

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW: MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION (MSEDAD) AND/OR PRELIMINARY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL (PASC)

Program Overview

People who apply to this master's program are working in preschool or K-12 settings as teachers or other professionals who possess a California teaching or services credential. They also want to develop their skills as educational leaders. Our degree courses are designed to apply toward the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) so that, at the end of the program, graduates can have both the M.S. in Educational Leadership and Administration as well as the PASC.

I. Department/Program Mission, Goals and Environment

A. Briefly describe the mission and goals of the unit and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the University mission, goals, and strategies.

MISSION

We help leaders disrupt and transform educational systems so that all students, particularly those who have been marginalized in schools and society, can engage fully in the benefits of education.

VISION

An educational system that is just, equitable, and inclusive.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Our students/graduates will be school leaders who are...

1. Learning-Centered
2. Change Partners
3. Organizational Leaders
4. Community-Centered Leaders
5. Relationship Builders
6. Anti-Racist Advocates
7. Reflective Thinkers

Outcome Definitions

- **Learning-Centered.** Learning leaders center critical consciousness and sociopolitical action in their work. They draw on a range of asset-based frameworks and use varied and often underutilized data sources (e.g. community cultural wealth (CCW), street data) to design, support, and enhance robust learning experiences for and with students, teachers, staff, and their communities.
- **Change Partners.** Change partners leverage continuous improvement approaches to understand, disrupt, and enact meaningful organizational change bidirectionally and inclusively with their community and educational partners.
- **Organizational Leaders.** Organizational leaders drive improvement in learning systems by creating a shared vision, shared power, team learning, and developing leadership capacity through culturally and linguistically relevant strategies.
- **Community-Centered Leaders.** Community-centered leaders support students, teachers, and the community by integrating community assets, cultural diversity, and history into all aspects of their leadership practice and co-building and sustaining mutually beneficial partnerships with the community, beyond institutionalized spaces.
- **Relationship Builders.** Relationship Builders develop, foster, and sustain empowering relationships with the school community. They have knowledge of the structures, protocols, and tools for bringing partners together and communicating in a way that is culturally responsive and inclusive.
- **Anti-Racist Advocates.** Anti-Racist Advocates actively seek and make changes that disrupt and re-shape systems perpetuating racial and other inequities and building systems of justice. They affirm and empower educational partners to harness the resources needed to navigate and dismantle an unjust world with empathy, savvy, and agency to create an educational system that is just, equitable, and inclusive.
- **Reflective Thinkers.** Reflective thinkers connect learning and create processes that facilitate authentic, vulnerable inquiry at the personal, team, and organizational levels. This includes active, persistent, participatory reflection on one's positionality including thinking rigorously about your recent/past experiences that speak to informing your next steps and your next actions.

Alignment with University Mission & Goals

The program objectives align well with the current University mission (<https://planning.fullerton.edu/>) . In particular, we strive to create “dynamic inclusivity, and social responsibility. Rooted in the strength of our diversity” and to help shape the next generation of leaders.

In addition, The University is guided by its recently ratified Strategic Plan whose values include Student Success, Faculty and Staff success, Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion, Scholarly & Creative Activities, Shared Governance, and Civic and Community Engagement (<https://planning.fullerton.edu/>). We believe our program in particular strives to promote student success and to do so in way that supports and celebrates diversity, equity and inclusion, and just as importantly, ensures that our students are able to promote these same values in the educational settings in which they will be employed.

CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS (CAPE)

Every course workload and assignments are aligned to CAPEs to ensure our graduates become effective educational leaders that strive for educational opportunities that are driven by equity and culturally responsive practices. More so, our graduates are to recognize, respect,

and utilize their strengths, experiences, and background as assets for teaching, learning, and leadership. Effective educational leaders confront and alter institutional biases of student marginalization, deficit-based schooling, and low expectations. The following CAPEs are integrated throughout the MSEDAD/PASC coursework:

CAPE 1: Development and Implementation of a Shared Vision: Education leaders facilitate the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning and growth of all students

CAPE 2: Instructional Leadership: Education leaders shape a collaborative culture of teaching and learning informed by professional standards and focused on student and professional growth.

CAPE 3: Management and Learning Environment: Education leaders manage the organization to cultivate a safe and productive learning and working environment.

CAPE 4: Family and Community Engagement: Education leaders collaborate with families and other stakeholders to address diverse student and community interests and mobilize community resources.

CAPE 5: Ethics and Integrity: Education leaders make decisions, model, and behave in ways that demonstrate professionalism, ethics, integrity, justice, and equity and hold staff to the same standard.

CAPE 6: External Context and Policy: Education leaders influence political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education to improve education policies and practices.

B. Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify the external factors that impact the program (e.g., community/regional needs, placement, and graduate/professional school).

The program shifted curriculum in 2018 in two ways. First, the faculty worked to restructure the series of courses to be more intentional about the department's mission in disrupting and transforming schools towards a more social justice centered education; all in a hybrid model. Second, the California Department of Education (CDE) began the implementation of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) as a requisite in obtaining the Preliminary Administrator Services Credential. The Assessment is composed of three different cycles described below:

CalAPA Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity

CalAPA Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice

CalAPA Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth

In turn, the Department worked to follow the CDE's guidelines to align the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) which undergird the curriculum of our series, to the implementation of the CalAPA. Our current course work is then aligned to the implementation of the CalAPA through the application of material that is aligned to the CAPEs leveraging material that is driven by tenets of justice, equity, and inclusion.

In terms of external factors impacting the program, to attract more students, the program moved towards full hybrid implementation with three Saturdays of the semester as in-person synchronous days while the rest of instruction is carried out asynchronously throughout the other 13 weeks. In addition, regarding attracting students, two faculty members started the Leadership Education for Anaheim Union High School District (LEAD) as a collaborative partnership between districts and CSUF. Like the PASC program, courses are collaboratively taught with district administrators as partners at their respective sites. District administrators along with other district senior instructors, teach content with the guidance and support of a CSUF appointed faculty member.

