1988)**

New York State Certification in Special Education, College of New Rochelle, New York (1986)

Master of Science, Special Education, College of New Rochelle, New York (1986)

Bachelor of Arts, Child Study, St. Joseph's College, New York (1981)

EXPERIENCE

August 2006 to Present **Western Connecticut State University, Associate Professor, Instructional Leadership Doctoral Program**

September 2004 to August 2006, **Saint John's University, Associate Professor, Division of Administrative and Instructional Leadership**

September 1998 to June 2004, **Saint Joseph's College, Associate Professor of Child Study**

June 2002 to Present (Adjunct), **Buffalo State College, SUNY, Associate Professor of International Education**

GRADUATE TEACHING

Buffalo State College (SUNY)

- CRS 585: *Learning Style Methods and Resources for Creative and Talent Development* (Course Location: Monterrey, Mexico; Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Mexico City, Mexico)
- EDU 534: *Holistic Curriculum - Teaching to Both Sides of the Brain* (Course Locations: Muscat, Oman; Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Shanghai, China; and Puerto Vallarta, Mexico)
- EDU 604: *Instructional Strategies for More Effective Teaching* (Course Location: Monterrey, Mexico)
- ELF 630: *Curriculum Leadership* (Course Location: Muscat, Oman)
- EDU 690: *Supervisor of Culminating Research Projects* (Shanghai, China)
-

St. John's University--Queens and Staten Island

- EDU 5701: *Theories of Teaching and Learning*
- EDU 7120: *Research and Theory Concerning Students' Instructional Needs*
- EDU 7238: *Designing Innovative Instructional Materials*
- EDU 7399: *Field Research in Reading and Learning Styles*
- EDU 7701: *Research in Innovative Instructional Strategies*

- EDU 7708: *Trends and Techniques in the Evaluation of Programs*
- EDU 7712: *Change Theory in Curriculum*
- EDU 7890: *Independent Study*
- EDU 7990: *Doctoral Research Seminar*

List of Publications

2006 Publications:

- Burke, K & Dunn, R. (accepted for publication, 2006). Higher education and teacher certification programs: Needed ethical changes. *The Journal of Higher Education Management*.
- Burke, K. & Shea Doolan, L. (2006). Chapter Eight: Learning styles and higher education: No adult left behind. In Ronald and Serbrenia Sims, (Eds.). *Learning Styles and Learning: A Key to Meeting the Accountability Demands in Education*. NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Dunn, R & Burke, K. (accepted for publication, 2006). Book Chapter: Why do children have trouble with math? What really counts? In Rita Dunn and Shirley Griggs, (Eds.). *What If Educators Knew*.

2005 Publications:

- Burke, K. (2005). School readiness: Who gets ready for whom? *The New Jersey Journal of Supervision and Curriculum Development: Focus on Education*.
- Burke, K. (2005). Teacher certification exams: What are the predictors of success? *College Student Journal*, 39(4), 784-793.

2004 Publications:

- Burke, K. (2004). Recognizing the gifts of the spirit. *Momentum*, XXXV(2), 62-64.
- Burke, K., & Samide, B. (2004). Required changes in the classroom environment: It's a matter of design. *The Clearing House*, 77(6), 236-239.
- Burke, K., & Soldyn, T. (2004). Math education and literature: It all adds up. *The New York State Mathematics Teachers' Journal*, 54(2), 22-25.
- Burke, K., & Sutherland, C. (2004). Attitudes toward inclusion: Knowledge vs. experience. *Education*, 125(2).
- Shea Doolan, L. & Burke, K. (2004). The learning styles of urban college freshmen: Can professors leave no adult behind?. *College Teaching Methods & Styles*.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

- 2006** (August 20) **Keynote Presenter**. "Mathematics Instruction: Meeting the Needs of Global and Analytic Students." Norwegian Teachers and Administrators: **Oslo, Norway**.
- 2006** (August 14-18) **Presenter**. "Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles." Asker Municipality Teachers and Administrators: **Oslo, Norway**.
- 2006** (March 6) **Presenter**. "Teaching to Both Sides of the Brain: Meeting Students Needs Through Differentiated Instructional Approaches." American British Academy: **Muscat, Oman**.

- 2006** (January 15) **Presenter.** “Teaching to Both Sides of the Brain: Meeting Students Needs Through Differentiated Instructional Approaches.” The Carol Morgan School Parents Association: **Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.**
- 2005** (November 8, 15, 22, and 23) **Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Students Through Differentiated Instructional Approaches.” South Huntington Union Free School District: **South Huntington, New York.**
- 2005** (November 1-2) **Program Evaluator and Presenter.** “Early Childhood Curriculum Planning.” American School of Nicaragua: **Managua, Nicaragua.**
- 2005** (October 12-14) **Presenter.** “Early Childhood Assessment,” “Early Language and Literacy: The Tasks of Early Childhood Education;” and “Redesigning the Classroom for Diverse Learners.” Conference of the Association of American Schools of Central America, Columbia, Caribbean, and Mexico: **San Jose, Costa Rica.**
- 2005** (September 17) **Keynote Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Freshmen College Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.” Rhode Island College: **Providence, RI.**
- 2005** (August 15-19) **Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.” Asker Municipality Teachers and Administrators: **Oslo, Norway.**
- 2005** (July 5-10) **Conference Coordinator and Presenter.** “Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles--28th Annual Certification Institute.” International Learning Style Network: **New York City, NY.**
- 2004** (November 11) **Presenter.** “Mathematics Instruction: Meeting the Needs of Global and Analytic Students.” Teaching Smart Through Reflective Practice: Creating Spaces for Urban School Success. Co-sponsored by St. John’s University and Wagner College: **Staten Island, New York.**
- 2004** (November 2) **Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.” DOE Teachers and Administrators of IS 61: **Staten Island, New York.**
- 2004** (September 28) **Research Presentation.** “The Learning Styles of Urban College Freshmen: Can Professors Leave No Adult Behind?” The International College Teaching Methods & Styles Conference: **Reno, Nevada.**
- 2004** (August 11-17) **Conference Coordinator and Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.” Asker Municipality Teachers and Administrators: **Oslo, Norway.**
- 2004** (July 28-August 4) **Conference Coordinator and Presenter.** “Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles--27th Annual Certification Institute.” St. John’s University’s Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles: **New York City, New York.**
- 2004** (February 25) **Presenter.** “Multiple Intelligences and Learning Styles: Making the Connections.” St. Stan’s Elementary School Teachers and Administrators: **Maspeth, New York.**
- 2004** (February 7) **Presenter.** “Introduction and Practical Applications to Teaching Community College Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.” Urban College of Boston: **Boston, Massachusetts.**

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kathryn J. Campbell, Ph.D.
247 Cannon Road
Wilton, Connecticut 06897

Education

1995 Ph.D., Applied Educational Psychology: School Psychology and Reading,
Columbia University

1976 M.S. in Education, specialization in reading, Hunter College of the City
University of New York, Department of Curriculum and Teaching

1970 B.S. in Education, summa cum laude, Dakota State University

Professional Employment

2003-present Associate Professor and Chair, Education and Educational Psychology
Department, Western Connecticut State University

1996- 2003 Assistant Professor, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT.,
Education and Educational Psychology Department

1995-1996 Assistant Psychologist, Soifer Center for Learning and Child
Development, White Plains, New York

1995-1996 Adjunct Assistant Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University, New
York, N.Y., Educational Psychology Department

Certifications

Licensed Psychologist, New York and Connecticut

Teacher of Reading (K-12), New York State Permanent Certificate

Teacher of Elementary School (N-6), New York State Permanent Certificate

Professional Affiliations

American Psychological Association

Connecticut Psychological Association

Sigma Xi

Publications

Campbell, K. J. and Williams, J.P. (2000). Social desirability concerns and text that
violates social values: Evidence of an interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology,
92(3), 515-523.

