

# Assessment Plan

2019-20



## Program (COE) - Doctor of Education

**University Mission:** George Fox University, a Christ-centered community, prepares students spiritually, academically, and professionally to think with clarity, act with integrity, and serve with passion.

**Program Mission:** To support and develop professionals - administrators, faculty, staff, and students alike - to think critically, transform practice, and promote justice in P-16 environments and beyond.

**Alignment With GFU Mission:** The George Fox School of Education builds upon a genuinely experiential Christian faith foundation and emphasizes a Transformative Model that focuses on the integration of faith, learning, and living based on a Christ-centered worldview.

**Degree Outcomes:**

- Reflect critically and ethically on matters of equity and social justice in educational settings
- Collaborate to solve educational problems and implement strategic actions that reflect justice for all students and stakeholders
- Apply research-based skills to improve educational practice and student outcomes
- Provide strategic leadership in educational settings
- Analyze and apply research-based learning solutions that support schools and educational settings toward improved practice and student outcomes

**Assessment Lead:** Dane Joseph

## Outcome: Admissions Checkpoint

Student readiness for doctoral program

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Admissions Evaluation

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

### Assessment Tools

#### Survey - 1. Admissions File Review Feedback Form

The admissions checkpoint summarizes data from the department's admissions file reviews as well as the interview day reviews. For both reviews, faculty participate in teams to review the candidates' files, determine and select individuals to participate in two (2) on-campus interview dates, and rate perceptions of these interviews on several dimensions.

##### Admissions File Reviews

Each candidate's admissions file was reviewed by a team of faculty and rated on several constructs, including candidates': writing ability; leadership experience; depth of research experience; educational experience; recommendations from others; and overall perception. Additional notes and questions for the department/candidate are included in the review questionnaire. The constructs are rated on a variety of Likert-type scales ranging from "very weak" to "strong" assessments of the candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities.

#### 2. Admissions Interview Day Feedback Form

After candidates attend an invited interview session, they are rated on several constructs, including their: collaborative orientation; motivation to complete the program; mission fit; verbal communication abilities; perceived demonstrative leadership skills; and overall perception. Additional qualitative notes are made and shared with the department at a follow-up meeting. The constructs are rated on a variety of Likert-type scales ranging from "very weak" to "strong" assessments of the candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities. (Active)

**Target:** Faculty Agreement on at least 70% of ratings for individual applicants

**Schedule for Data Collection:** Bi-annually (November and April)

**Schedule for Data Analysis & Reporting:** Annually (May)

# Program (COE) - Doctor of Education

## Outcome: Yearly Progress Checkpoint

Yearly CGPA and Satisfactory Progress towards Degree Completion

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Core Theme #1: Liberal Arts Foundation, Core Theme #2: Professional Preparation

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

### Assessment Tools

**Presentation/Performance** - 1. Student yearly progress is assessed via their cumulative grade point average (CGPA) from departmental coursework. While the department recognizes that GPA is at best a moderate proxy variable for achievement, it is nevertheless included in many research and assessment studies, as well as here. (1.1).

2. Satisfactory progress is assessed by the proportion of students who leave the program per year as compared to those who make continuous satisfactory progress towards degree completion. (1.1, 1.2)

3. 100% attendance at summer colloquiums involving guest-educational speakers and professional activities. (1.2, 1.3). (Active)

**Target:** 1. At least a 3.0 for individuals (to continue in program)

2. No more than 10% dropout or leave-of-absence.

**Schedule for Data Collection:** Annually (April)

**Schedule for Data Analysis & Reporting:** Annually (May)

## Outcome: End-of-Coursework Checkpoint

Student readiness to independently conduct a research study

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Core Theme #2: Professional Preparation