It should be noted that this is the program's first Program Performance Review (PPR), and therefore there are no specific changes related to previous PPR feedback nor previously articulated PPR goals which we would report progress toward.

C. Identify the unit's priorities for the next three (short term) and seven years (long term).

Our priorities for the future are as follows:

Short Term

1. Maintain enrollment of cohorts reflecting a wide range of diversity, inclusive of, but not limited to age, race/ethnicity, ability national origin, citizenship, sexual orientation, gender identification, socioeconomic status, and religion.
2. Increase enrollment numbers in the fall through greater outreach to community partners specifically focusing on local educational agencies that seek to strengthen their pipeline from classroom to administration.
3. Increase partnerships with local educational agencies like LEAD in efforts to increase enrollment. LEAD is an extension of MSEDAD/PASC with local district partners. There are two faculty that lead the work with local partners and the department is seeking ways to expand the work with local educational agencies towards collaborating with current teachers that will seek out to obtain a preliminary administrative services credential.

Longer Term

4. Add an undergraduate course connected to educational leadership also in efforts to increase enrollment numbers.
5. Create a virtual mentor retreat for all the students in PASC in efforts to strengthen the scope of work candidates must complete in relationship to fieldwork with their designated mentors.

D. If there are programs offered in a Special Session self-support mode, describe how these programs are included in the mission, goals and priorities of the department/program (e.g., new student groups regionally, nationally, internationally, new delivery modes, etc.).

The only program offered in special session is for students that have completed all the graduation requirements for the master's in education administration but have not completed all the requirements towards the preliminary administrative services credential specifically passing scores of the CalAPA. Students who have not passed the CalAPA get an additional semester to work with the CalAPA Coordinator to establish a plan of action towards successful completion of the assessment. Students yet to complete the assessment after the additional semester are required to enroll in a CSUF extension course.

II. Department/Program Description and Analysis

A. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs and new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review. Have any programs been discontinued?

As stated above, the only curricular changes took place in 2018 to address the new hybrid model of instruction and alignment to the CalAPA.

B. Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g., identify required courses, how many units of electives, expected modalities of courses in the program) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements and alignment of the requirements with the department resources. In particular, please discuss how the curriculum and/or programming reflects the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) or future revisions the program plans to make to address DEI in the curriculum.

Students need to complete 24 instructional units towards PASC and an additional 6 units to complete the Master in Educational Administration. The following is the series for students enrolled in Fall Semester:

MSEDAD + PASC Course Sequence		
<i>Semester</i>	<i>Course Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
Fall (Semester 1)	EDAD 505 A: P12 Instructional Leadership and Assessment A (3 Units)	Approaches for advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and professional growth.
	EDAD 593: Foundations of Leadership through Equity in P-12 Schools (3)	This course will introduce conceptual underpinnings of program and examine theoretical frameworks, research methods, and contemporary educational problems that help school leaders promote just and equitable education for all students.
Spring (Semester 2)	EDAD 510 - Instructional Leadership and Assessment B (3)	Use data and inquiry methods to assess students' learning and instructional practices. Apply data analysis to determine interventions and assess impact.
	EDAD 566 - Community Engagement for School Leaders	Role of the school leader in engaging community and family stakeholders to transform schools and communities. Identifying and incorporating community and familial needs/resources in the vision of the school. Leadership, reflective practice, human relations, school leader's role in community outreach.
Summer (Semester 3)	EDAD 503A - Organizational Leadership and Management A	Introduces organizational frameworks to understand schools and leaders' roles in bringing about change in schools. Techniques used to guide, motivate, delegate, build consensus and lead others in the achievement of goals and vision.
	EDAD 561 - Political Leadership	Education policies and implementation strategies that influence policymaking and advance the community's understanding of

		education policy and its impact on student learning. The role of leaders in advocating for students in policy implementation and advocacy.
Fall (Semester 4)	EDAD 504 - Organizational Leadership and Management B	Use organizational theory and leadership studies to understand and bring about change in schools. Organization, structure and cultural context of schools, and study techniques used to develop, build consensus, lead others and implement shared vision and goals.
	EDAD 567 - Fieldwork	Directed fieldwork in administrative areas in school.
Spring (Semester 5)	EDAD 597 - Project	Design and carry out an authentic research project at fieldwork school site. Connections between theory and evidence-based practice. Builds on EDAD 505A and extends learning from directed EDAD 567 fieldwork administrative experiences.

The logic model behind the structure of these courses is aligned to the College of Educations Justice, Equity, and Inclusive Education and the scope of the CalAPA exam. The course structure is aimed at providing students with

1. Broad yet relevant topics regarding education, education policy, leadership, and other social challenges including economics, housing, and health
2. A clear structure around school administrators as instructional leaders specifically focusing on how they support teachers through and with a Just, Equitable, and Inclusive Education (JEIE) lens
3. Understanding of community needs which aligns to the current community and schools leadership tracks taking place at local educational agencies throughout the state
4. The internal structures of schools and school districts emphasizing human resources, educational law, finance, and politics
5. Deep understanding of fieldwork with support from a credentialed mentor throughout each of the classes and potentially implemented as a Master's thesis

The courses are closely aligned to the California Administrator Performance Assessment so as to prepare the students to successfully submit and complete the additional requirement towards the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

C. Using data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to discuss student demand for the unit's offerings. Discuss topics such as over/under enrollment (applications, admissions, and enrollments), retention, graduation rates for majors (FTF and transfer), and time to degree. Address equity gaps in retention and graduation rates (see instructions, Appendices A and B).

Enrollment Trends & Headcount

MSEDAD/PASC program has had a steady number of interested applicants for the fall over the seven years. Over the years, except for 2017 and 2018, the number of students enrolled is not far from the number of students that originally applied. One potential reason for the drop is the implementation of the CalAPA exam. Before 2018, the exam had no direct consequence on student progress given it was not a full requirement towards candidates receiving their preliminary credential. In 2019, successful completion of the exam became a requirement towards obtaining preliminary credentials. The implementation of the exam unfortunately coincided with the Covid-19 Pandemic which also reduced our numbers.

