General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)
Standing Requirements

Mission Statement

OUR MISSION: Our singular mission is to prepare today's practicing and promising educator to be tomorrow's complete administrative professional.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The 66 credit hour maximum educational specialist degree (Ed.S.) is regarded as an intermediate practitioner's degree and as such, is a continuation of work completed in pursuit of the master of education.

The degree may serve as an avenue to professionalize the Elementary or Secondary School Administration License and/or it may qualify the student for the Indiana Standard Superintendent's License and/or leadership positions in education. The objective of the degree is to develop those skills and competencies needed to serve in positions of leadership in school or district situations.

Outcomes Library

EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1.0: Vision</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 1.1</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 1.2</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 1.3</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 1.4</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 2.1</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 2.2</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 2.3</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 2.4</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 3.0: Management**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district’s organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.1</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.2</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.3</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.4</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.5</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 4.0: Collaboration**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 4.1</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district’s educational environment.

Standard Element 4.2
Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

Standard Element 4.3
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.

Standard Element 4.4
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive district relationships with community partners.

Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

Outcome Mapping

Standard Element 5.1
Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

Standard Element 5.2
Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.

Standard Element 5.3
Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district.

Standard Element 5.4
Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district.

Standard Element 5.5
Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

Outcome Mapping

Standard Element 6.1
Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.

Standard Element 6.2
Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment.
Standard Element 6.3
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps

EdS in School Administration (Supt)
Alignment Set: EdS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011
Created: 08/25/2014 11:58:48 am CDT
Last Modified: 08/25/2014 12:10:49 pm CDT

Communication of Outcomes

Outcomes for the Ed.S. program will be shared with stakeholders on the Department of Educational Leadership website each summer and through a presentations each fall at the annual Alumni Luncheon and on Assessment Day with the Bayh College of Education and other partners in our University's Assessment Unit.
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Assessment Plan

Action Plan
**2012-2013 Assessment Cycle**

**Assessment Plan**

**Outcomes and Measures**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**

**ELCC Standard 1 (2001)**

- **Standard Element 1.1 Develop a Vision**
  - Candidates demonstrate understanding of the skills needed to work with a Board of Education to develop a vision for success, applied in context, using data-based research strategies regarding diversity and mobilizing resources.

  **Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
  **Direct:** Student Artifact
  **Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.
  **Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
  **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.
  **Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

- **Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
  **Direct:** Other
  **Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.
  **Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
  **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.
  **Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

- **Standard Element 1.2 Articulate a Vision**
  - Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate...
components of a vision for a district, use data-based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources of assessment and community needs to assess learning and communicate such to Board and stakeholders.

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 1.3 Implement a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to plan programs and motivate stakeholders to achieve a vision, designing research-based processes to implement vision through an entire community.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous
evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 1.4 Steward a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to align and/or redesign administrative policies/practices requirement for implementation of vision and to understand theory related to leadership and engage in collection, organization, and analysis of data to assess progress.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders in the district and community concerning implementation and realization of vision.

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 1.6 Advance Equity and Social Justice**

Candidates demonstrate ability to lead and align school district efforts to address social justice and equity issues.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the
outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**ELCC Standard 2 (2001)**

**Standard Element 2.1 Promote Positive School Culture**

Candidates demonstrate ability to develop a sustained approach to improve and maintain a positive district culture for learning that capitalizes on diversity to meet the learning needs of all students.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Standard Element 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to understand the variety of instructional research methodologies, utilizing as well qualitative and quantitative data, appropriate methods, and technology to assess district’s improvement and accountability, including curricular and instruction practices, justifying resources to sustain programs.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 2.3 Apply Best Practice to Learning**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate and engage in activities via best practices and research to improve instructional programs, student learning, the understanding of human development, learning, diversity, and motivation.

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans

Candidates demonstrate ability to demonstrate knowledge of adult learning strategies, technology, and research on skill development activities in the workplace, with the ability to use reflection for professional growth and plans that reflect commitment to lifelong learning.

### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

## Assessment Findings

### Finding per Measure
ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

ELCC Standard 1 (2001)

Standard Element 1.1
Develop a Vision
Candidates demonstrate understanding of the skills needed to work with a Board of Education to develop a vision for success, applied in context, using data-based research strategies regarding diversity and mobilizing resources.

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

Substantiating Evidence:

New Portfolio Assessment (Adobe Acrobat Document)
As a requirement by SPA reviewers, this Administrative Standards Assessment is our new programmatic portfolio assessment for the purpose of this data submission. Thus, the duplicity of the University Supervisor data, as this new assessment only contains ELCC Standards 3 and 4 (will align with next year’s submission). We will be redesigning this assessment mechanism for the 2014-2015 school year.

University Supervisor SPA Assessment ONGOING (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This is an ongoing SPA data file submitted with our successful SPA report, containing data relevant to all of the Standard Elements below.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Instructional Efficacy
(Answer Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, culminating in their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Instructional Efficacy
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Standard Element 1.2
Articulate a Vision

Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate components of a vision for a district, use data-based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources of assessment and community needs to assess learning and communicate such to Board

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these
Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assure their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

---

### These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title:** Assessment Synthesis

((Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Instructional Efficacy**

((Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard...
Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

### Standard Element 1.3

**Implement a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to plan programs and motivate stakeholders to achieve a vision, designing research-based processes to implement vision through an entire community.

---

**Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports)
or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
**Standard Element 1.4**  
**Steward a Vision**  
Candidates demonstrate ability to align and/or redesign administrative policies/practices requirement for implementation of vision and to understand theory related to leadership and engage in collection, organization, and analysis of data to assess progress.

### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

- **Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**  
  (Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

- **Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**  
  (Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 =
does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Standard Element 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders in the district and community concerning implementation and realization of vision.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5%
Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisor have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.
Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**ELCC Standard 2 (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 2.1</th>
<th>Promote Positive School Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>Administrative Portfolio Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Standard Element 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to understand the variety of instructional research methodologies, utilizing as well qualitative and quantitative data, appropriate methods, and technology to assess district’s improvement and accountability, including curricular and instruction

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

Reflections/Notes: Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis
(Active Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy
(Active Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001
reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assure their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Standard Element 2.3 Apply Best Practice to Learning**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate and engage in activities via best practices and research to improve instructional programs, student learning, the understanding of human development, learning, diversity, and motivation.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that
present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings** for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:**  
All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
**Standard Element 2.4**
**Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans**

Candidates demonstrate ability to demonstrate knowledge of adult learning strategies, technology, and research on skill development activities in the workplace, with the ability to use reflection for professional growth and plans that reflect commitment to lifelong learning.

### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Don lan

#### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations :**
All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes :** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

#### These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:**
All circumstances in which students are not meeting expectations must be examined by program faculty. From these examinations, we can then determine whether these are accurate representations given student leadership efficacy (and our programmatic supports) or whether our program needs to be enhanced. As we are in our 3rd year of implementing the 2001 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, we should examine our data for any trends that present themselves and double-down our efforts to ensure that assessments are based on student performance, as opposed to student and stakeholder perceptions of programmatic relevance. This was the main concern in prior SPA reports, and we have worked to assuage their concerns.

**Reflections/Notes:** Continued, mindful assessment practices in closing the loop have resulted in a more data-driven Department of Educational Leadership.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Overall Recommendations**

The overall recommendation would be to continue working as a program to ensure meaningful assessment activities for practitioners that align with the expectations of external evaluators. In one case this year, we found that incongruency existed when striving to meet those outside expectations, yet in another, the product even better reflected an activity meaningful to evaluators. Program faculty will work diligently along these lines in future months, as we gear-up for 2011 ELCC implementation in 2014-2015.

---

**Overall Reflection**

We have found data-mindfulness and the resultant, deep conversations regarding teaching and assessment efficacy, to be of great benefit as we have experienced growing pains in this new view of assessment (student competency-specific, as opposed to student perspective gathering).

---

**Action Plan**

**Actions**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**
## ELCC Standard 1 (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.1</th>
<th>Develop a Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Action is associated with the following Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment</strong> (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Findings:</strong> Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</strong> (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Findings:</strong> Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Action:** Instructional Efficacy |
| **This Action is associated with the following Findings** |
| **Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment** (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle) |
| **Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015. |
Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Standard Element 1.2 Articulate a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate components of a vision for a district, use data-based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources of assessment and community needs to assess learning and communicate such to Board and stakeholders.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.
**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Action: Instructional Efficacy**

**This action is associated with the following findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 22% Exceeds Expectations; 74% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.
Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Standard Element 1.3
Implement a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to plan programs and motivate stakeholders to achieve a vision, designing research-based processes to implement vision through an entire community.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: Medium

Action: Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 35% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and IAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Standard Element 1.4 Steward a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to align and/or redesign administrative policies/practices requirement for implementation of vision and to understand theory related to leadership and engage in collection, organization, and analysis of data to assess progress.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis
This Action is associated with the following Findings
Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.
Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need
modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Standard Element 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders in the district and community concerning implementation and realization of vision.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.
Priority: Medium

Action: Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 43% Meets Expectations, and 5% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

ELCC Standard 2 (2001)

Standard Element 2.1
Promote Positive School Culture

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings
Candidates demonstrate ability to develop a sustained approach to improve and maintain a positive district culture for learning that capitalizes on diversity to meet the learning needs of all students.

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element
included the following: 43% Exceeds Expectations; 57% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High
Action Details: Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

Priority: Medium

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS
assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Standard Element 2.3**

**Apply Best Practice to Learning**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate and engage in activities via best practices and research to improve instructional programs, student learning, the understanding of human development, learning, diversity, and motivation.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element
included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we'll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Action Details: Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

---

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

---

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 48% Exceeds Expectations; 48% Meets Expectations, and 4% Does Not Meet Expectations. Because of changes required by SPA to conform to the 2001 reporting standards, we were in a position where we needed to combine the assessment of the University Supervisors Evaluation and Administrative Portfolio Assessment into one assessment activity (with identical results, of course, as we’ll report), as the Portfolio Assessment evolved into a specific assessment over ELCC Standards 3 and 4, outside the scope of the initial intent of this evaluation cycle. We hope to iron-out these differences for a more robust data review as we move into the 2011 ELCC Standards in 2014-2015.

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status Report**

**Action Statuses**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**

**ELCC Standard 1 (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.1 Develop a Vision</th>
<th>Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate understanding of the skills needed to work with a Board of Education to develop a vision for success, applied in context, using data-based research strategies regarding diversity and mobilizing resources.</td>
<td>Action Details: Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.
**Action:** Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Instructional Efficacy**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRI’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Standard Element 1.2 Articulate a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate components of a vision for a district, use data-based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources of assessment and community needs to assess learning and communicate such to Board and stakeholders.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment-Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.
Priority: Medium

Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

Action: Instructional Efficacy

Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Baich.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Instructional Efficacy

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIIRI’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.
Standard Element 1.3
Implement a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to plan programs and motivate stakeholders to achieve a vision, designing research-based processes to implement vision through an entire community.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High
**Status** for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle Initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRII’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Standard Element 1.4 Steward a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to align and/or redesign administrative policies/practices requirement for implementation of vision and to understand theory related to leadership and engagement in collection, organization, and analysis of data to assess progress.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status** for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.
Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRI’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

Standard Element 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together and communicate effectively with stakeholders in the district and community concerning implementation and realization of vision.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

Action Details: Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are
moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status** for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRI’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**ELCC Standard 2 (2001)**

**Standard Element 2.1 Promote Positive School Culture**

Candidates demonstrate ability to develop a sustained approach to improve and maintain a positive district culture for learning that capitalizes on diversity to meet the learning needs of all students.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.
**Program Outcomes Assessment**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

**Action: Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRII’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.
Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

### Standard Element 2.2
**Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to understand the variety of instructional research methodologies, utilizing as well qualitative and quantitative data, appropriate methods, and technology to assess district’s improvement and accountability, including curricular and instruction practices, justifying resources to sustain programs.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.
Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation(s) Status: Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRI’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Element 2.3 Apply Best Practice to Learning
Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate and engage in activities via best practices and research to improve instructional programs, student learning, the understanding of human development, learning, diversity, and motivation.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

Action Details: Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation(s) Status: Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action: Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

Action Details: Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is
implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

Measures: Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

**Status** for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle Initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRII’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Standard Element 2.4**  
**Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans**