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

### Assessment Tools

**Writing Assignment** - 1. Precis Proposal

The dissertation is a commonplace culminating capstone project in the vast majority of doctoral programs – research or professional degree-wise. Proposing a strong study that is theoretically and conceptually grounded, has an appropriate methodological plan, and is scholar-practitioner oriented is a cornerstone of the doctoral degree. The department believes that dissertation success exemplifies the program's commitment and ability to prepare grounded scholar-practitioners within the educational subfields of instructional design and delivery, higher education, as well as K-12 administration. The dissertation checkpoint consists of three (3) major sub-checkpoints: a précis proposal; a dissertation proposal; and a dissertation defense. The précis proposal is holistically assessed by the committee as a pass/no pass in which the candidate receives detailed feedback on a 10-12-page proposal to use in building a 50+ page proposal to be defended in front of a committee. (2.1). (Active)

**Target:** 1. At least 80% of students with a "Pass" within 1 semester post-coursework.

2. At least 80% of students with a successful précis proposal AND dissertation proposal defense within one calendar year post-coursework.

**Schedule for Data Collection:** Annually (May)

**Schedule for Data Analysis & Reporting:** Annually (May)

## Outcome: Dissertation

# Program (COE) - Doctor of Education

Student application of research to produce successful scholar-practitioner dissertation

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Core Theme #2: Professional Preparation, Core Theme #4: Local & Global Engagement

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

## Assessment Tools

### Capstone Assignment - 1. Dissertation Proposal Rubric

The dissertation proposal is assessed on several constructs, among them: a clear and established framework; a literature-driven statement of a problem; a clear purpose of the study; well-worded and answerable research questions; a theoretical framework; a definition of terms; inclusion of necessary limitations and if necessary, delimitations; candidate leadership on the issue; a comprehensive literature review; a well-organized and written literature review; description of relevance in the literature review; synthesis in the literature review; educational importance within the literature review; appropriate methods for the research questions; relationship between the methods and the scholarship area; sufficient sampling demographic details; sufficient sampling plan; potential for successful outcomes; reliability/validity/trustworthiness discussion; an overall assessment; and qualitative feedback. (2.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

### 2. Final Dissertation Defense Rubric

The final dissertation document made available for defense is assessed primarily on candidate (and document) growth from the dissertation proposal to the defense stage, including constructs such as: clear explanation of results through graphical means; themes and results directly explanatory of the study's proposed research questions; quality of the data; proper insights and limitations; reflection of the results with respect to the literature review; relevance of results to the educational field; appropriate implications; containment of appropriate suggestions for future research; overall clarity in voice; and overall summative assessment of the work. (2.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). (Active)

**Target:** 1. Faculty Agreement on at least 80% of the individual ratings for both proposal and final defense.

2. At least 80% of ratings at or above 'acceptable' levels for each category.

**Schedule for Data Collection:** Annually (May)

**Schedule for Data Analysis & Reporting:** Annually (May)

## Outcome: End-of-Program

Successful graduation in 3 to 5 years

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Core Theme #2: Professional Preparation, Core Theme #4: Local & Global Engagement

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

## Assessment Tools

### Portfolio Review - Exit Survey and Interview (Active)

**Target:** 1. At least 90% applicable cohort with successful graduation in 3 to 4 years. (2.1).

2. Qualitative indications of success from survey feedback. (4.2, 4.3).

**Schedule for Data Collection:** Annually (May)

**Schedule for Data Analysis & Reporting:** Annually (May)

## Outcome: Program Quality

Continuous faculty study of program delivery

**Outcome Status:** Active

**OutcomeType:** Core Theme #2: Professional Preparation, Core Theme #4: Local & Global Engagement

# Program (COE) - Doctor of Education

---

**Start Date:** 07/01/2016

## *Assessment Tools*

<b>Presentation/Performance</b> - Online Course Evaluations (Active)
<b>Target:</b> Department scores at or above university scores <b>Schedule for Data Collection:</b> Annually (May) <b>Schedule for Data Analysis &amp; Reporting:</b> Annually (May)