Levy, E. and Campbell, K. J. (2000). D.W. Winnicott in the literature classroom. Teaching English in the Two-year College, 27(3), 321-327.

Daria Prophet, M. and Campbell, K. J. Schools need sexuality education programs. Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality. (October 10, 2004): <http://www.weihs.org/volume7/sexed.html>.

Presentations

Campbell, K. J. (October, 2001). The graduate counselor education program at Western Connecticut State University. Presentation at the 41st Annual Meeting of the New England Psychological Society, Danbury Connecticut

Campbell, K. J. (October, 1999). The effects of social desirability concerns on adolescents' text comprehension. Presentation at the Connecticut State University Research Conference, Eastern Connecticut State University.

Campbell, K. J. (September, 1999). Using literacy circles in elementary reading programs. Presentation at district-wide in-service for teachers, Sherman, Connecticut.

Campbell, K. J. & Perin, D. (March 1997). The key role of the reading specialist in assessment and remediation of reading disabilities. Presentation at the Orton Dyslexia Society's 24th Annual Conference & Symposium on Dyslexia, New York, N.Y. (Region

Campbell, K. J. (December 1995). Social desirability, text comprehension and problem representation. Presentation at the 45th Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Honors/Awards

1996 - Received the Miriam Goldberg Research Prize awarded for the best dissertation in psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University

1996- Elected to the Columbia University Kappa Chapter of *Sigma Xi*, an honorary scientific research society

1989 – Awarded Behavioral Analysis Scholarship at Teachers College

Thomas A. Cordy Ph.D.
Education and Educational Psychology Department
Western Connecticut State University
 Danbury, CT 06810
 cordyt@wcsu.edu
 203-837-8520 (office)

EDUCATION:

<i>State University College, Buffalo</i>	B.S.
Major: Exceptional Education (Mental Retardation)	June 1964
<i>SUNY Albany</i>	M.S.
Major: Student Personnel Services In Higher Education	June 1966
<i>University of Connecticut</i> in Educational Psychology: Education of the Gifted Professional Education	Sixth Year Diploma December 1991
<i>University of Connecticut</i> Educational Leadership: Educational Administration	Ph.D. August 1993

PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCES:

<i>Professor, Education & Educational Psychology Department</i> 1993-present (Promotion to rank of Professor- effective Fall 1998) Department Chairperson E&EP Coordinator of Center for Developmental Studies Coordinator of Four (4) Graduate Options Certification Officer	1997-2003 1994-1996 1995-1996 2000-2005
<i>Special Education Resource room & Consultant Teacher</i> Peru Jr.-Sr. High School, Peru, NY	1992-93
<i>Graduate Assistantship- Office of the Dean</i> University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT	1991-92
<i>Coordinator, Junior-Senior High Gifted and Talented Program</i> Peru Jr.-Sr. High School, Peru, NY	1987-91
<i>Special Education Teacher and Part-time Gifted & Talented Coordinator</i> Peru Jr.-Sr. High School, Peru, NY	1985-87
<i>Special Education Teacher (Self-Contained Classroom)</i> Peru Jr.-Sr. High School, Peru, NY	1968-85

Adjunct Faculty Member (Lecturer 4- Psychology)
 North Country Community College, Saranac Lake, NY 1971-88
 Clinton Community College, Plattsburgh, NY 1989-91

Director of Housing & Adjunct Instructor of Psychology 1967-68
 State University College, Plattsburgh, NY

Assistant Dean (Residence Hall Director) 1965-67
 State University College, Plattsburgh, NY

ADDITIONAL RELATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES:

WCSU Certification Officer 2000-2005
Description: Responsibilities include verification of student eligibility for university endorsement for teacher certification in Connecticut and maintenance of student records and files pertaining to certification. The Certification Officer also serves as liaison with CTSDE in matters of policy and regulation and is responsible for the dissemination of information to students, faculty and administration.

WCSU Title II Coordinator 2000-2005
Description: Responsibilities include liaison work with CTSDE Title II Officers; collection of WCSU student Praxis II assessment data and attendance at informational meetings.

CSDE Site Visit Team Member Fall 2004
Description: Member of the Connecticut State Department of Education Accreditation team for evaluation of program at Albertus Magnus College

CSDE Site Visit Team Member Fall 2003
Description: Member of the Connecticut State Department of Education/NCATE Accreditation team for evaluation of program at Eastern Connecticut State University

Graduate Assistant, Dean's Office, School of Education, University of Connecticut
 1991-92
Description: Responsibilities included establishing and scheduling clinical field placements for graduate and undergraduate education majors and assisting in preparation for NCATE and Connecticut State Department of Education accreditation visits.

Special Publications Projects: Dean's Office, School of Education, University of Connecticut: SS 1993
Description: Organization and layout of a major revision of the clinical field placement manual for graduate and undergraduate students, university faculty and field personnel.

Thinking Skills Consultant: Project ASTRA (Space Shuttle Simulator Project) 1991-92
 Westfield Middle School, Westfield, MA

Description: Served as thinking skills consultant to a planning team developing a space shuttle simulator for middle school children. Curriculum materials were developed consistent with methodologies designed to provide for the direct instruction of thinking skills. The project was partly sponsored by grant monies from the National Science Foundation, Horace Mann, Eisenhower Grant monies and the Christa McAuliff fellowship grant.

Member and Network Facilitator, North Country Teacher Resource Center 1987-90
Network for the Teachers of the Gifted and Talented

Description: Served as member and facilitator of network of teachers of the gifted and talented in Clinton, Essex, and Franklin Counties in NYS. Network activities included establishing lines of communication among teachers of the gifted as well as sponsoring related staff development activities.

Member and Chairperson: Commissioner's Advisory Panel (OECHC) 1981-88
Office for the Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions, New York State Education Department.

Description: Approximately seven years of total service (five as chair) to the State Education Department advisory panel responsible for promulgating and reviewing regulations and policies affecting handicapped children.

Member New York State Education Department Bicentennial Planning Committee 1984-85

Description: Member of statewide committee responsible for overseeing the planning process for the bicentennial celebration of the University of the State of New York.

Member NEA/NY Special Education Committee: 1980-85

Description: Member of statewide committee responsible for recommending NEA/NY policy on issues concerning handicapped children.

Member New York State Education Department – Olympic Education Support Project 1975

Description: Member of statewide committee responsible for overseeing the development and dissemination of curriculum materials related to the Lake Placid Winter Olympics.

Thinking Skills Consultations:

Schroon Lake Central School, Schroon Lake, NY 1991

Dwight Elementary School, Hartford, CT 1993

Description: Group presentations to faculty and staff, including methods and materials appropriate to the direct instruction of thinking skills in the curriculum.