Candidates demonstrate ability to demonstrate knowledge of adult learning strategies, technology, and research on skill development activities in the workplace, with the ability to use reflection for professional growth and plans that reflect commitment to lifelong learning.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** Action Details: Dr. Ryan Donlan will strive for assessment synthesis among internal and external assessments (SPA/UAS/NCA, etc.) so that program faculty can better make meaning of trends in data and the positive influence that assessment can have on faculty teaching and candidate learning.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing departmental resources are sufficient for this action item.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status** for Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis
**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Status: Assessment synthesis efforts are going well, albeit with challenges. We are moving into 2011 ELCC’s, which are much different and not aligned with 2001 ELCC’s. Further, we are aligning our Department’s efforts with the College’s efforts in moving to 4-point, as opposed to 3-point rubrics. What is very nice, however, has been faculty support of these efforts and a continual desire for data that will help us better to serve students. We are moving ahead at a good pace and are enjoying the work.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy

**Action Details:** Action Details: The K-12 program within the Department of Educational Leadership strives for a focus, holistic effort toward continual pedagogical improvements in teaching. Thus, it is implementing an action plan that is consistent among the Standard Elements assessed, across two assessments. Mindful of this, the Department will focus on ONE ACTION PLAN, Instructional Efficacy, utilizing the results of data gathering and analysis to identify areas within the program that need modification (gap analysis) and align instructional efforts to meeting those needs. This will be accomplished through ongoing collaborative conversations among program faculty in meetings and instructional planning summits when practicable throughout the remainder of the academic year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Instructional Efficacy efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2013-2014 academic year and summer beyond, in preparation for the implementation of the 2011 ELCC Standards and Standard Elements during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan, Dr. Terry McDaniel, Dr. Bobbie Jo Monahan, Dr. Todd Whitaker, and Dr. Brad Balch.

**Measures:** Measures: ELCC Standards and Standard Elements, as well as SPA and UAS assessments, aligned to and embedded within courses through the K-12 programs curriculum alignment/programmatic spreadsheet.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Ongoing, regular program meetings and one-on-one faculty consultations, as well as involvement in Teaching Triangle Initiative (Ryan Donlan) and analysis of not only SIRII’s, but also intermittent, narrative course evaluation addendums, is helping us to gauge instructional efficacy. This will never really be a completed process – rather “ongoing.” We continually seek-out feedback from students regarding instructional efforts made on their behalf, and receive this information directly from the instructional leaders we teach.

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

---

**Status Summary**

We are very satisfied with the status of the Action Plans for 2012-2013 and are eager to continue building a mindful assessment culture in the Department of Educational Leadership. We look forward to upcoming coaching opportunities.

---

**Summary of Next Steps**
Ongoing, mindful efforts in the 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle.
2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011

Standard 3.0: Management
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district’s organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

Standard Element 3.1
Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Standard Element 3.2
Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio
Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

| Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment |
| Direct - Other |

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

| Standard Element 3.3 |
| Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district. |

| Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment |
| Direct - Portfolio |

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

| Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment |
| Direct - Other |

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan
competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 3.4**
Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard Element 3.5**
Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Standard 4.0: Collaboration**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

---

**Standard Element 4.1**

Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district’s educational environment.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
calendar year.  
**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 4.2

Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

#### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that are serving as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 4.3

Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.

#### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Assessment Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding per Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011
Standard 3.0: Management
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district's organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

Standard Element 3.1
Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Summary of Findings: 3.1 Knowledge
Exceeds: 25%
Meets: 58%
Developing: 13%
Does Not Meet: 4%

3.1 Skills
Exceeds: 25%
Meets: 54%
Developing: 17%
Does Not Meet: 4%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Elements, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the
new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 3.1 Knowledge

- Exceeds: 36%
- Meets: 45%
- Developing: 18%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

**3.1 Skills**

- Exceeds: 32%
- Meets: 36%
- Developing: 27%
- Does Not Meet: 5%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
**Standard Element 3.2**
Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:**

3.2 Knowledge

- Exceeds: 13%
- Meets: 33%
- Developing: 50%
- Does Not Meet: 4%

3.2 Skills

- Exceeds: 13%
- Meets: 29%
- Developing: 54%
- Does Not Meet: 4%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**

Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes**

Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 3.2Knowledge

- Exceeds: 41%
- Meets: 32%
- Developing: 27%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

3.2 Skills

- Exceeds: 23%
- Meets: 50%
- Developing: 27%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester's data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year's past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
Standard Element 3.3
Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:** 3.3 Knowledge
Exceeds: 17%
Meets: 71%
Developing: 13%
Does Not Meet: 0%

3.3 Skills
Exceeds: 17%
Meets: 71%
Developing: 13%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:**

3.3 Knowledge
- Exceeds: 50%
- Meets: 41%
- Developing: 9%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

3.3 Skills
- Exceeds: 23%
- Meets: 68%
- Developing: 9%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Summary of Findings: 3.4 Knowledge
Exceeds: 13%
Meets: 75%
Developing: 13%
Does Not Meet: 0%

3.4 Skills
Exceeds: 29%
Meets: 58%
Developing: 8%
Does Not Meet: 4%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.
assessments of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 3.4 Knowledge

- Exceeds: 41%
- Meets: 59%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

3.4 Skills

- Exceeds: 41%
- Meets: 59%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than the one in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Standard Element 3.5:** Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the
ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings: 3.5Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5 Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester's data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year's past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask for the intern to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (Timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 3.5Knowledge
Exceeds: 45%
Meets: 55%
Developing: 0%
Does Not Meet: 0%

3.5 Skills
Exceeds: 41%
Meets: 55%
Developing: 4%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

Standard 4.0: Collaboration
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

Standard Element 4.1
Candidates understand and can collaborate with

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district's educational environment.