During distance learning, the California Department of Education provided a fee waiver for the CalAPA and the he California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE) which is the other option for students to obtain their credentials. The CPACE is designed to assess candidates planning a career in school administration and comprised of two components: CPACE-Content and CPACE-Performance.

An individual seeking PASC can do it in one of two ways: enrolling in a program and taking the CalAPA or just taking the CPACE. In lieu of taking a program that requires students to take the CalAPA and pay tuition, educators could just take the CPACE and obtain their credentials. During the fee waiver offered to students by the state, candidates could forgo enrolling in a program and take the CPACE for free.

It is unclear the impact these waiver changes at the state level had in terms of our enrollment numbers. It is important that our spring cohorts have decreased in size. Starting in 2024, the department decided on not having a spring cohort for the first time.

It's also important to note that LEAD programing is not reflected here. The partnership in Anaheim had led to increased numbers of applicants along with students enrolled.

Please See Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix B for detailed application, admission, enrollment and FTES trends by academic year.

Graduation Rates

2-year graduation rates have varied quite dramatically over the last several cohorts, ranging between 52% and 85.7%. 3-year graduation rates have been a bit more consistent cohort by cohort, ranging between 68.8% and 86.7% over the last several cohorts. It is unclear why there is such cohort-to-cohort variation, and low and high points do not correspond to identifiable factors. However, it should be noted the typical size of the cohorts, even small changes in the absolute numbers can produce significant changes in the percentages.

Please See Tables 7 and 8 for overall graduation rates and total degrees awarded, respectively.

Regarding equity gaps in graduation rates, a comparison of recent cohorts disaggregated by under-represented status shows a varied and inconsistent picture. For example, the Fall 2016 and Fall 2017 cohorts were characterized by higher graduation rates for students classified as Under-Represented, whereas more recent cohorts found the reverse. A similar picture emerged when disaggregating by gender, with some cohorts indicating higher graduation rates for women and others for men,

Please See Tables 9 and 10 for 2-year graduation rates disaggregated by Under-Represented Status and Gender, respectively.

D. Discuss the unit's enrollment trends since the last program review based on enrollment targets (FTES), faculty allocation, and student faculty ratios. For graduate programs, comment on whether there is sufficient enrollment to constitute a community of scholars to conduct the program (see instructions, Appendices A and B).

Demand for the MSEDAD Program is steady as demonstrated in the number of applications. In 2017, the program admitted double cohorts of students to help offset the potential shortage of school administrators statewide. In 2023, due to a decline in applications consistent with challenges stemming from the pandemic and implementation of standardized assessments, spring cohorts will stop for the foreseeable future. With changes in the assessments (CPACE has become harder to pass as the state prefers students enrol in a program and take the CalAPA due to its central alignment to equity measures), there is potential for renewed growth as students must enroll in a program to take the CalAPA. Requirements for a preliminary administrative services credential ask that students be associated with an institution (i.e. CSUF) and successfully past the CalAPA exam.

The size of the current cohorts of MSEDAD/PASC students is sufficient to constitute a community of scholars. Over the years MSEDAD has had strong percentages in terms of graduation rates with the exception of the pandemic years.

Please See Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix B for detailed application, admission, enrollment and FTES trends by academic year.

E. Describe any plans for curricular changes in the short (three-year) and long (seven-year) term, such as expansions, contractions, or discontinuances. Relate these plans to the priorities described above in section I. C (unit's future priorities).

MSEDAD/PASC has no foreseeable plans in either the short or long run unless there are changes statewide that have to deal with the CalAPA assessments. In terms of curriculum, there is potential to make curricular changes that strengthen the work already taking place specifically around Equity, Justice, and Inclusion.

F. Include information on any Special Sessions self-support programs the department/program offers.

N/A

III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The review should address how the program ensures high-quality learning using relevant indicators and analyses, and how these analyses can facilitate continuous improvement.

Please provide information on the following aspects, and if applicable, please include relevant documents in the appendices.

A. Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g., general approach, timetable, etc.) and structure (e.g., committee, coordinator, etc.), and if applicable, how the plan and/or structure have changed since the last PRP.

Assessment activities follow a system whereby responsibilities are split between college-level infrastructure and support provided by the Dean's Office, and program level activity supervised by faculty. Dr. Rohanna Ylagan-Nicanor serves as Director of Accreditation and Assessment and Grace Nguyen serves as Research and Data Analyst. Both provide critical support in organizing key components of program assessment out of the Dean's Office. At the program level, the Department Chair and Program Coordinator also oversee assessment activities and help to generate annual assessment reports which are uploaded each November 15th to the campus's AMS site, as directed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

One key change from the last PPR was the creation of a standing department level Assessment Committee composed of faculty members from across the programs (including our Masters in Higher Education) to work on revising the assessment process on the program side.

B. For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.

All candidates are assessed using a signature assignment embedded in a particular course as well as scored components of the Masters Project. Enrolled candidates (identified at midpoint in the program) are invited via email to complete the inventory. Passing criteria for assignments are included on each rubric used for scoring. Survey scales are identified on the survey instrument.

Program SLOs are as follows:

SLO-01: Learning Centered

Learning leaders center critical consciousness and sociopolitical action in their work. They draw on a range of asset-based frameworks and use varied and often underutilized data sources (e.g. community cultural wealth (CCW), street data) to design, support, and enhance robust learning experiences for and with students, teachers, staff, and their communities.

SLO-02: Change Partners

Change partners leverage continuous improvement approaches to understand, disrupt, and enact meaningful organizational change bidirectionally and inclusively with their community and educational partners.

SLO-03: Organizational Leaders

Organizational leaders drive improvement in learning systems by creating a shared vision, shared power, team learning, and developing leadership capacity through culturally and linguistically relevant strategies.

SLO-04: Community-Centered Leaders

Community-centered leaders support students, teachers, and the community by integrating community assets, cultural diversity, and history into all aspects of their leadership practice and co-building and sustaining mutually beneficial partnerships with the community, beyond institutionalized spaces.