Peru Central School District Site Coordinator: National Research Center for the Gifted and Talented

Research Projects: 1989-91

Description: School district contact person responsible for the collaborative study between the local school and the National Research Center for the Gifted and Talented.

Conducted studies include the Compacting study and field-testing of Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS) instrument.

University Committee Service:

Member, Educational Review Committee 1993-2003
Member, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Committee 1993-1994
Co-chair, Fifth Annual Faculty Research Conference 1994-1995
Member, *ad hoc* Library Swing Space Committee 1994-1995
Coordinator, Center for Developmental Studies 1994-1996
(including service as *ex-officio* member - Western Connecticut Superintendent's Association)
Member, University Senate (E&EP Department) 1995-1997
Member, Graduate Council 1995-1997
Chair, Graduate Council 1996-1997
Member, Planning Committee, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th, Annual Educator's Conference
Connecticut Tourette Syndrome Association 1996-1999
Member, University Assessment Committee 1996-1998
Member, Academic Vice-President Search Committee 1997-1998
Member, School of Professional Studies Instructional Technologies Committee 1997-1998
Member, Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities
For Teacher Education (CACUTE) 1996-2005
Member, Statewide Committee for the Integration of Technology in Instruction-
Teacher Preparation Programs 1997-1999
Member, West Side Classroom Building Committee 1997-2002
Member, Faculty Scholarship Subcommittee: Fifth Year NEASC Report 1998-1999
Member, Research and Development Committee 1998-2001
Member and Chair, University Planning and Budget Committee 1998-2001
Member, CSU Foundation Board (University faculty representative) 2002-2004
Member, CUCAS 2001-2003
NEASC Sub-committee Standard IVa on Programs and Instruction 2002-2003

Department Committee Membership

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 1993-2000
Graduate Curriculum Committee 1993-present
CPD Advisory Board 1993-present
Professional Development Committee 1994-95
Department Search Committees 1994-2005
Department Evaluation Committee 1996-present
Member Ed.D. Advisory Committee 2002- present
Member Ed.D. Admissions Committee 2002-present
Member of E&EPY Reaccreditation Team (Standard VI) 2003-2004

UNIVERSITY TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Courses Taught:

ED 206	Introduction to Education
ED 500	Contemporary Educational problems
ED 501	Introduction to Educational Research
ED 525	The Teaching of Children with Learning Disabilities
ED 578	Gifted and Talented Children and Youth
ED 590	Research Seminar in Education
ED 773	Staff Development Seminar: Critical Issues in Special Education
ED 733	Alternatives in the Inclusion Classroom
ED 773	Educating the Exceptional Child: Strategies and Materials
ED 773	Critical Issues: Inclusion and Special Education
EPY 200	Fundamentals of Human Development
EPY 405	Introduction to Special Education
EPY 601	Fundamentals of Statistics and Research
EPY 603	Group Work Foundation: Theory and Practice
ED800:	Foundations of Instructional Leadership (Co-taught)
ED803:	National Standards Current Practices, and Policies in Education (Summer Institute)
ED822:	Talent Development Across the Curriculum
ED861:	Qualitative Methods Applied to Educational Research

Current dissertation advisees:

Nora Bennett
Lori Kolbusz
Steve Kobylenski
Raymond Velez

RESEARCH AND PRESENTATIONS:

Dissertation: Leaving: A Quantitative and Qualitative Case Study of an Urban Dropout Problem. The inquiry is a longitudinal cohort study that chronicles and examines the movement of students in and out of an urban inner city high school in Hartford, Connecticut. The study traces a potential cohort of 866 students over a three-year period of time. Research finds, and substantiates, local variables that prompt leaving or staying behaviors (Copyright TX 3-860-776, August 1994).

Publication: The University as Change Agent. Proceedings of the 8th Annual National Dropout Prevention Conference. pages 121-137.

Member, CSU Delegation: USDOE National Conference on Teacher Quality. Washington DC. January 2000.

Member, Advisory Board Western Connecticut Superintendents' Association Distance Learning Consortium. Fall 2000.

Presenter, First Annual Conference: Future Teachers of Western Connecticut – Inspire the Desire. November 9, 2000.

Panelist, Town Meeting: Individual Rights, Academic Freedom and the Role of the University. WCSU November 29, 2000
External Reviewer: An Assessment of Student Reading Improvement Comparing Two Instructional Delivery Models: Robin Young, Seton Hall University (Defended successfully October 17, 2003)
Reviewer of encyclopedia entry on Learning Disabilities, Scholastic Publications. Fall 2003.
Presenter, Sixteenth Annual At-risk Youth National Forum. February 22-25, 2004.
Instructional Leadership as an Element of School Reform.
Team Member: Title II Grant – Performance Assessment in Mathematics. 2002-04

GRANTS, AWARDS and HONORS:

Recipient, George B. Hobson Award for Excellence in Teaching: North Country Community College- 1983

Recipient, Appreciation Award for Educational Service: Student Government Association, Elizabethtown Campus - North Country Community College – 1987

Co-recipient, CSU/AAUP research grant - Counselor Intervention Strategies with At-Risk Students: A Qualitative Analysis of Local Variables. 1994-95

Recipient, CSU/AAUP research grant: Alternative Assessment: An Inquiry 1995-96

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

Pi Lambda Theta, Educational Honors Association*

Phi Delta Kappa, Educational Honors Association *

Phi Kappa Phi, Honor Society *

American Educational Research Association (AERA)

Eastern Educational Research Association (EERA)

Connecticut Counseling Association

National Tourette's Association

* Indicates current active membership

Edward Duncanson, Ed. D.

**Box 202, 10 Kevin Court
Bullville, New York 10915
(H) (845) 361-2101
eduncanson@hvc.rr.com**

Objective: To secure a position in the field of teacher education.

Summary of Personal Qualifications

- University teaching experience with graduate and undergraduate students.
- Over 37 years of experience as an award-winning teacher, coach, mentor and administrator for K-12 science programs serving over 5,000 students.
- Extensive background in K-12 curriculum development, program implementation and support.
- Recognized expertise in inquiry teaching, classroom organization, differentiation of instruction and the use of data to inform instruction.
- Proven executive leadership and managerial skills encompassing material, facilities (7 buildings), and equipment.
- Effective communicator with outstanding presentation skills and extensive connections to community resources.
- Authored books and articles on education, geology and swimming.

Education

Ed. D. in Educational Administration and Supervision, 2003

Seton Hall University
College of Education and Human Services
Department of Educational Administration, Management, and Policy
South Orange, New Jersey
Dissertation: The Impact of Classroom Organization in Grade 4 on Student Achievement in Science

School Administrator/Supervisor Certificate, 1990
State University of New York, College at New Paltz, NY

Master of Natural Science, 1971
University of Oklahoma, College of Geosciences, School of Geology and Geophysics
NSF Grant sponsored program
Norman, Oklahoma
Thesis: Preglacial Drainage in the Port Jervis Trough

Bachelor of Science (Physics), 1965

New York University, School of Engineering and Science, New York, NY

Associate in Applied Science (Engineering), 1962

Orange County Community College, Middletown, NY

Employment Experience

2003-present: **Western Connecticut State University**
Danbury, Connecticut

Assistant Professor of Education

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Taught undergraduate and graduate level courses: Introduction to Education, Curriculum, Technology in Education, and Measurement and Evaluation.
- Served as the university supervisor of student teachers.
- Assisted in the preparations for an accreditation review.
- Counseled pre-service students and adults enrolled in the ‘Certification Only’ programs.
- Served as the liaison to an elementary school.