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

**Summary of Findings:** 4.1Knowledge  
Exceeds: 13%  
Meets: 67%  
Developing: 21%  
Does Not Meet: 0%

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations :** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and
assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 4.1 Knowledge
- Exceeds: 50%
- Meets: 45%
- Developing: 5%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

4.1 Skills
- Exceeds: 41%
- Meets: 50%
- Developing: 9%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year's past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Standard Element 4.2**
Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective
journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Summary of Findings:** 4.2 Knowledge

- Exceeds: 8%
- Meets: 92%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

**4.2 Skills**

- Exceeds: 8%
- Meets: 92%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 4.2 Knowledge
Exceeds: 36%
Meets: 50%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

4.2 Skills
Exceeds: 36%
Meets: 50%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:**
Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Standard Element 4.3**
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
**Direct - Portfolio**

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Summary of Findings:** 4.3 Knowledge
- Exceeds: 8%
- Meets: 92%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

4.3 Skills
- Exceeds: 8%
- Meets: 92%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted: across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Measure:** Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each
calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 4.3 Knowledge
- Exceeds: 50%
- Meets: 45%
- Developing: 5%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

**4.3 Skills**
- Exceeds: 36%
- Meets: 55%
- Developing: 9%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

**Reflections/Notes:** With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

---

**Standard Element 4.4**
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive district relationships with community partners.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidenceary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.
Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Summary of Findings: 4.4 Knowledge
Exceeds: 8%
Meets: 83%
Developing: 8%
Does Not Meet: 0%

4.4 Skills
Exceeds: 8%
Meets: 83%
Developing: 4%
Does Not Meet: 4%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the first time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives; thus, this semester’s data is considered as baseline. Newer Standard Elements do not match older Standard Elements (2001). Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. Faculty noted that across both Standard areas, Field Supervisor rankings trended higher than University Faculty rankings. It might be that field supervisors are either seeing the direct benefits of the work of their Interns in the school corporations, or conversely, that they have more difficulty with a rigorous assessment, as they have to work with these interns on a day-to-day basis and in many cases, ask the interns to deliver the final evaluations to the university, when an option exists to deliver them confidentially.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan
Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 4.4 Knowledge
Exceeds: 41%
Meets: 45%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

4.4 Skills
Exceeds: 41%
Meets: 45%
Developing: 14%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the preceding finds through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were new, baseline data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Careful study of these data in comparison to future rounds of data in the same Standard and Standard Element areas, as we move beyond baseline data in the new ELCC system.

Reflections/Notes: With double the number of Standard Elements as per the new, bifurcated focus on KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS under each Standard Element, faculty may wish to examine curriculum appropriately and make decisions on the number of Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process does not become overly unwieldy. A factor analysis perspective might be taken along these lines.

Overall Recommendations

At this point, faculty need to have some detailed conversations about the transition to the new ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Elements, particularly with the effect, if any, it will have on stakeholder and candidate fatigue in field assessments and self-assessments. Ongoing professional development may be needed for familiarization with the new Standard Elements and their new-found place in coursework assignments.

Overall Reflection

Great year of mindful reflection regarding assessment and implications for teaching and learning. Much support from program faculty as we have made the transition, particularly with respect to assignment and syllabus redesign, and ongoing conversations and technical assistance to students.

Action Plan

Actions
## ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

### ELCC Standard 3 (2001)

#### Standard Element 3.1
**Manage the Organization**
Candidates demonstrate ability to use research – based knowledge of organizational practices to optimize student learning, organization of fiscal, human, and material resources time management toward instructional outcomes, assurances of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, in a manner that promotes legal and ethical compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action:</strong> Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Action is associated with the following Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding &quot;what to do next&quot; with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday's, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standard Element 3.2
**Manage Operations**
Candidates demonstrate ability to involve stakeholders in aligning resources with priorities, using needs assessment and data to align resources with vision, develop staff communication plans to enhance integration, and promote and support school & community collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action:</strong> Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Action is associated with the following Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding &quot;what to do next&quot; with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday's, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standard Element 3.3
**Manage Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action:</strong> Assessment Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Candidates demonstrate ability to use strategic planning and problem solving skills with teaching and learning, as well as to creatively seek new resources, apply financial models that maintain fiscal stability and equitable allocation, and apply current technologies toward positive outcomes.

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday's, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**ELCC Standard 4 (2001)**

**Standard Element 4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members**

Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together family and community resources, use public information and research of issues and trends to assist in this process, understand community relations to drive partnerships, nurture relationships with divergent groups and stakeholders, involve the community in decision making, interface with community agencies to help families, and ensure positive belief in family efficacy.

**Action: Assessment Synthesis**

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Standard Element 4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs**

Candidates demonstrate ability to use decision
making that is informed by formal and information input from multiple stakeholders, promote maximum involvement of the community, interact effectively with those who have conflicting perspectives to improve district performance, and advocate for students with special needs.

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Standard Element 4.3 Mobilize Community Resources**

Candidates demonstrate understanding of and ability to use the community resources, social service agencies, and public funds to support student achievement, solve problems, achieve goals, and serve the community.

**Action: Assessment Synthesis**

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High
**Organization**
Candidates demonstrate ability to use research-based knowledge of organizational practices to optimize student learning, organization of fiscal, human, and material resources, time management, instructional outcomes, assurances of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, in a manner that promotes legal and ethical compliance.

---

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday's, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

---

**Standard Element 3.2 Manage Operations**
Candidates demonstrate ability to involve stakeholders in aligning resources with priorities, using needs assessment and data to align resources with vision, develop staff communication plans to enhance integration, and promote and support school & community collaboration.

---

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday's, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Assessment Synthesis**
Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

Standard Element 3.3 Manage Resources
Candidates demonstrate ability to use strategic planning and problem solving skills with teaching and learning, as well as to creatively seek new resources, apply financial models that maintain fiscal stability and equitable allocation, an apply current technologies toward positive outcomes.

Action: Assessment Synthesis

Action Details: We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding “what to do next” with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Assessment Synthesis

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

ELCC Standard 4 (2001)

Standard Element 4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members
Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together

Action: Assessment Synthesis

Action Details: We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of
family and community resources, use public information and research of issues and trends to assist in this process, understand community relations to drive partnerships, nurture relationships with divergent groups and stakeholders, involve the community in decision making, interface with community agencies to help families, and ensure positive belief in family efficacy.

any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

---

**Standard Element 4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs**

Candidates demonstrate ability to use decision making that is informed by formal and information input from multiple stakeholders, promote maximum involvement of the community, interact effectively with those who have conflicting perspectives to improve district performance, and advocate for students with special needs.

**Action: Assessment Synthesis**

**Action Details:** We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Assessment Synthesis**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned
Next Steps/Additional Information: Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

Standard Element 4.3 Mobilize Community Resources
Candidates demonstrate understanding of and ability to use the community resources, social service agencies, and public funds to support student achievement, solve problems, achieve goals, and serve the community.