SLO-05: Relationship Builders

Relationship Builders develop, foster, and sustain empowering relationships with the school community. They have knowledge of the structures, protocols, and tools for bringing partners together and communicating in a way that is culturally responsive and inclusive.

SLO-06: Anti-Racist Policy Advocates

Anti-Racist Policy Advocates actively seek and make changes that disrupt and re-shape systems perpetuating racial and other inequities and building systems of justice. They affirm and empower educational partners to harness the resources needed to navigate and dismantle an unjust world with empathy, savvy, and agency to create an educational system that is just, equitable, and inclusive.

SLO-07: Reflective Thinkers

Reflective thinkers connect learning and create processes that facilitate authentic, vulnerable inquiry at the personal, team, and organizational levels. This includes active, persistent, participatory reflection on one's positionality including thinking rigorously about your recent/past experiences that speak to informing your next steps and your next actions.

Assessment Results: Overall, students have consistently met or exceeded expectations (based on direct measures of the program's SLOs and pre-determined criteria for success that 90% of assessed students meet the passing standard on the relevant assessment measure embedded in EDAD 593 and/or 597

Recent results from annual assessment cycles are as follows:

Year	SLO Assessed	Result
2021-22	SLO-01, SLO-02	100% met or exceeded on signature assignment in (Diversity Assignment) for both Fall and Spring Cohorts + 100% met or exceeded on MA project. For SLO-02, Exit Survey results also indicated 100% met or exceeded (% Strongly Agreed or Agreed @90% or above) on items specific to the SLOs
2022-23	SLO-02	100% met or exceeded on the signature assignment (Systemic Problem Assignment) for the Fall 22 Cohort and 92% met or exceeded for the Spring 23 cohort. For Exit Survey Results, 100% met or exceeded (% Strongly Agreed or Agreed @90% or above) on items specific to this SLO
2023-24	SLO-06	100% met or exceeded on the relevant components of the MA project, which were relevant to this SLO for the Fall 23 cohort. However, only 80% met or exceeded the criteria for the Spring 2024 cohort. For Exit Survey results, the sample sizes for each cohort were so low (n=1

		and n=4 respectively) that a valid interpretation is difficult to make
--	--	--

Please See Appendix F for samples of a recent Assessment Report and Assessment Assignment Rubric.

C. Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, inform faculty professional development, and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.

Program Improvement Plans for the PASC/MSEDAD Program are framed within the Reach, Teach/Lead, Impact framework. The goal is to bring the Program SLO's further aligned with the COE Conceptual Framework on Impact. In addition, assessments in EDAD 593 and EDAD 597 have been used to amend the syllabi of these courses respectfully to specifically address the COE's conceptual framework. EDAD 593 specifically broadens conversations of equity to leverage the Reach, Teach/Lead, Impact framework. Assignment here pushes students to think deeper on how to critique and dismantle systems of oppression. EDAD 597 pushed those students completing a masters thesis to address the framework head on through a research project. The assessments are accountability levers for the COE and for the department to prepare students to lead. More so, they help the instructors maintain a sense of urgency and awareness towards the societal impact of the envisioned framework.

D. Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of student learning and effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g., number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, community engagement/leadership).

The program's CalAPA pass rate sits at 97%, which is quite high and worthy of highlighting. In addition, the College implements a "year-out" survey of our graduated alumni. A recent set of results conducted in 2023 of our 2021/22 graduates indicated strong endorsement of self-perceived levels of preparation across all indicators. Students reported that they

“agreed” or “strongly agreed” across all 29 indicators of preparation to be Learning Centered”, Change Partners, Organizational Leaders, Community-Centered Leaders, and Relationship Builders in their current positions. One challenge is the low response rate to this (15%) and previous “Year Out” surveys.

Please See Appendix F for a sample Exit Survey and Alumni Year Out Survey

E. Many departments/programs offer courses and programs via technology (e.g., online) or at off-campus sites and in compressed schedules. How are these courses identified, and how is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?

There is no difference in assessment activity by course modality or location (i.e., hybrid within-person and asynchronous online components). Courses are identified for assessment purposes based on the embedded assessment artifact that is deployed in that particular course.

IV. Faculty

A. Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g., new hires, retirements, FERP’s, resignations) and how these changes may have affected the program’s or department’s academic offerings and the department’s long-term goals. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor) [see instructions, Appendix C]. Attach faculty vitae (see Appendix D).

This is the first PPR since the program's inception, therefore there are no "changes" per se'

B. Describe priorities for faculty positions. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline; student enrollment and demographics; the career objectives of students; the planning of the University; and regional, national, or global developments.

Given the desire to expand LEAD-type partnerships with school districts in the region, faculty members with the requisite experience to run these cohorts at district (off campus) sites is critical. An ideal candidate would have experience in leadership preparation with a clear administrative credential.

Students who enter this program are already working in preschool or K-12 settings as teachers or other professionals who possess a California teaching or services credential. These students typically want to develop their skills as educational leaders. Our degree courses are designed to apply toward the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) so that, at the end of the program, graduates can have both the M.S. in Educational Leadership and Administration as well as the PASC.

C. Describe the role of tenure line faculty, lecturers, and graduate/student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty and teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are solely or primarily the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.

Currently the department relies heavily on part-time faculty for instructional purposes. A typical semester's schedule results in about two-thirds of our courses taught by part-time faculty. None of our tenured/tenure track faculty teach exclusively within the MSEDAD program, which is not the case for our other two programs (Doctorate in Education and Masters in Higher Education). In 2018, the program coordinator on record worked to realign the curriculum of all courses to address the California Administrators Performance Expectations (CAPEs) and the CalAPA. Part-time faculty adheres mainly to the CAPEs and aligns their instruction accordingly to. With collaboration to the support of the CalAPA coordinator, faculty also align

some of their assignments to the structure of the assessment. In sum, the responsibilities of Part-time faculty are to teach and in the case of the CalAPA coordinator, to support students as they prepare for the assessment.