1969-2002: **Pine Bush Central School District**
Pine Bush, New York

Secondary Science Teacher (33 years)

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Served as a consummate team player and collaborated with colleagues in developing mission statements, visions and supporting goals with strategic planning.
- Modeled the highest ethical and professional values.
- Taught and facilitated learning in General Science, Introductory Physical Science, Regents Earth Science, and Regents Physics.
- Worked with students to prepare projects for Science Congress.
- Expanded from 8-25 teachers for the grade 9-12 science program.
- Worked in a variety of school configurations (K-12, 6-9, 10-12 and 9-12).
- Contributed as a curriculum developer for the revision of the New York State 1970 Earth Science Syllabus.
- Actively involved parents in classroom activities.
- Obtained support for the science program from over 30 businesses for scholarships, awards, travel, career programs and shadowing opportunities.

Secondary Department Chairman – Science (13 years)

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Prepared appropriate budget requests for professional development, print material, equipment, supplies and contract services.
- Authored the Student Services and Science Department reports for a Middle States evaluation.
- Assisted staff in the development of winning grant proposals.
- Supervised the alignment of curriculum with new state standards.
- Supervised the administration, grading, and evaluation of state-mandated science tests.

- Arranged for teacher training in technical writing, the integration of advanced technology into science instruction, and the use of instructional software.
- Conducted evaluations of teaching materials and science programs.
- Successfully inducted new teachers into the profession.
- Successfully mentored new teachers and assisted experienced staff in the development of effective teaching methods.
- Planned and directed a staff conference focused on students with special needs.
- Assisted in the planning, design and furnishing of a high school building expansion project.
- Directed the creation and implementation of new science programs.
- Conducted monthly meetings of science staff.
- Promoted programs for students and staff to expand their educational horizons.
- Counseled students in their selection of appropriate science classes.

Science Coordinator K-12 (10 Years)

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Co-chaired the district-wide Science Curriculum and Instruction Review Team that collaboratively developed the K-6 science program.
- Aligned curriculum with state standards.
- Supervised pilot programs involving science kits for grades K-6.
- Trained teachers in the use of science kits.
- Designed and implemented appropriate assessment to evaluate the K-6 program.
- Planned and created a district-wide science materials center.
- Trained paraprofessionals to refurbish science kits and deliver them to over 100 elementary teachers in a timely manner.
- Prepared appropriate budget requests for professional development, print material, equipment, supplies and contract services.
- Initiated a Schoolyard Ecology program.
- Monitored the state mandated grade 4 testing program.

Athletic Team Coach (7 years)

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Taught skills for field hockey, swimming and diving to aspiring athletes.
- Developed championship teams.

Pool Director (5 years)

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Trained staff to conduct a comprehensive swimming program for beginner to advanced swimmers including a Learn-To-Swim program, life saving, Water Safety Instructor training, community swimming, competitive swimming and diving, masters swimming, and synchronized swimming.
- Assisted in the design, planning and opening of an elementary school aquatic facility.

1971-1973: **Orange County Community College**

Middletown, New York

Geology Instructor in Continuing Education Program

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Taught General Geology to adult students in both on and off campus settings.
- Conducted field trips to explore geologic sites of interest.

1965-1969: Valley Central High School,

Montgomery, New York

Secondary Science Teacher

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Taught General Science in grades 7-9.
- Created and taught a General Chemistry course.
- Founded and advised the Science Club.
- Coached the first Varsity Swimming and Diving Team in the school's history.

1965: Middletown High School

Middletown, New York

I. Permanent Chemistry Substitute

Demonstrated Performance and Competencies:

- Prepared all materials for laboratory experiments.
- Conducted a tutoring program for at-risk students.

Honors

- **NASA Teacher in Space Project, New York State Representative** presented by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), 1985.
- **Delta Kappa Pi International Honor Society.** Inducted with a 3.93 GPA in Ed.D. program, 2003.
- **Nominated for the Outstanding Ed. D. Dissertation Award** presented by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, 2003.
- **Teacher of the Year** presented by Radio Shack, 2000.
- **Award of Honor** presented by the National School Public Relations Association, 1988.
- **Bright Idea Award: Best Classroom Practices** presented by Chevron, National Science Foundation, and the California Academy of Sciences, 1997.
- **New York State Conservation Education Teacher of the Year,** presented by the New York Association of Conservation Districts (NYACD), 1998.
- **New York State Teacher of the Year Finalist** presented by the New York State Education Department, 1990, 1991.
- **Science Teacher of the Year (Middle School)** presented by the Science Teachers Association of New York State, 1988.
- **New York State Representative to the International Space Camp** presented by the New York State Education Department, 1992.
- **Outstanding Science Teacher Award** presented by the Science Teachers Association of New York State, Southeastern Section, 1992.
- **Educator of the Year** presented by Phi Delta Kappa, 1991.

- **Orange County Conservation Teacher of the Year** presented by the Orange County Soil and Water Conservation District, 1998.

PUBLICATIONS

II. Article manuscripts in progress for submission to an appropriate journal.

- Duncanson, E. (200X). *Time-centered classrooms*.
- Duncanson, E. (200X). *Making space for science achievement*.
- Duncanson, E. (2003, Nov) *Classroom space: Right for adults but wrong for children*. Educational Facility Planner. 35, (1), (in press).
- Duncanson, E. (2003, Spring) *Classrooms are not roadways. They are parking lots!* The Science Teachers Bulletin, 66, (2), 1-4.
- Duncanson, E. (2003). The impact of classroom organization in grade 4 on student achievement in science. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ. (University Microfilms International)
- Duncanson, E. (2000, Spring) *I know why I do this*. The Science Teachers Bulletin.

GRANTS AND INVITATIONAL CONFERENCES/WORKSHOPS

- **National Science Foundation Grant** to attend a workshop for *Science Assessment* at the Institute for Inquiry, Exploratorium, San Francisco, CA, 2001.
- **Community Foundation Grant** to purchase science equipment, 1998, 2000.
- **Mid-Hudson Teacher Center Grants (7)** to conduct action research and support for innovative classroom programs, 1994-2000.
- **National Science Foundation Grant** to attend a workshop for *Professional Development Design* at the Institute for Inquiry, Exploratorium, San Francisco, CA, 1997.
- **Association of Science Materials Center Grant** to attend the *First Step Conference*, Seattle, WA, 1997.
- **National Science Materials Center Grant** to attend a training workshop, Washington, DC, 1993.
- **Technology Education Grant** from the Council of Great Lakes Governors to support a technology initiative in four elementary schools, 1992-1993.
- **Orange-Ulster BOCES Equality Grant** provided professional training to address equality issues in public schools, 1992-1995.
- **NSTA/Monsanto Grant** to attend the *Elementary School Science: A Strategy for Change* Conference, Washington, DC, 1992.
- **Christa McAuliffe Fellowship** from the US Department of Education to write a geologic field guide, 1987.