Action: Assessment Synthesis

Action Details: We are currently in a state of flux in the K-12 Program in the Department of Educational Leadership, as Indiana has implemented new State Standards for School Leaders that inform leadership licensure in K-12. These do not align tightly with ELCC Standards, required of our accrediting agency. Further, the ELCC Standards are in transition as well, complicating the use of any cross-walking documents that currently are in place. Thus, we are very much involved in deciding "what to do next" with respect to assessment efforts. If anything, these have given us good opportunities for conversation regarding our program and services to candidates in K-12 leadership. Program meetings are held monthly on Wednesday’s, and we are continuing our work here toward a longer-lasting and meaningful assessment system.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Assessment synthesis efforts will be ongoing throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key/Responsible Personnel: Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measures: Measures: All internal and external assessment metrics.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: Existing Departmental allocations are sufficient for implementation.

Priority: High

Status for Assessment Synthesis

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

Status Summary

Faculty are continuing their curriculum work, as the Department Assessment Coordinator has now become an ELCC Reviewer for CAEP and has learned a good deal about ongoing and continuing expectations for course assessment via Specialized Program Association Requirements. Work is ongoing, and further course re-alignment will occur during Summer 2015.

Summary of Next Steps

Continued diligence in programmatic reflection through assessment activities, curricular redesign, and collaborative instructional planning.
# 2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

## Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes and Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011

#### Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

### Standard Element 5.1

Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

- **Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

- **Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 5.2

Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

- **Direct - Other**
practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Standard Element 5.3**

Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these
Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Standard Element 5.4

Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district.

**Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Standard Element 5.5

Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 6.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation. |

| Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 = exceeds expectations). |

| Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year. |

| Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements. |

| Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 = exceeds expectations). |

| Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan |
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 6.2
Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

### Standard Element 6.3
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
### Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Assessment Findings

#### Finding per Measure

### EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011

#### Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

---

#### Standard Element 5.1

Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

### Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

#### Findings for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** 5.1 Skills

- Exceeds: 73%
- Meets: 20%
- Developing: 7%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then
finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Measure:** Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.1 Skills

- Exceeds: 73%
- Meets: 20%
- Developing: 7%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both
field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Standard Element 5.2**
Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings** for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** 5.2 Skills
- Exceeds: 53%
- Meets: 47%
- Developing: 0%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle! an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.
**Measure:** Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.2 Skills  
Exceeds: 53%
Meets: 47%
Developing: 0%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Standard Element 5.3**  
Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district.

---

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 – 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.3 Skills
- Exceeds: 74%
- Meets: 13%
- Developing: 13%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied "Skills" data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content "Knowledge," as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor**

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 – 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor**
Summary of Findings: 5.3 Skills
Exceeds: 74%
Meets: 13%
Developing: 13%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Standard Element 5.4
Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district.

Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 5.4 Skills
Exceeds: 53%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 7%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.
It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

Summary of Findings: 5.4 Skills
Exceeds: 53%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 7%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data
collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes**: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

### Standard Element 5.5
Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

- **Measure**: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
  - Direct - Other

**Details/Description**: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target**: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s)**: Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings** for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings**: 5.5 Skills
- Exceeds: 60%
- Meets: 33%
- Developing: 7%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilize the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied "Skills" data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year's past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes**: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

- **Measure**: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor
  - Direct - Portfolio
**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.5 Skills
Exceeds: 60%
Meets: 33%
Developing: 7%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied "Skills" data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content "Knowledge," as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes:** Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

**Standard Element 6.1**

Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.

**Measure:** On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District
Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 6.1 Skills
Exceeds: 60%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 0%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations** : Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes** : Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Measure:** Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Findings** for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Summary of Findings**: 6.1 Skills
Exceeds: 60%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 0%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes**: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Standard Element 6.2**
Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment.

**Measure**: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description**: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target**: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s)**: Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings** for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings**: 6.2 Skills
Exceeds: 40%
Meets: 27%
Developing: 33%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association
and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

**Reflections/Notes**: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

**Measure**: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description**: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target**: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “3” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s)**: Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings** for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

**Summary of Findings**: 6.2 Skills

- Exceeds: 40%
- Meets: 27%
- Developing: 33%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.
Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

---

Standard Element 6.3
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

Measure: On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations, and 4 exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for On-Site Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 6.3 Skills
Exceeds: 40%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 20%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content "Knowledge," as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.
Measure: Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "3" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Portfolio Assignment University Supervisor

Summary of Findings: 6.3 Skills
Exceeds: 40%
Meets: 40%
Developing: 20%
Does Not Meet: 0%

Faculty summarized the preceding findings through an approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective, and then finally between BOTH objectives assessed, as these were ongoing data under a different assessment system than in the past, as per requirement of our Specialized Program Association and the desire of the Department to utilized the most current tools available by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. This process again resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps relevant to a program geared toward K-12 practitioner/leaders.

It should be noted that this is the second time the Ed.S. program has used ELCC 2011 Standards and Standard Objectives. Newer Standard Elements do not match our older Standard Elements (2001), and because of our most current expectations under our accrediting body, applied “Skills” data were assessed in this cycle, not necessarily content “Knowledge,” as we had done last year. Overall Standards are the same and holistically reflect the strengths and growth areas of candidates similarly to year’s past. During this cycle, an overall ranking sheet was utilized for both field supervisor and university supervisor data in this transition year, as we are again realigning our system of assessment and wished not to overly tax field partners during the process.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Overall Recommendations

Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Overall Reflection

Our main intent with the flux of data submission requirements at the state level is to maintain and further enhance a
positive, departmental culture of assessment, while doing what we can to prepare our candidates for the profession, all-the-while protecting them from any confusion that is being caused by multiple sets of standards that involve accrediting bodies and licensure offices.

**Action Plan**

**Actions**

### EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011

#### Standard 1.0: Vision

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; promotion of continual and sustainable district improvement; and evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans supported by district stakeholders.