D. Include information on instructor participation in Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.

N/A

V. Student Support and Advising

A. Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students and the effectiveness of this advising structure. Describe the support from outside the department that is necessary for students to receive additional information that they need.

Our students receive their primary advising support from our Department Admissions and Academic Advisor, Rachael Amaro. This support begins from application, admission and matriculation process onward through graduation. In addition, our students have access to college level resources, including our Student Success and Community Engagement Specialist, Amir Woods. At the program level, course instructors provide various levels of support typical of instructional faculty, and our Program Coordinator, Dr. Rodolfo Acosta. MSEDAD students also have access to the MSEDAD Community Page on Canvas that houses important program information and the Student Policies Handbook in particular

B. Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities made available and accessible to students? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate any plans the department has for increasing these activities.

N/A

VI. Resources and Facilities

A. Itemize the state support and non-state resources the program/department received during the last seven years (see instructions, Appendix E).

EDAD Operating Budget

Fund	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Dept OE	5500	5500	5500	5500	5500
CCF	1567	1556	4182	4182	Not provided yet
Total:	7067	7056	9682	9682	

B. Identify any special facilities/equipment used by the program/department, such as laboratories, computers, large classrooms, or performance spaces. Identify changes over the last seven years and prioritize needs for the future.

N/A

C. Describe the current library/research resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next seven years, and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.

Jon Cornforth (<https://libraryguides.fullerton.edu/edlead>) is the librarian assigned to MSEDAD

All students are also provided access to OneSearch, whose searchable resources include 29 million books, journals, and articles.

Current, the program does not anticipate the need for any additional library resources

VII. Long-term Plans

A. Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity (see instructions, Appendix F).

MSEDAD's long term plans are to continue efforts to expand the LEAD-type program to other school districts in the region. Currently overtures have begun with the Hacienda Heights and Rowland School districts.

B. Explain how the long-term plan implements the University's mission, goals, and strategies, as well as the unit's mission and goals.

The goal of expanding our program aligns with the mission of the department, college, and campus to scale the training of future school leadership within a JEIE framework, seeking to create an educational system that benefits all learners while closing equity gaps that result from systemic inequities.

C. Explain what kinds of evidence will be used to measure the unit's results in pursuit of its goals, how the unit will collect and analyze such evidence, and the timeline against which progress toward those goals will be measured.

The immediate indicator of success will be the actual expansion and running of LEAD type partnerships with an additional one to two school districts. Assessment of the efficacy of those programs will be folded into the existing structure that is already a part of our assessment protocols described in Section III.

D. Describe the resources (internal and external) that may be necessary, available, and/or attainable to meet the unit's priorities. Describe new funding that may be needed to maintain educational quality. Discuss the appropriate balance between state-supported and external

Additional resources may be needed to secure and train additional faculty to implement an increase in LEAD-type partnerships with regional school districts. Currently only 2 full-time faculty members are so equipped, leading the current two LEAD programs in Anaheim, limiting any further expansion.

VIII. Appendices Connected to the Self-study (Required Data)

- A. N/A
- B. Graduate Degree Programs
- C. Faculty
- D. Resources/ Budget Information
- E. Curriculum Vitae of faculty (which should include recent scholarly/creative activity and any research funding)
- F. Supplementary Materials

APPENDIX B. GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Table 5. Graduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Table 5. Graduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2017	32	16	15
2018	37	32	28
2019	18	17	16
2020	21	19	14
2021	27	25	25
2022	20	20	19
2023	20	19	18

Table 6. Graduate Program Enrollment by Headcount and FTES

Table 6. Graduate Program Enrollment by Headcount and FTES

Academic Year (Annualized)	Headcount	FTES	FTES per Headcount
2017-2018	95	47.50	0.50
2018-2019	135	67.75	0.50
2019-2020	127	63.50	0.50
2020-2021	77	38.50	0.50
2021-2022	102	50.75	0.50
2022-2023	56.5	28.25	.50
2023-2024	61.5	30.63	.50

Table 7. Graduate Student Graduation Rates

Table 7-A. Graduation Rates for Master's Programs

All Master's Entered in Fall:	Cohort	% Graduated		
		In 2 Years	In 3 Years	In 4 Years
2017	15	80.0	86.7	86.7
2018	28	78.6	78.6	78.6

2019	16	68.8	68.8	68.8
2020	14	85.7	85.7	85.7
2021	25	52.0	84.0	N/A
2022	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 8. Master's Degrees Awarded

Table 8. Graduate Degrees Awarded

College Year	Degrees Awarded
2017-2018	23
2018-2019	22
2019-2020	36
2020-2021	23
2021-2022	13
2022-2023	1
2023-2024	N/A

Table 9. Master's Degrees 2-year Graduation Rates:

Under-Represented (UR) and Non-Under-Represented (NUR)

Cohort	UR %	NUR %
Fall 2016	100	85.7
Fall 2017	83.3	77.0
Fall 2018	72.7	76.5
Fall 2019	66.7	70
Fall 2020	60	100

Table 10. Master's Degrees 2-year Graduation Rates: By Gender

Cohort	Men	Women
Fall 2016	N/A	100

Fall 2017	60.0	90.0
Fall 2018	62.5	80.0
Fall 2019	80	63.6
Fall 2020	100	80

APPENDIX C. FACULTY

Table 9. Full-Time Instructional Faculty

Table 9. Faculty Composition¹

Fall	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Full-Time Lecturers	Actual FTEF
2017	8	2	0	0	3	13
2018	8	2	0	0	3	13
2019	7	3	0	0	2	12
2020	7	3	0	1	3	12
2021	6	3	0	1	3	10.9
2022	5	2	0	1	2	8.1
2023	9	3	.5	1	2	13.1

¹ Headcount of tenured, tenure-track, sabbaticals at 0.5, and FERP at 0.5 includes full-time and part-time faculty. Headcount of lecturers only includes full-time faculty, as consistent with the IPEDS HR definition. It does not represent the number of full-time lecturer lines assigned to the department.