PRESENTATIONS

- Duncanson, E. (2003, Nov). *Are There Any Questions?* Hands-on workshop presented at the Fall Superintendent's Conference Day in Poughkeepsie, New York.

- Duncanson, E., Byam, S., & Reichle, B. (2003, Oct). *Using K.I.S.S. (Key Indicators of Student Success) in Science*. Interactive workshop presented at the NYS Teacher In-service Conference in Albany, NY.
- Duncanson, E. & Reichle, B. (2000, Dec). *Inquiry as a staff development tool*. Interactive workshop presented at the National Staff Development Council Annual conference in Atlanta, GA.
- Duncanson, E. & Reichle, B. (2000, Nov). *The structure and process of inquiry*. Interactive workshop presented at the National Science Teachers Association Eastern Area Conference in Baltimore, MD.
- Duncanson, E. & Reichle, B. (2000, Nov). *The role of questioning in inquiry*. Interactive workshop presented at the Science Teachers Association of New York State Annual Conference in Ellenville, NY.
- Duncanson, E., Volpe, J. & Reichle, B., (2000, Jan). *Inquiry as a tool for training*. Interactive workshop presented at the NYS Teacher In-service Conference in Albany, NY.

SERVICE

- NASA Teacher in Space, 1986-Present. Travel throughout New York State presenting Space Science programs for schools, colleges, civic and community groups. Frequently interviewed for newspaper, magazine, radio and television reports. Serve as a local resource for students interested in space programs and networking with scientists and policy makers in Washington, DC.
- Technology Advisory Committee – New York Congressional Representative District, 1985–2002. Served as an advisor to Rep. Benjamin Gilman regarding technology issues related to the Space Transportation System and the International Space Station. (Rep. Gilman lost his elected position in 2002 due to redistricting).
- Pine Bush Central School District Instructional Council, 1995-2002. Served on a district-wide committee coordinating curriculum implementation, special programs, and evaluation of the instructional program.
- Pine Bush Central School District Professional Development Council, 2000-2002. Served on a district-wide committee that included representatives from the teacher’s union, the paraprofessional union, community members, and university personnel to design, implement, and evaluate a professional development program for district personnel.
- Orange County Community College Medical Technology Department, 1996–Present. Serve on the Board of Directors overseeing program offerings, certification reviews, and placement of students for practical workplace experience.
- New York State Health Department Task Force on Mercury in the Schools, 2001-2002. Represented the state’s teachers while preparing a plan to reduce the amount of mercury in New York State schools.
- Mid-Hudson Interactive Museum, 1998-2001. Served on the board of directors as a science advisor and served one-term as Vice President. This community group is raising funds to support a hands-on science museum.
- Town of Crawford – Groundwater Guardian Committee, 1995-Present. Work with the Town of Crawford Chemist to conceive, plan and execute community programs

that promote the safety and conservation of groundwater resources. The group works closely with the national Groundwater Foundation.

Mid-Hudson Teacher Center, 1999-Present. Professional Development Trainer for education-business partnerships, inquiry teaching and learning, and data analysis. Recent presentations have been made for the following school districts in New York State:

Florida School District

Kingston School District

Pawling School District

Pine Bush Central Federal Credit Union, 1970-1981, 1998-2001. Assisted in the creation of the credit union (charter member) and served as the first Assistant Treasurer. Continued as a member of the Board of Directors including three years as President. The Board oversees the business operation, with assets of \$5 million, establishes policy, and promotes the growth of membership.

St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church, 1974-Present. Active church member involved with fund raising, parish dinners, charity drives, grounds keeping, and serving as a lector at mass.

American Red Cross, 1965-1993. Board of Directors (4 years), Water Safety Instructor Trainer (25 years), National Aquatic School Faculty (3 years).

Bullville Volunteer Fire Company, 1973-1980. Assisted in the formation of the fire company (charter member) and served as the Secretary for 7 years. Also served as the secretary of the Fire District for five years.

State Registration Review Team, 1990. Served as the science program specialist on a select team under the auspices of the New York State Education Department to study an under-performing high school in New York City.

Middle States School Visitation Team. Served as a member of the site visitation team that evaluated school programs in the following schools in New York State:

Somers High School

Highland Falls High School

Amityville High School

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)

Association of Science Materials Centers (ASMC)

Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society in Education (KDP)

National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)

National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE)

New York State Certified Swimming Officials Association (NYSCSOA)

New York State United Teachers (NYSUT)

Orange County (New York) Community College Alumni Association (OCCCAA)

Phi Delta Kappa (PDK)

Science Teachers Association of New York State (STANYS)

Teacher in Space Education Foundation (TISEF)

CONSULTING

Science Program: Provided guidance for the development of a kit-based, elementary science program, conducted a needs survey, guided field testing of materials, presented program orientation sessions, evaluated text books, directed curriculum alignment, and mentored teachers in new instructional methods for the following school district in New York State:

Marlboro Central School District

CERTIFICATIONS

New York

Physics, Earth Science, and General Science 7-12

School Administrator/Supervisor

RESEARCH INTERESTS

The structure and process of inquiry teaching and learning.

Classroom organization.

The use of data to inform instruction.

Pleistocene history of Orange, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties, New York.

MICHAEL J. WILSON, Ph.D.

C2 Carver Place
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

email: wilsonm@wcsu.edu
Tel#: 609-219-0725

EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYMENT

9/2003 to present **Assistant Professor**, Western Connecticut State University - **Duties** - Teach classes in reading (clinical approach to reading, reading development and theory), research and statistics (qualitative and quantitative approaches to research) measurement and evaluation (the development of instructional uses and understanding of measurement), and technology (integration of technology into instruction); Designed and coordinate NCATE assessment and data systems; Generated courses in research and mathematics education; Represent faculty on the University Senate and Committee on Assessment; Chair doctoral dissertations; Conduct personal research into learning in technology, decision-making in assessment and reading comprehension theory.

3/2002 to 6/2003 **Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction**, Washington Township Public Schools in Robbinsville, NJ - **Duties** – Supervised curriculum development in visual and performing arts, world languages, social studies and language arts; Coordinated district technology usage; Supervised teacher professional development; Developed plans for block scheduling at the middle school; Conducted meetings and worked with parents on issues related to gifted education; Observed and evaluated teacher; Developed school and department budgets; Developed and coordinated assessments; Generated curriculum and program evaluations; Coordinated instructional planning and strategy development; Coordinated teacher training; Worked cooperatively with others on district data usage.

10/96 to 3/02 **Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction: Assessment**, Plainfield Public Schools in Plainfield, NJ - **Duties** – Supervised or assisted in the supervision of curriculum development in mathematics, science, arts, health, physical education and language arts; Coordinated aspects of district technology usage; Participated in the development of middle schools of choice and problem based learning initiatives; Supervised teachers and completed teacher evaluations; Participated in block scheduling development; Worked and communicated with parents on various school and district level initiatives; Assisted in the development of safe schools initiative and school discipline; Contributed to school budget development; Managed grants; Participated in the coordination of whole school reform planning, Developed and interpreted assessment and assessment use; Conducted curriculum and program evaluation; Participated in instructional planning and the coordination of teacher training; Coordinated all district wide testing and test interpretation; Developed district data usage and report generation; Worked on district level planning and budgeting.