---

**Standard Element 1.1**

Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

---

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 1.2**

Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

---

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and
**Standard Element 1.3**
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 1.4**
Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium
**Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

### Standard Element 2.1

Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

### Standard Element 2.2

Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium
Standard Element 2.3
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

Standard Element 2.4
Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

Standard 3.0: Management
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district’s organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.
Standard Element 3.1
Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Action is associated with the following Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Action Details: |
| Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency. |

| Reflections/Notes: |
| Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment. |

| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis. |

| Key/Responsible Personnel: |
| Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation. |

| Measures: |
| Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available. |

| Resource Allocations: |
| Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time. |

| Priority: |
| Medium |

Standard Element 3.2
Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Action is associated with the following Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Action Details: |
| Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency. |

| Reflections/Notes: |
| Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment. |

| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis. |

| Key/Responsible Personnel: |
| Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation. |

| Measures: |
| Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available. |

| Resource Allocations: |
| Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time. |

| Priority: |
| Medium |

Standard Element 3.3
Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across...
data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 3.4**

Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 3.5**

Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all...
K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard 4.0: Collaboration**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

---

**Standard Element 4.1**

Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district’s educational environment.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 4.2**

Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all
K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 4.3**

Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 4.4**

Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive district relationships with community partners.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and
assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.
**Priority:** Medium

---

### Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

---

### Standard Element 5.1

Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.
**Priority:** Medium

---

### Standard Element 5.2

Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and
**Standard Element 5.3**
Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Standard Element 5.4**
Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium
Standard Element 5.5
Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

Standard Element 6.1
Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium
Standard Element 6.2
Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Standard Element 6.3
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status Report

Action Statuses

EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011
### Standard 1.0: Vision
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; promotion of continual and sustainable district improvement; and evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans supported by district stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.1</th>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

*No Status Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.2</th>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**
**Standard Element 1.3**
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

No Status Added

---

**Standard Element 1.4**
Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

No Status Added
Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

Standard Element 2.1

Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments

No Status Added

Standard Element 2.2

Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments
Standard Element 2.3
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments

No Status Added

---

Standard Element 2.4
Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments

No Status Added
**Standard 3.0: Management**
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district’s organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

**Standard Element 3.1**
Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

No Status Added

**Standard Element 3.2**
Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**
**Standard Element 3.3**
Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.

- **Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

- **Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

- Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

- **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

- **Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

- **Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

- **Priority:** Medium

- **Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

  *No Status Added*

---

**Standard Element 3.4**
Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership.

- **Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

- **Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

- Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

- **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

- **Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

- **Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

- **Priority:** Medium

- **Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

  *No Status Added*
Standard Element 3.5
Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments
No Status Added

Standard 4.0: Collaboration
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

Standard Element 4.1
Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the district’s educational environment.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium
Standard Element 4.2
Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments

No Status Added

Standard Element 4.3
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

Measures: Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Continue with Program Assessments

No Status Added
No Status Added

**Standard Element 4.4**
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive district relationships with community partners.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**
No Status Added

---

**Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics**
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Standard Element 5.1**
Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium
**Standard Element 5.2**
Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

No Status Added

---

**Standard Element 5.3**
Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

No Status Added
**Standard Element 5.4**
Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

*No Status Added*

---

**Standard Element 5.5**
Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

**Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

*No Status Added*
### Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

### Standard Element 6.1
Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Status Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Element 6.2
Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a district environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Status Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard Element 6.3**
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

**Action: Continue with Program Assessments**

- **Action Details:** Action Details: Stay the course of program delivery at this time, as our system of data collection and assessment is in flux, as per new expectations of our Specialized Association/Accreditation Agency.

  Reflections/Notes: Faculty are planning to group more tightly the Standard Elements assessed in each class, each semester, to ensure that this process allows for an overall Standard assessment in each course that is a part of our system of assessment.

- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: To be implemented in 2015-2016 by all K-12 faculty involved in these courses, including adjunct instructors, routed to Dr. Ryan Donlan for analysis.

- **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: Program Faculty for data collection and tabulation; Program Faculty for implementation.

- **Measures:** Measures: Continued measurement as per this assessment plan with the new tools and assessments available.

- **Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

- **Priority:** Medium

**Status for Continue with Program Assessments**

- **Status Added**

**Status Summary**

- **No text specified**

**Summary of Next Steps**

- **No text specified**
## Assessment Plan

### Outcomes and Measures

**EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011**

| Standard 1.0: Vision | Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.  
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).  
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.  
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members |
| --- | --- |
| Standard Element 1.1 | Measure: **Administrative Portfolio Assignment**  
Direct - Portfolio |
| Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district. | |

| Measure: **University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
Direct - Other |
| --- | --- |
| Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.  
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).  
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.  
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members |
| --- | --- |
| Standard Element 1.2 | Measure: **Administrative Portfolio Assignment**  
Direct - Portfolio |
| Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district |
goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Other</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Standard Element 1.3**
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Other</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Standard Element 1.4**
Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficienties attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program**
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

---

**Standard Element 2.1**
Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio
culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Standard Element 2.2**

Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous
evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

### Standard Element 2.3
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

- **Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

- **Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

### Standard Element 2.4
Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

- **Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, culminating in their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

**EDS in School Administration (Supt) Outcome Set - 2011**

**Standard 1.0: Vision**

A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; promotion of continual and sustainable district improvement; and evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans supported by district stakeholders.

**Standard Element 1.1**

Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**
### No Findings Added

#### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

#### Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

No Findings Added

---

#### Standard Element 1.2
Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.

#### Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

#### Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

No Findings Added

---

#### Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

No Findings Added
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

No Findings Added

---

Standard Element 1.3
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

No Findings Added

---

Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

No Findings Added
Standard Element 1.4
Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment
No Findings Added

Measure: University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other

Details/Description: University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
No Findings Added

Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program
A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

Standard Element 2.1
Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district

Measure: Administrative Portfolio Assignment
Direct - Portfolio
culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

No Findings Added

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Direct - Other

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

No Findings Added

---

**Standard Element 2.2**

Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

*No Findings Added*

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

*No Findings Added*

---

**Standard Element 2.3**

Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Administrative Portfolio Assignment**

*No Findings Added*

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a
culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Standard Element 2.4

Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

---

**Measure:** Administrative Portfolio Assignment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Administrative Portfolio Assessment is a select, culminating evidentiary piece from the Ed.S. Central Office Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school district leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into district leadership and their dialogue with on-site Mentors through the lenses of the ELCC Standard Elements, along the way using these as guidelines for weekly activities, reflective journaling, project completion, and eventually compilation into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Administrative Portfolio evidentiary products in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the ELCC Standard Elements.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings** for Administrative Portfolio Assignment

*No Findings Added*

---

**Measure:** University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Direct - Other**

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Central Office Internships, a culmination of their Ed.S. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's District Leadership Preparation Program. This comprehensive, summative assessment provides a rigorous evaluation of candidate skills and dispositions, built upon a foundation of ELCC Standard Element competencies that have served as the building blocks of leadership preparation.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Evidence will be collected and analyzed in August of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings** for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

*No Findings Added*
No Findings Added
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1. Institution Name
Indiana State University

2. State
Indiana

3. Date submitted
MM  DD  YYYY
03  /12  /2013

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:
Ryan Donlan
Phone: Ext.
(812)237-8624
E-mail:
ryan.donlan@indstate.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:
Denise Collins
Phone: Ext.
(812)237-2918
E-mail:
denise.collins@indstate.edu