APPENDIX D. RESOURCES

EDAD Operating Budget

Fund	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Dept OE	5500	5500	5500	5500	5500
CCF	1567	1556	4182	4182	Not provided yet
Total:	7067	7056	9682	9682	

APPENDIX F. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

AMS Assessment Report- AY 23/24 Activity- MSEDAD

Outcome Abbreviation:

SLO-06: Anti-Racist Policy Advocates

Step 1: Outcome Statement:

Anti-Racist Policy Advocates actively seek and make changes that disrupt and re-shape systems perpetuating racial and other inequities and building systems of justice. They affirm and empower educational partners to harness the resources needed to navigate and dismantle an unjust world with empathy, savvy, and agency to create an educational system that is just, equitable, and inclusive.

Outcome Type:

Learning Outcome

Outcome Status:

In Use

Start Date:

11/16/2023

Status:

Active

Measure Type:

Both

** denotes a required field.*

Submission Date *

Reporting Period *

2023 - 2024

Result *

Assessed and Met

Data Collection and Analysis (Step 4) Press ALT + 0 for accessibility help *

Data Collection and Analysis (Step 4)

DIRECT MEASURES

The assessment artifact for 597 is a Master’s Project whose elements address this SLO, specifically the components of “actively seek and make changes that disrupt and re-shape systems perpetuating racial and other inequities” and “to create an educational system that is just, equitable, and inclusive.” This is a signature/ summative assignment that addresses _____. A calibrated rubric was created and used for scoring purposes, resulting in ratings on a scale from 1-4 (1=No Pass, 2=Developing, 3=Good, 4=Excellent). The assignment and the rubric have been uploaded to AMS.

Given that this assessment artifacts represent embedded assignments, all student in each course completed the assessment, and therefore the sample sizes reported equate to course enrollment at that time.

Full scoring results from the Fall 23 and Spring 24 cohorts are as follows. Of specific importance in determining competencies for this SLO, the first 4 categories of *Problem to Practice*, *Context to Case Study*, and *Case Narrative* are most applicable as students must demonstrate clear articulation of systems that perpetuate educational inequities, describe prior just, equitable and inclusive efforts within that space, as well as proposing their own approach in describing their particular case study at a specific educational institution.

Across the 3 component scores for the 2 cohorts, all but one average score indicated either “Good” or “Excellent” rating. The one exception was the score for *Context to Case Study* for the Spring 2024 cohort. That average score of 2.67 falls between a rating of “Developing” and “Good”

EDAD 597- Fall 2023

Criteria	Average	StDev	Percentage of students who met or exceeded passing criteria overall	N-Value
Problem of Practice	4	0	100	13

Context to Case Study	4	0		
Case Narrative	4	0		
Literature Review	4	0		
Conclusion and Dissemination	4	0		
Quality of Writing	4	0		
Presentation Quality	3.15	0.38		
Overall	3.88	0.05		

EDAD 597- Spring 2024

Criteria	Average	StDev	Percentage of students who met or exceeded passing criteria overall	N-Value
Problem of Practice	3.67	0.72	80	15
Context to Case Study	2.67	1.23		
Case Narrative	3.13	1.25		
Literature Review	2.2	0.9		
Conclusion and Dissemination	3.43	0.56		

Quality of Writing	3.87	0.35		
Presentation Quality	3.73	1.03		
Overall	3.24	0.45		

INDIRECT MEASURES

The department deploys exit surveys for all graduating students, including those in the MSEDAD program. As was the case with the direct measures, data is collected separately for a Fall and Spring cohort. Of the 35 questions on the exit survey asking students to self-assess their abilities or understandings, 7 were specific to this SLO, centering on students self-assessment in their preparation to be “Anti-Racist Policy Advocates” using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agreeing” to “strongly disagreeing” with their preparation to do the following:

Using culturally relevant and sustaining strategies for educating through an anti-racist lens

Using culturally relevant and sustaining strategies for leading through an anti-racist lens.

Using linguistically relevant teaching strategies for educating through an anti-racist lens.

Explore and understand systems of oppression within my field of study.

Using linguistically relevant leadership practices for leading through an anti-racist lens.

Explore and understand approaches to dismantling systems of oppression within my field of study.

I am able to create learning experiences or resources that reflect principles of anti-racist education.

The Fall 2023 survey results indicated scores of 3 or higher for all item responses, indicating self-ratings in the “agreeing” to “strongly agreeing” range. Unfortunately, only one student completed this exit survey (8% response rate), which significantly challenges any interpretation of the cohort on the whole. The response rate for the Spring 24 cohort was better (n=4, response rate=20%) albeit still limited. Results indicated that students “agreed” to all items with the exception of “*I am able to create learning experiences or resources that reflect principles of anti-racist education.*” Where the mean score was 2.8, putting it in the upper end of the range between “disagreeing” and “agreeing” Once again with such a limited sample of respondents, it is difficult to characterize how representative these scores are relative to the total cohort. It is also worth noting that if scores from the two cohorts were combined, then the responses for all items would be in the “agreeing” to “strongly agreeing” range.

Interpretation

Overall, scores indicate strong competency for this SLO, with the one possible exception already described for a particular cohort. Historically, students have performed very well on this SLO and component scores for the Masters Project have been “Good” to “Excellent”. It is also important to note that the small sample sizes per cohort (n=13 and n=15) mean that individual score outliers can significantly affect mean scores. When scores are combined across both cohorts, then the ratings for all components—including Context to Case Study—would be above 3 indicating “Good” and higher performance. However, for our own internal purposes, we like to be able to record and analyze cohort specific metrics and are therefore reporting them this way.

As far as the indirect assessment, the challenges of increasing response rates is the critical issue, and until this is addressed further interpreting the findings and determining if any action is needed is not possible.

Improvement Actions (Step 5)

The improvement actions we are under-going are not the result of any of the student ratings of the assessment artifacts—which have been and continue to be strong. Rather, the program has begun revising our SLOs, with the goal of creating more assessable, operational, and specifically worded ones, including this SLO.