7/93 to 10/96 **Educational Coordinator**, Paterson School District, Paterson, NJ – **Duties** – Coordinated testing and basic skills curriculum; Designed and coordinated district evaluations; Developed and coordinated federal grants; Assisted in the

development of basic skills curriculum evaluation; Worked as the high school-district liaison; Coordinated district technology usage; Coordinated integration of school services; Coordinated test usage and interpretation.

7/92 to 6/93 **Director of Research and Assessment**, Orange Public Schools, Orange, NJ, - **Duties** - Coordination of basic skills curriculum, coordination of testing program administration, scoring and reporting; worked on the development of grants, set up data base system, evaluation of programs and curriculum

12/89 to 6/92 **Education Specialist**, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey – **Duties** - Managed: Curriculum committees in reading, mathematics, and writing; Coordinated the RFP procedures, development, training, production, administration, scoring, reporting and interpretation of the High School Proficiency Test and Early Warning Test; and Developed department communications with regard to testing issues; Assisted in planning related to testing and state curriculum interpretation; Participated in the selection of contractors and the development of department budgets.

6/88 to 12/89 **Assistant Director**, Educational Test Service, Princeton, NJ – **Duties** – Assisted in the direction of the operation of the CLEP program; Consulted and coordinated psychometric processes; Conducted sales meetings, Represented the CLEP products to national audiences; Developed testing products including tests on technology, history, psychology, calculus; Assisted in the development of budgets and strategic planning; Developed a data coordination system using SAS.

1/85 to 6/88 **Assistant Professor**, University of North Texas in Denton, Texas – **Duties** - Taught courses in special education methodology, research, behavior management, learning, child development, curriculum, evaluation, and assessment; Supervised student teacher in elementary and secondary; Sat on dissertation committees in evaluation, curriculum, learning, instructional and curriculum design, and administration; Managed and worked on NIH and USDOE grants; Worked with the Fort Worth School district on the development of school effectiveness assessments to determine the effectiveness of school and evaluated programs such as a program for pregnant teenagers; Worked with the Literacy Initiative communicating with school districts and providing training to Texas districts about process reading and writing; Worked with the Dallas Independent School District on assessment and evaluation issues.

9/81 to 12/84 **Resource Teacher**, Lennox School District in Lennox, CA - **Duties** - Coordinated and conducted teacher training and in-class inclusion in reading and mathematics; Assessed and planned instruction for resource students in English and Spanish; Worked on the development of the science curriculum; Conducted student assessment; Developed, wrote programs for and managed an Apple 2E computer learning lab.

9/72 to 9/81 **Special Education Teacher**, Los Angeles Co. Schools in Los Angeles – 5th-12th grade (9/72-9/79) & Hermosa Beach Schools in Hermosa Beach, CA 4th-6th grades (9/80-6/81) – **Duties** - Taught students in all subjects including: mathematics, reading, writing, science, social studies, and vocational education.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Lawrence Township School Board – chaired the Educational Program Committee (2000 to 2005); Chaired the NJ School Board Associations Assessment Committee (2001-2003); President of Lawrenceville Village Community Board (1998 -2002); Church Finance Committee Member (1993-1996), Titusville, NJ; Torrance Soccer Association Coach (1980-1982); Boy Scout Leadership (1979-1983), Torrance, CA

EDUCATION

Ph.D. -University of Southern California - 1983 (Education – Educational Psychology)

M.A. -California State University, Los Angeles - 1973 (Education – Learning Handicaps)

B.A. -University of California, Santa Cruz - 1971 (Anthropology)

CREDENTIALS/CERTIFICATES (California, Texas, and New Jersey)

School administration (NJ, CA, PA, TX); Standard K-8 (CA, TX); Special Education (NJ, CA, TX), Bilingual education – Spanish (CA), Resource teaching certificate (CA, TX)

HONORS AND AWARDS

Educare Scholar, University of California, Los Angeles, CA

National Study Grant in Special Education, California State College, Los Angeles, CA

Honor Roll, University of Maryland, Asian Overseas Schools

PROFESSIONAL WRITING / PRESENTATIONS

Flanagan, R. Gurkowitz, R. & Wilson, M. (2005) Improving Spatial Reasoning through Experience: A Pilot Study – Presented at the American Psychological Association Conference.

Wilson, M. (2005) School Improvement: Using Concept Derived, Goal Based, Decision Driven Data. Presented at the Central Connecticut State University Faculty Research Conference

Wilson, M & Beardsley, R (2005) Intensive Tutoring Pilot Program, Requisite Systems Incorporated. Bridgewater, NJ

Caruso, J. & Wilson, M. (2005) Teacher Disposition Assessment 2004-05, Presented at the Eastern Connecticut State University Conference on Assessment

Wilson, M., Tienken, C. (2002) Using state standards and tests to improve instruction. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation in (eds.) L. Rudner and W. Schafer What Teachers Need to Know About Assessment Washington DC, National Educational Association

Wilson, M. (2001) The Assessment-Evaluation Cycle: Model for Instruction.
ERIC digest. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 458 263.

Appendix D

Western Connecticut State University

Department of Education and Educational Psychology

Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership

Comprehensive Written Examination:
Guidelines, Suggested Bibliography, and Sample Questions

2005-2006

For Additional Information contact:

Dr. Marcia A. B. Delcourt

Program Coordinator

Westside 305

203.837.9121

delcourtm@wcsu.edu

Guidelines for the Comprehensive Written Examination for the Doctor of Education Degree in Instructional Leadership

General Information: The comprehensive examination will be administered in two parts. Each part will consist of a four-hour block of time for a total of eight hours. Each section of the comprehensive examination consists of essay or application questions selected by the program faculty to represent the course content of the various strands of the program. Therefore, preparation for the comprehensive written examination is dependent upon the student completing of all coursework designated in the Program of Study, maintaining currency by reading the literature, and referring to review topics as well as the recommended bibliography included in this guide.

Comprehensive Written Examination Content:

Part I will cover coursework consisting of Inquiry Strategies related to quantitative and qualitative methods applied to educational research. Specifically coursework related to ED860: Quantitative Methods Applied to Educational Research, ED861: Qualitative Methods Applied to Educational Research, ED865: Introduction to Educational Research Designs, and ED805: Program Administration and Assessment will be covered with hands-on computer applications as well as statistical analysis and interpretation.

Part II will include essay questions in three parts.

Part II.A will include coursework related to the Theory and Foundation of Instructional Leadership. This section consists of coursework specifically related to ED 800: Foundations of Instructional Leadership, ED 801: Group Leadership, Group Processes, and Team Building in Education, and ED 821: Leadership Assessment and Development.

Part II.B will cover coursework related to Theory and Foundation and Areas of Specialization related to National Standards, Curriculum, and Improving Student Performance. This section will include coursework specifically related to ED802: Emerging Instructional Technologies, ED803: National Standards Current Practices, and Policies in Education, ED804: Learning, Cognition, and Teaching, ED805: Program Administration and Assessment, ED820: Topics in Curriculum and Instruction, and ED 898: Curricular Applications of Educational Research.