6. Name of institution's program
School Administration

7. NCATE Category
Educational Leadership-Superintendent

8. Grade levels(1) for which candidates are being prepared
K-12

(1) e.g. K-6, P-12

9. Program Type
☒ Other School Personnel
☐ Unspecified
10. Degree or award level
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?
- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

14. Program report status:
- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. Is your unit seeking
- NCATE accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
- Continuing NCATE accreditation

16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:
NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?
- Yes
- No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ELCC standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)
Per NCATE’s Guidelines for Preparing a Response to Conditions Report language, “You do not need to submit text or attachments for every item – you only submit the specific responses and documents that demonstrate changes or additions that respond to the items listed in Part G of the original report” (p.1), we did not submit a response for this item. If we misinterpreted this guidance, please inform us, and we will expedite any information that you wish to review.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)
Per NCATE’s Guidelines for Preparing a Response to Conditions Report language, “You do not need to submit text or attachments for every item – you only submit the specific responses and documents that demonstrate changes or additions that respond to the items listed in Part G of the original report” (p.1), we did not submit a response for this item. If we misinterpreted this guidance, please inform us, and we will expedite any information that you wish to review.

3. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

5. Candidate Information
Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate,
post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</th>
<th># of Program Completers (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

6. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Will you please let us know if you need any additional clarification that our faculty have remained the same since the submission of our original report? Thanks.</th>
<th>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University (3)</th>
<th>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member (4)</th>
<th>Faculty Rank (5)</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Scholarship (6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years (8)</th>
<th>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator
(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor
(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.
(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.
(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.
(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g., clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ELLC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Number of Assessment</th>
<th>Name of Assessment (10)</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment (11)</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)</td>
<td>School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).</td>
<td>State Licensure Examination.</td>
<td>A summative assessment taken at any time during an Educational Specialist Degree Program or prior, upon completion of the Master’s Degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership (required)</td>
<td>Foundations Assessment, EDLR 759.</td>
<td>An assessment project of candidate content knowledge aligned primarily with EDLR Standards 2 and 3 in course, Seminar in School Superintendency.</td>
<td>A summative assessment administered during EDLR 759, a required course for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: Assessment of ability to design, align, and evaluate curriculum, guide professional learning (required)</td>
<td>Supervisory Assessment, EDLR 751.</td>
<td>An assessment project of candidates' instructional leadership aligned with ELCC Standards 2 and 3 in course, Administration of School Personnel.</td>
<td>A summative assessment administered at specific time periods appropriate to scope and sequence of curriculum in EDLR 751, a required course for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4: Assessment of internship/clinical practice (required)</td>
<td>Field Assessment: University Supervisors' Evaluation of Interns, EDLR 790-792.</td>
<td>A comprehensive, portfolio examination, including artifact and leadership log evidence analysis, of Intern/Candidate aligned with ELCC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 during the Central Office Internship. An assessment project synthesis implemented in-the-field, aligned with ELCC Standards 1, 2, and 5, during the Central Office Internship. An assessment project implemented that is aligned with ELCC Standards 1, 5, and 6 in course, Social Foundations of Education.</td>
<td>A summative assessment administered near the end of the EDLR 790-792, a required course internship for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5: Assessment of ability to support student learning and development (required)</td>
<td>Learning Impact Initiative, EDLR 790-792</td>
<td></td>
<td>A summative assessment administered near the conclusion of the EDLR 790-792 experience, a required course internship for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)</td>
<td>Philosophical Application Conceptual Model: Content-Based Application of Content, EDLR 710.</td>
<td>An assessment project aligned to ELCC Standards 3 and 4 that is designed to enhance and assess community relations and organizational management.</td>
<td>A summative assessment administered near the end of the course EDLR 710, a required course for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)</td>
<td>Administrative Standards Assessment in Organizational Management and Community Relations, EDLR 790-792.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A summative assessment administered near the end of EDLR 790-792, a required course internship for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ELCC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ELCC standards.
1. **Standard 1.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a district vision of learning supported by the school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Develop a District Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Articulate a District Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Implement a District Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Steward a District Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Promote Community Involvement in District Vision.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Standard 2.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Promote a Positive District Culture.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program within District.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Standard 3.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Manage the District Organization.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Manage District Operations.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Manage District Resources.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Standard 4.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with the families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Standard 5.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Acts with Integrity.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Acts Fairly.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Acts Ethically.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Standard 6.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Standard 7.0:** Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Candidates apply skills and knowledge articulated in the first six ELCC standards as well as state and local standards for educational leaders. Experiences are designed to accommodate candidates’ individual needs.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in NCATE’s unit standard 1:
• Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
• Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
• Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

(1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:
   a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
   b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
   c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
   d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and

(2) Assessment Documentation
   e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
   f. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
   g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above, and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to: 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 6.1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for Not Including This Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Attachments panel below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership. ELCC standards addressed in this assessment could include but are not limited to 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 6.1. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, essays, and case studies. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Attachments panel below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively design, align, and evaluate curriculum, guide professional learning, and other identified professional responsibilities in educational leadership. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment
include but are not limited to: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3. Examples of assessments include district improvement plans, needs assessment projects, and district curriculum redesign projects.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Sections III and IV.

Assessment #3

See Attachments panel below.

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in internship/clinical practice. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Examples of assessments include faculty evaluations of candidates' performances, internship/clinical site supervisors' evaluations of candidates' performances, and candidates' formative and summative logs and reflections. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

In addition to the assessment a one-page description should be submitted to inform reviewers how the internship/clinical experience(s) have been designed to meet ELCC standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6.

Assessment #4

See Attachments panel below.

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' ability to support student learning. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 1.1; 1.2; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 6.2; and 6.3. Examples of assessments include post-graduate 360 surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, and community feedback surveys of candidates or graduates. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #5

See Attachments panel below.

6. Assessment of the application of content knowledge in educational leadership. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 6.1. Examples of assessments include action research projects and portfolio tasks. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #6

See Attachments panel below.