The issue of the low response rates for the exit surveys also needs to be addressed, as already noted earlier. On plan is to better integrate the exit survey into courses during students’ final term, such as providing time during the course to complete them.

Advanced Programs Unit-Wide Culminating Assignment Scoring Rubric

Summary of Scores

Department: Educational Leadership (EDAD)

Program: Educational Administration

Academic year: 2022-2023

Name of Assignment: Systemic Problem Assignment

Rating Scale: 1 -4, with 4 being best rating. (see rubric).

Passing Score: An overall average of 3.0 or higher, with no “1” or “2” ratings

	Criteria	Weight	Fall 2022 N= 21			Spring 2023 N= 10		
			Avg.	SD	% ≥3	Avg.	SD	% ≥3
1	Part I: Introduction and Definition of the Problem	1	4.00	0.00	100%	3.77	0.80	92%
2	Part II: Literature	1	4.00	0.00	100%	3.77	0.80	92%
3	Part III: Advocacy Plan	1	4.00	0.00	100%	3.77	0.80	92%
4	Part IV: Reflection:	1	4.00	0.00	100%	3.77	0.80	92%
5	Format & Writing	1	3.38	0.49	100%	3.70	0.82	92%
	Final Weighted Avg. Score		3.88	0.10	100%	3.75	0.80	92%

Name of Assignment: Culminating Assignment

Passing Score: An overall average of 3.0 or higher, with no "1" or "2" ratings

	Criteria	Weight	Fall 2022			Spring 2023 N= 12		
			Avg.	SD	% ≥3	Avg.	SD	% ≥3
1	Problem of Practice	1				3.92	0.28	100%
2	Context to Case Study	1				3.83	0.37	100%
3	Case Narrative	1				3.92	0.28	100%
4	Literature Review	1				4.00	0.00	100%
5	Conclusion and Dissemination	1				4.00	0.00	100%
6	Quality of Writing	1				4.00	0.00	100%
7	Presentation Quality	1				4.00	0.00	100%
	Final Weighted Avg. Score					3.95	0.09	100%

CSU Fullerton, College of
Education Advanced EXIT Survey
Results

Term: Spring 2023

Department: EDAD

Program: Edu/Educational Admin MS

Response Rate: 58%

Questions Related to the Program

Rating Scale: 1-4 (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4)

	Please think about your learning experiences in the program that you are about to complete, and tell us if you agree with the following statements.	N	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	SD
1.1	I received appropriate academic advisement and guidance.	7	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	3.14	0.83
1.2	I was provided with experiences that prepared me for my final semester culminating experience (project, thesis, qualifying exam, dissertation, or NBPTS certification submission).	7	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	2.86	1.12
1.3	Overall, I received well-developed online instruction (Canvas, online modules and/or courses).	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	3.57	0.73
1.4	I received ample opportunities to engage with research that is relevant to my field of study.	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45
1.5	My courses included learning experiences or activities that helped me link theory to practice.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
	My program demonstrated and provided opportunities to practice:							
1.6	Using culturally relevant and sustaining strategies for teaching through an anti-racist lens	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
1.7	Using culturally relevant and sustaining strategies for developing curriculum through an anti-racist lens.	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00	0.00
1.8	Using culturally relevant and sustaining strategies for leading through an anti-racist lens	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
1.9	Using linguistically relevant teaching strategies for teaching through an anti-racist lens	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45
1.10	Using linguistically relevant leadership practices for leading through an anti-racist lens	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45
1.11	Using educational technologies for teaching and leading through an anti-racist lens	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
1.12	Engaging with diverse communities through an anti-racist lens	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
	My program provided opportunities to:							
1.13	explore and understand systems of oppression within my field of study.	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45
1.14	explore and understand approaches to dismantling systems of oppression within my field of study.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49

		N	%Yes	%Maybe	%No
1.15	Would you recommend this program to a colleague?	7	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%

Note: Also see text-based responses on page three.

Questions Related to the Graduates Preparedness

Rating Scale: 1-4 (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4)

	Please think about your learning experiences in the program that you are about to complete, and tell us if you agree with the following statements.	N	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	SD
	As a graduate of this program...							
2.1	I am more prepared to collaborate with other professionals in settings related to my field of study.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.2	I am more prepared to demonstrate knowledge and leadership in the use of technology for teaching and learning as it relates to my role in schools/my work environment.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.3	I am more prepared to meet the professional standards within my professional role.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.4	I am more prepared to meet the ethical standards within my professional role.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.5	I am more prepared with knowledge about professional, state, and/or institutional content standards that guide my field of study.	7	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	0.0%	3.29	0.70
2.6	I am more prepared to design instruction for diverse learners.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.7	I am more prepared to evaluate instruction for diverse learners.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.8	I am more prepared to implement instruction for diverse learners.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.9	I am more prepared to design and implement a range of assessments and evaluations that allow all learners to demonstrate meeting stated learning outcomes.	7	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	3.43	0.73
2.10	I better understand how policy shapes practice and impacts the context of student learning.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is:							
2.11	Fair.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.12	Respectful.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.13	Non-discriminatory.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.14	Equitable.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.15	Inclusive.	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
2.16	Humanizing	7	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.43	0.49
	I am more prepared to critically examine:							
2.17	my privilege(s) as it relates to my field of study.	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45
2.18	my implicit bias(es) as it relates to my field of study.	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	3.57	0.73
2.19	my explicit bias(es) as it relates to my field of study.	7	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.71	0.45

	Please think about your learning experiences in the program that you are about to complete, and tell us if you agree with the following statements.	N	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	SD
	Because of my program:							
2.20	I am able to teach using culturally relevant strategies.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.21	I am able to lead others using culturally relevant strategies.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.22	I am able to develop learning resources using culturally relevant strategies.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.23	I am able to create learning experiences or resources that reflect principles of anti-racist education.	7	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	3.43	0.73
2.24	I am able to use or support the use of educational technologies that provide equitable learning opportunities so that all learners can attain high-quality outcomes.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.25	I am able to use culturally and linguistically relevant practices to engage with diverse communities.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.26	I have a clear understanding of approaches I can take to dismantle systems of oppression as a professional in my chosen field.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49
2.27	I am committed to working towards dismantling systems of oppression through my work as a professional in my chosen field.	7	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.57	0.49

Questions Requiring Text Response

Only responses from specific department included here.