Part II.C will cover coursework related to Areas of Specialization, specifically related to ED822: Talent Development Across the Curriculum, ED823: Models of Creative Thinking, and ED824: Diversity Issues in Schools.

Students may consult the Program Coordinator for further guidance in preparation of the examination. However, students should be advised that information will not be provided about specific questions included on the exam.

Examination Schedule: The Comprehensive Written Examination will be conducted in two parts. It will be administered the last two Saturdays in July 2006. Part I will be administered Saturday, July 22, 2006 from 9 AM to 1 PM and Part II will be administered Saturday, July 29,

2006 from 9 AM to 1 PM. Students who have completed all required coursework, with the exception of the dissertation seminars, may sit for the examination. Students are required to have passed the comprehensive examination prior to their registering for dissertation seminar, ED 881. Students who fail a section may retake that section once. A date and time will be scheduled for late August or early September.

Examination Scoring: Each question will be read by two readers who evaluate each answer according to the following scoring system: 4 = excellent, 3 = good, 2 = pass, and 1 = poor (unacceptable). In order to pass the comprehensive, students must obtain a score of 2 or higher on each section.

4 = Excellent: Indicates a superior level of understanding of the concepts and issues related to the question, providing an insightful response as well as a high level of organization and writing skills.

3 = Good: Indicates a better than average understanding of the concepts and issues related to the question, providing a comprehensive response as well as an above average organization of the material and writing skills.

2 = Pass: Indicates an adequate understanding of the concepts and issues related to the question, providing a response that addresses the question as well as a satisfactory organization of the material and writing skills.

1 = Poor (unacceptable): Indicates an inadequate level of understanding of the concepts and issues related to the question, providing an unsatisfactory response to the question as well as a poor presentation of the response to the question.

Examination Results: The program coordinator reports the results to the chairperson of the department and the program faculty. Students will be notified in writing of the results of the comprehensive examination within 3 weeks of the administration of the examination.

Program Review Questions

Inquiry Strategies: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods as Applied to Educational Research

Part I will cover coursework consisting of Inquiry Strategies related to quantitative and qualitative methods applied to educational research. Specifically coursework related to ED860: Quantitative Methods Applied to Educational Research, ED861: Qualitative Methods Applied to Educational Research, ED865: Introduction to Educational Research Designs, and ED805: Program Administration and Assessment will be covered with hands-on computer applications as well as statistical analysis and interpretation.

Suggested Bibliography:

ED860: Quantitative Methods Applied to Educational Research

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American psychological association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2005). *Educational research; An introduction* (7th edition). New York: Longman.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation* (3rd edition). San Diego: Edits Publishers.

Huck, S. W., & Cormier, W. H. (1996). *Reading statistics and research*. New York: Harper Collins.

ED861: Qualitative Methods Applied to Educational Research

Marshall, C., & Rssman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

ED865: Introduction to Educational Research Designs

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Optional Texts:

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education*. (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Popham, W. J. (1993). *Educational Evaluation*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Standards for educational and psychological testing. (1985). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Note: Also review all course notes and handouts.

Example Items:

1. Dr. Walton, the Assistant Superintendent in a small city school district, needs help in assessing whether or not to make science fair participation mandatory for all grade 10 students in the district. She knows that you have expertise in research design and analysis and has asked you to design and implement a study to address this issue. You are told that there are some records available about student performance in science fairs for the past 2 years (student achievement scores in science and student science fair assessment scores).
 - a. Set-up a grid for your evaluation design, include stakeholders, objectives, research questions, data sources, data methods, and a timeline. Be sure to use both quantitative and qualitative methods. You will likely adjust your grid as you continue working on the project described below.
 - b. Using an ANOVA, compare the science achievement scores of students who have participated in science fairs and those who have not. Interpret your results.
 - c. Correlate the science achievement scores of students with the effects of their participation in science fairs. Interpret your results.
 - c. Develop a qualitative component for your evaluation that includes the questions you will ask in either an interview or survey format.

2. A colleague implemented your suggestion to survey her 5th grade class about their reading preferences. She developed a survey, distributed the form, collected the results, and constructed the following table. Please help him to interpret the results. What advice can you offer your teammate about this process? What methods would you suggest to your colleague to display, understand, and analyze these data?

Student	Results in Rank Order					
	Action	Biography	Fantasy	Non-fiction	Poetry	Science-fiction
1	5	2	4	1	6	3
2	1	5	2	3	6	4
3	1	6	2	3	5	4
4	2	4	1	3	6	5
5	3	6	2	4	5	1
6	1	6	2	5	4	3
7	3	1	4	2	6	5
8	3	6	2	5	1	4
9	6	5	3	1	4	2
10	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	1	2	6	4	5	3
12	4	3	5	2	1	6
13	1	6	2	3	5	4
14	2	4	1	3	6	5

Student	Results in Rank Order					
	Action	Biography	Fantasy	Non-fiction	Poetry	Science-fiction
15	1	6	2	5	4	3
16	3	1	4	2	6	5
17	3	6	2	5	1	4
18	6	5	3	1	4	2
19	1	6	2	5	4	3
20	2	4	1	3	6	5
21	1	6	2	5	4	3
22	2	4	1	3	6	5
23	2	4	1	3	6	5
24	2	4	1	3	6	5

3. You were asked by your Assistant Superintendent to help analyze the outcomes of a needs assessment that will guide the NEASC visit and the next 5-year district plan. All faculty, administration, and staff have received a 50-item survey asking them about their needs. The survey has both Likert items on a 4-point scale and open-ended items. Develop a plan for analyzing these data and for reporting the results to the Board of Education.

Theory and Foundation

Part II.A will cover coursework related to the Theory and Foundation of Instructional Leadership. This section will cover coursework specifically related to ED 800: Foundations of Instructional Leadership, ED 801: Group Leadership, Group Processes, and Team Building in Education, and ED 821 Leadership Assessment and Development.

Suggested Bibliography:

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Optional Texts:

Covey, S. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Covey, S. (2004). *The eighth habit of highly effective people*. New York: Free Press.

Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2000) *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Gabriel, J. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gardner, H. (2004). *Changing minds*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Kohn, A. (1999). *The schools our children deserve*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Littky, D., & Grabelle, S. (2004). *The big picture: Education is everyone's business*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

MacGregor Burns, J. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York: Grove Press.

Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Alexandria: VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maslow, A. H. (1998). *Maslow on management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Maxwell, J. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson.

Peters, T. (1999). *The circle of innovation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Senge, P. M. (1999) *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Snowden, P. & Gorton, R. (2002). *School leadership and administration* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Welch, J. & Welch, S. (2005). *Winning*. New York: Harper Collins Publishing.

Note: Also review all course notes and handouts.

Example Items:

1. Based on a review of the literature on organizational change, list several primary factors associated with instructional leaders as “change agents” and explain how these factors help to promulgate successful change in an organization.
2. Instructional leadership may be viewed through various constructs. List several of these constructs and explain how these qualities contribute to the success of an organization (department, school, school district).
3. Increased student achievement is an important outcome in measuring the success of a school and its leadership. Explain how instructional leaders can have a significant impact on this measure.
4. Based on a review of the literature on instructional leadership, compare and contrast two leadership styles, listing the major constructs of each.

