

Filter by: [Objective](#)

Online Assessment Tracking Database

Filter by: [Objective](#)[Change Period](#)[Models](#)[Reports](#)[Administration](#)[Parents & Children](#)[Help](#) [Logout](#)

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2010 - 2011

Educational Leadership EDD

[View & Request Level Feedback](#)

Add New: [Goal](#) [Objective](#) [Indicator](#) [Criterion](#) [Finding](#) [Action](#)

GOAL: Competence In Field Of Educational Leadership

Objective	Development Of Knowledge And Skills In Educational Leadership Doctoral students in Educational Leadership will develop knowledge, skills, and success in educational leadership fields
Indicator	Research Proposal Doctoral students in educational leadership will develop a proposal for dissertation research
Criterion	Proposal Quality At least 75% of currently enrolled doctoral students will present a proposal with the first three chapters complete, including introduction, literature review, and methodology
Finding	Successful Proposal Defenses During the 2010 academic year, 24 Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership students successfully defended dissertation proposals. During the same year, 36 students were enrolled in dissertation courses that had not successfully defended a proposal. This indicates that 66.67% of the students enrolled in proposal writing successfully defended a proposal in 2010. This rate of completion falls below the program standard. The Doctoral Council has implemented a new advisory process utilizing "major advisers" and assigned from the students first day of study instead of having one adviser for all students during the first two years of study. Additionally, a Research Competency Plan has been developed for each first year student under the direction of the major advisor. These changes should address this weakness by allowing the student to begin thinking about and working with their major advisor sooner in the process. Additionally, the Research Competency Plan will provide the student opportunities to work through the same research study process with their adviser before having to complete it on the dissertation.
Indicator	Comprehensive Examinations Passing scores on comprehensive examinations
Criterion	Comprehensive Examinations Students will successfully complete comprehensive exams at the end of core coursework. Written comprehensive examinations are developed by faculty and are administered in two parts: (a) a take home exam, completed over a one month time period, that focuses on application of research methods and statistics; and (b) an all day written examination completed on campus that focuses on the application of theory and synthesis of learning. Examinations are scored holistically as pass or fail and are scored by six faculty members. After successfully passing all six questions, students must participate in an oral comprehensive examination with three of their dissertation committee members. During the oral examinations,

students must demonstrate their fulfillment and mastery of the doctoral program objectives and competencies. Forms used to document student completion of these examinations are included. Patterns across students' passing or failing responses are analyzed to indicate strengths and/or areas of need within the doctoral coursework and program.

Finding

Comprehensive Exam Results

During the 2010 academic year, 72.2% (13 of 18) of doctoral students taking comprehensive exams passed all parts on the initial attempt. Three of the students who did not pass all parts of the initial exam passed the one part upon second attempt. One other student was able to also successfully complete the exam (who failed more than one part on the initial attempt) resulting in 17 of the 18 initial exam takers in 2010 passing comprehensive exams and reflecting an overall 94.4% passing rate for 2010.

Additionally, review data indicated that program curriculum changes implemented when the doctoral program went to 60 semester credit hours had not been adequately reflected in the comprehensive exams. Specifically, content added when the curriculum was retooled needs to be integrated into the comprehensive exam. During the 2011-2012 year, the Doctoral Council will review the comprehensive exam in order to 1) align to the 60 semester hour program and applicable program and NCATE standards; 2) Further integrate the comprehensive examination question across course content; and 3) reflect input provided by the program survey conducted in 2010 and advisory council feedback.

Actions for Objective:

Action

Comprehensive Exam Review/Revisions

In the coming year, the Educational Leadership Doctoral Council will review and revise the Comprehensive Exams to insure they reflect current program expectations and outcomes.

GOAL: Quality And Effectiveness

Objective

Student Scholarship

During the doctoral program, all students will develop the skills needed to submit one article for publication and one paper for presentation at a research conference, both to be externally reviewed. (Papers may be submitted for publication or presentation in cooperation with doctoral faculty.) Assessment of students' knowledge will be based upon acceptance of the paper by the journal or conference.

Indicator

Correspondence With Journal Editors And/or Conference Planners

Feedback from journal editors and/or conference planners related to

the quality of article and proposal submissions

Criterion

Positive Feedback Related To Publication Or Presentation

Positive feedback leading to the acceptance of a journal article or conference proposal

Finding

Doctoral Student Accomplishments In Presentations And Publications

During the 2010 academic year, the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership students demonstrated stellar accomplishments in academic presentations and peer-reviewed publications. Specifically, 39 doctoral students participated in 48 conference presentations and 37 doctoral students participated in 50 peer-reviewed publications as documented by the faculty.

Data also indicates that most of the scholarly productivity of students was mentored from the same six doctoral faculty. With the many talents of the faculty, students will benefit from such mentoring and collaborations involving all doctoral faculty. Each doctoral faculty member has now been assigned the role of Major Adviser in an effort to increase the scholarly productivity of doctoral student particularly through the Research Competency Plan requirements. The Plan will also provide students the opportunity to connect theory to practice while demonstrating effective research design and methods.

Actions for Objective:

Action

Major Advisers

During the 2010-2011 year, the Doctoral Council began implementing Major Advisers coupled with a Residency Plan for each first and second year student that should provide more opportunities and expectations for doctoral students to engage in supervised scholarship activities.

The 2010-2011 year produced a great deal of data for program improvement and review. A comprehensive survey was conducted of doctoral students (current and alumni) and the faculty met with the Doctoral Advisory Council. Data from these two sources will substantially inform continued program review during 2011-2012.

Closing the Loops Summary

In 2010, a comprehensive survey was done of current and alumni doctoral students. Additionally, the faculty met with the Doctoral Advisory Council for formal feedback on course content, competitiveness, relevance and rigor. Course instruction in statistics and leadership theory for doctoral students in educational leadership will include practice and feedback similar to what students will be expected to successfully demonstrate on their comprehensive exams. Patterns of weaknesses in student responses that appeared on comprehensive exams continue and will be addressed in courses in order to prevent similar responses on future exams. Specifically, students will be asked to design educational studies that utilize appropriate statistical methods. They will also be required to connect theory and practice in the context of leadership theory. Doctoral students will also receive additional instruction related to skills for successful manuscript and proposal development and will be assigned a faculty mentor who will assist with effective strategies for presenting and publishing scholarly research. The program,

in making the decision to assign individual Major Advisors in the first year of study, should provide new opportunities for students to connect theory and practice, engage in the dissertation process earlier and benefit from quality mentoring each phase of study.

The 2011-2012 year will yield a review of comprehensive exams to insure alignment and relevance as well as the Doctoral Council disaggregating data from the before mentioned sources. The outcome of that review will identity additional strengths and weaknesses that will also inform program improvements.

[Jump to Top](#)

Sam Houston State University | Huntsville, TX 77341 | (936) 294-1111 | 1-866-BEARKAT