1.5	Would you recommend this program to a colleague? Please explain:
	“Yes” Response (57.1%) 2 Comments
	The program is strongly connected to the district and works well in developing educators.
	Great program that provides supports through the district we work for.
	“Maybe” Response (28.6%) 1 Comment

	Perhaps when the timely support for CalAPA is scheduled throughout the whole program, and the course that coincide with it, is meaningfully reflected in the coursework assignment.
	I prefer programs with less busy work and more hands application. I want to have dialogue and discussion and not just read to read. Many times we did not even utilize the readings in class or conversation
	"No" Response (14.3%) 1 Comment

	Unless the Cal APA portion is adjusted so that this program better helps and explains the process I will not recommend it to a colleague due to how unprepared and unhelped I felt through the process.
--	---

1.6	Overall, what were the strongest aspects of this program? (6 Comments) ↓
	EDAD 597 assignment coursework related to each other from week to week. This allowed for a more meaningful, deep understanding to see to big picture, the whole.
	Learning current practices to promote a fair, just and equitable environment.
	The strongest aspects of the program were the connections that related to my district and the personalization of that aspect of the program.
	Our professor provided learning opportunities that directly connected to the school district I work for making my learning more impactful. She also provided opportunities for everyone to share their multiple perspectives and own backgrounds.
	Professors
	Multiple opportunities for on the job training

1.7	What recommendation do you have to strengthen this program? (4 Comments)
-----	---

	A timely schedule to support students in completing and submitting for CalAPA.
	Diversify the professors. Having one the entire program was a disservice as we did not have multiple viewpoints and we did not have always the best learning experiences. We never received timely feedback and the projects never had clear guidelines or expectations
	CAL APA prep. and information. I was very unprepared and informed.
	Keep looking for ways to make improvements.

1.7	What recommendation do you have to strengthen this program? (4 Comments) <i>continued...</i>

1.8	Do you have any other comments? (3 Comments)
	If the program is completely off-campus and not a part of the university setting, we should not get charged all the fees that students on campus get charged. It would also be nice to work more with mentors throughout the two years of experience in a way that is embedded and not check-ins.
	THE Cal APA process needs to be handled MUCH better moving forward. My peers and I were extremely unprepared, lacking adequate direction, and information throughout much of the process. We were not aware we needed to submit the first cycle until our summer session class, more than a year into the program. THis was unacceptable when we are paying for this program to guide us through the process.
	It was a wonderful program. I actually completed my Masters in Administration at University of Phoenix in 2004. This program was 1000% more relevant than the program I completed in 2004.

Questions Requiring Text Response (continued)

5.1	What is the next professional step you want to make? (7 Comments)
	Instructional Support Specialist (ISS), similar to a TOSA.
	I would like to eventually become a Vice Principal or Director.
	I will follow up in the next few years in some educational leadership role and work in curriculum and instruction long term
	Apply for AP position.
	I would like to become an Assistant Principal.
	Principal in the next 5 to 10 years.
	Assistant Principal

CSU Fullerton, College of Education
Advanced Graduate Year-Out Survey Results -
PSLOs

Year: 2023 for Graduates of 2021-22

Department: Educational Leadership

Program: Educational Administration

Response Rate: 15%

Questions Related to the Graduates Knowledge, Skills, and Disposition for Graduates Working in Field of Education

Rating Scale: 1-4 (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4)

		N-Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	1. Learning-Centered							
Q4	I am more prepared to meet the professional standards within my professional role.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q6	I am more prepared with knowledge about professional, state, and/or institutional content standards that guide [Field-2.05].	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q12_1	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Fair.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q12_2	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Respectful.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Q12_3	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Non-discriminatory.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q12_4	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Equitable.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q12_5	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Inclusive.	2	0.00	4.00	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Q12_6	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Humanizing.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	2. Change Partners	N-Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q11	I better understand how policy shapes practice and impacts the context of student learning.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q23	I have a clear understanding of approaches I can take to dismantle systems of oppression as a professional in my chosen field.	2	2.12	2.50	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Q24	I am committed to working towards dismantling systems of oppression through my work as a professional in my chosen field.	2	2.12	2.50	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
	3. Organizational Leaders	N-Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q18	I am able to lead others using culturally relevant strategies.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Q22	I am able to use culturally and linguistically relevant practices to engage with diverse communities.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4. Community-Centered Leaders		N-Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q2	I am more prepared to collaborate with other professionals in settings related to my field of study.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q7	I am more prepared to design instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%

Q8	I am more prepared to evaluate instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q9	I am more prepared to implement instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q10	I am more prepared to design and implement a range of assessments and evaluations that allow all learners to demonstrate meeting stated learning outcomes.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5. Relationship Builders		N-Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q2	I am more prepared to collaborate with other professionals in settings related to my field of study.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q7	I am more prepared to design instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%

Q8	I am more prepared to evaluate instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q9	I am more prepared to implement instruction for diverse learners.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q10	I am more prepared to design and implement a range of assessments and evaluations that allow all learners to demonstrate meeting stated learning outcomes.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q17	I am able to teach using culturally relevant strategies.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%

		N- Values	SD	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	6. Anti-Racist Policy Advocates							
Q20	I am able to create learning experiences or resources that reflect principles of anti-racist education.	2	1.41	3.00	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Q12_3	I am more prepared to provide a learning environment that is: - Non-discriminatory.	2	0.71	3.50	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	7. Reflective Thinkers							
Q13	I am more prepared to critically examine my privilege(s) as it relates to my field of study.	2	2.12	2.50	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Q14	I am more prepared to critically examine my implicit bias(es) as it relates to my field of study.	2	2.12	2.50	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Q15	I am more prepared to critically examine my explicit bias(es) as it relates to my field of study.	2	2.12	2.50	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%