Theory and Foundation and Areas of Specialization

Part II.B will cover coursework related to Theory and Foundation and Areas of Specialization related to National Standards, Curriculum, and Improving Student Performance. This section will cover coursework specifically related to ED803: National Standards Current Practices, and Policies in Education, ED804: Learning, Cognition, and Teaching, ED805: Program Administration and Assessment, ED820: Topics in Curriculum and Instruction, ED 898: Curricular Applications of Educational Research, and ED802: Emerging Instructional Technologies.

Suggested Bibliography:

ED803: National Standards Current Practices, and Policies in Education

Berliner, D. C. & Biddle, B.J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis*. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.

ED804: Learning, Cognition, and Teaching

Bruner, J. (1977). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dewey, J. (1991). *How we think*. New York: Prometheus Books.

Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier.

Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning and instruction*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

ED805: Program Administration and Assessment

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Popham, W. J. (1993). *Educational Evaluation*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Standards for educational and psychological testing. (1985). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

ED820: Topics in Curriculum and Instruction

Peter F. Oliva, P. F. (2005). *Developing the curriculum* (6th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Joyce, B. R., Weil, M., & Calhoun E. (2004). *Models of teaching* (7th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.

ED802: Emerging Instructional Technologies

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S. E., Albright, M. J., & Zvacek, S. (2003). *Teaching and learning at a distance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill Education/Prentice Hall.

Hirschbuhl, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Annual editions: Computers in education* (11th ed.) Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers.

Online References:

National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers

http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_stands.html

Connecticut Content Standards <http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dtl/curriculum/index.htm>

New York Content Standards <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/Documents/corecurr.htm>

Marzano Eight Thinking Skills <http://edservices.aea7.k12.ia.us/framework/thinking/>

Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences (8)
www.thomasarmstrong.com/multiple_intelligences.htm

Note: Also review all course notes and handouts.

Example Items:

1. Select an instructional model and critique the model based on its underlying theory and related research.
2. Locate a publication that reports improvement in student learning. Provide a critique of this report using both expected standards for the domain and the outcomes documented by the report.
3. Compare and contrast two theories of instruction.
4. You are a mentor for a new colleague. One of your responsibilities is to provide assistance for improving your charge's instructional strategies. He asks you for help with classroom management techniques. Describe how you would help him to implement a personal professional development plan for assisting with this issue.
5. A teacher has implemented an action research project in her classroom. Using an article about a report of an action research project, be a "critical friend" and provide feedback based on her investigation.

Areas of Specialization

Part II.C will cover coursework related to Areas of Specialization, specifically related to ED822: Talent Development Across the Curriculum, ED823: Models of Creative Thinking, and ED824: Diversity Issues in Schools.

Suggested Bibliography:

ED822: Talent Development Across the Curriculum

Heacox, D. (2002). *Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom*. Minneapolis, MN: Freespirit Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.) (2003). *Definitions and conceptions of giftedness*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.

Sternberg, R. J., & Davidson, J. E. (1986). *Conceptions of giftedness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Optional Texts:

Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Reis, S. M., Burns, D. E., & Renzulli, J. S. (1992). *Curriculum compacting*. Mansfield, Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1985). *The schoolwide enrichment model: A comprehensive plan for educational excellence*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1994). *Schools for talent development: A practical plan for total school improvement*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

ED823: Models of Creative Thinking

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Optional Texts:

Osborn, A. F. (1957). *Applied imagination*. New York: Charles Scribner's & Sons.

Sternberg, R. J., Grigorenko, E., Singer, J. L. (2004). *From potential to realization*. Washington, DC: APA Books.

ED824: Diversity Issues in Schools

Delpit, L. & Dowdy, J. K. (Eds.) (2002). *The skin that we speak*. New York: The New Press.

Jones, R. L. (Ed.). (1991). *Black psychology*. Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry Publishers.

Neisser, U. (Ed.).(1986). *The school achievement of minority children*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Padilla, A. M., Fairchild, H. H. & Valadez, C. M. (Eds.). (1990). *Bilingual education*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Note: Also review all course notes and handouts.

Example Items:

1. Describe and support your perspective of talent development. Describe how this plan integrates with a specific set of standards in your district's curriculum.
2. Outline a professional development plan for implementing creative thinking across the curriculum at a particular grade level.
3. Describe ways that creative thinking supports diversity in schools.
4. The school board has asked you to review an educational model for differentiating the curriculum. Select a model and provide a critique.
5. Describe how you will review standards for instructional technology across your school and district curriculum.

Results of Comprehensive Exam, July 22 and 29, 2006

Part I Quant.	Comments	Part I Qual.	Comments	Part II Q1	Part II Q2	Part II Q3	Comments	Part II Reflection on Original Leadership Plan	Sum	Mean	Outcome
1.00	Redo/revise	4.00		3.00	2.00	4.00		4.00	18.00	3.00	Redo Part I Quant. (completed 8/31/06) Pass
3.00		4.00		4.00	3.00	1.00	Redo/revise	3.00	18.00	3.00	Redo Part II Q3 (completed 9/5/06) Pass
4.00		3.00		4.00	2.00	4.00		3.00	20.00	3.33	Pass
4.00		4.00		3.00	2.00	3.00		4.00	20.00	3.33	Pass
4.00		4.00		4.00	2.00	4.00		3.00	21.00	3.50	High Pass
4.00		4.00		4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	23.00	3.83	High Pass
3.00		3.00		3.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	20.00	3.33	Pass
2.00	conference	2.00	conference	3.00	2.00	3.00		3.50	15.50	2.58	Pass; Conference with Delcourt and Cordy
1.00	Redo/revise	4.00		3.00	3.00	2.00		4.00	17.00	2.83	Redo Part I Quant. (completed 9/5/06) Pass
2.50	conference	3.00		4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	20.50	3.42	Pass; Conference with Delcourt
4.00		4.00		4.00	4.00	3.00		4.00	23.00	3.83	High Pass

Part I Quant.	Comments	Part I Qual.	Comments	Part II Q1	Part II Q2	Part II Q3	Comments	Part II Reflection on Original Leadership Plan	Sum	Mean	Outcome
4.00		4.00		4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	23.00	3.83	High Pass
3.50		3.00		4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	21.50	3.58	High Pass
2.50	conference	4.00		4.00	2.00	4.00		4.00	20.50	3.42	Pass; Conference with Delcourt
3.00		4.00		3.00	3.00	3.00		4.00	20.00	3.33	Pass
3.50		4.00		3.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	20.50	3.42	Pass
4.00		4.00		3.00	2.00	3.00		4.00	20.00	3.33	Pass
3.00		3.00		4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	21.00	3.50	High Pass
3.00		4.00		3.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	19.00	3.17	Pass
2.50	conference?	2.00		3.00	2.00	3.00		3.00	15.50	2.58	Pass; Conference with Delcourt
3.00		3.00		4.00	2.00	1.00	Redo/revise	3.00	16.00	2.67	Redo Part II Q3 (completed 9/10/06) Pass
4.00		4.00		3.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	21.00	3.50	High Pass
3.11		3.55		3.50	2.64	3.32		3.61	19.73	3.29	