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

7. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' abilities in organizational management and community relations. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Examples of assessments include district-based strategic plans, district simulations, and district intervention plans. (Answer required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #7

See Attachments panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, post graduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, school intervention plans, district-based strategic plans, simulations, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers.
1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program)

Process of Data Tabulation: Data from Aggregate Data Table information were taken from ELCC Assessments #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 and disaggregated using two separate methods:

(a) The first method began by combining the data totals of Exceeds, Meets, and Does Not Meet Expectations for each Standard Element, in Standard clusters for the combined years 2011 and 2012, yet separated under the categories of [1] Content Knowledge (for Assessments #1, #2, and #6 -- #1 was not reported to us via Standard Elements), [2] Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions (for Assessments #3, #4, and #7), and [3] Student Learning (for Assessment #5);

(b) The second method combined the data totals for each Standard Element, in Standard clusters for the year 2011, then for the year 2012, yet did not separate them by the categories noted in (a). Our intent was to reflect upon differences in data that may have resulted from our intentional curricular alignment and analytical assessment processes occurring between 2001 and 2012.

Once data was clustered, Standard-by-Standard totals of Standard Elements for those tallies of candidates were summed, grand totals for Standard-specific sample sizes were calculated and means averaged. The resulting grand mean averages are presented below in all categories:

Content Knowledge ELCC Assessment Results

| ELCC Standard Overall Analysis | 3= Exceeds Expectations | 2 = Meets Expectations | 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations |
| ELCC Standard 1 (40%) | (41%) | (19%) |
| ELCC Standard 2 (17%) | (82%) | (1%) |
| ELCC Standard 3 (19%) | (79%) | (2%) |
| ELCC Standard 4 (20%) | (77%) | (3%) |
| ELCC Standard 5 (96%) | (4%) | (0%) |
| ELCC Standard 6 (35%) | (43%) | (22%) |

Principal Findings from the Evidence: Standard 1 and Standard 6 appear incongruent with other Standards with respect to candidates not meeting expectations, as numbers are quite higher in these lower categories. Standard 5 is quite high. Candidate numbers of exceeding expectations seem quite high throughout the Standards.

Faculty’s Interpretation of Findings: Faculty did not find surprising the fact that Standards 1 and 6, with respect to content knowledge, were lower than other areas, because of the timing and resource allocation involved on the part of their district (corporation) or Internship mentors to bring those to bear. We noted that this is a content knowledge area, not necessarily a skill demonstration area. We may have to reframe our paradigms for rigor involving candidate demonstration of knowledge. We question whether or not we are assessing Standard 5 accurately or whether we are simply basing our assessment on observational dispositions of those enrolled.

Changes Made in (or Planned for) the Program as a Result: Collaborative planning will examine curriculum materials and course assignment examination for rigor.

Steps Taken to Use Information for Improvement of:

a. Candidate Performance: Department-level examination of instructional materials and assignments regarding rigorous content and expectations will take place over the summer and during the next academic year.

b. Program: The Department will undertake further processes of curriculum mapping, mindful of Standard Elements that should occur in a program sequence and will hold discussions of how instructional materials can enhance candidate performance. Further training and development will better ensure inter-rater reliability of assessments using ELCC Standard Elements.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions ELCC Assessment Results

| ELCC Standard Overall Analysis | 3= Exceeds Expectations | 2 = Meets Expectations | 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations |
| ELCC Standard 1 (47%) | (47%) | (6%) |
ELCC Standard 2 (35%) (61%) (4%)
ELCC Standard 3 (41%) (55%) (4%)
ELCC Standard 4 (41%) (55%) (4%)
ELCC Standard 5 (16%) (84%) (0%)
ELCC Standard 6 (31%) (63%) (6%)

Principal Findings from the Evidence: Standards 1 and 6 have increased significantly over those assessed for content knowledge. Our assessment results note significant results in “Exceeding Performance.” Standard 5 has shifted downward.

Faculty’s Interpretation of Findings: We question: Is our program too practitioner-focused and not enough grounded in the theory and rigor? As this area of assessment pertains primarily to activities completed in the Internship, we pose to ourselves if we are balancing the nuts and bolts with those involving academic reflection. Why are we rating our candidates so highly in Standard 5 with respect to content knowledge, but not with respect to pedagogy?

Changes Made in (or Planned for) the Program as a Result: The department will explore this gap between levels of performance of content knowledge and pedagogical/practical skills in order to examine this incongruence, as well as to consider again why we are rating so many candidates as exceptional, outside of the normal distribution.

Steps Taken to Use Information for Improvement of:

a. Candidate Performance: Faculty will collaboratively plan to allow better reinforcement in class of how content knowledge and practical skills must be synthesized for enhanced leadership efficacy.

b. Program: Faculty will engage in department-level discussions of the topic of unintentional, grade inflation and the potential sense of entitlement and false expectations that it can foster in students when it occurs in institutions.

Student Learning ELCC Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELCC Standard</th>
<th>Overall Analysis</th>
<th>3= Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>2 = Meets Expectations</th>
<th>1 = Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 1</td>
<td>(37%) (55%) (8%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 2</td>
<td>(31%) (68%) (1%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 4</td>
<td>(37%) (62%) (1%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 5</td>
<td>(20%) (80%) (0%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Findings from the Evidence: Standard 6 seems exceptionally high in “Exceeds” and quite low in “Does Not Meet,” especially in light of the fact that it differs in its distribution from rankings on the same Standard in Content Knowledge. Other Standards, 1 – 5, appear to be skewed toward “Exceeding Expectations” as well.

Faculty’s Interpretation of Findings: We note the disparity of results that has to do with academic content, practical skills, and student learning and will examine the data with respect to program evolution from 2011 to 2012 (provided below), as this initial analysis is not providing us with the clarity of direction we desire.

Changes Made in (or Planned for) the Program as a Result: Triangulation of data to gain a complete picture that will inform departmental improvement.

Steps Taken to Use Information for Improvement of:

a. Candidate Performance: Ensure through syllabus preparation and instructional planning that there is a congruence among standards for content rigor (and assignment), practical application of skills, and the positive impact on student learning. Instructors will model and candidate will make those connections through class discussions, artifact submissions, and project completion.

b. Program: Training should be implemented to bring about the desired result in (a) above, with a quarterly presentation during program meetings on how instructors can better-align planning with necessary components assessed.

Overall 2011 ELCC Standard Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELCC Standard</th>
<th>Overall Analysis</th>
<th>3= Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>2 = Meets Expectations</th>
<th>1 = Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 1</td>
<td>(28%) (58%) (14%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 2</td>
<td>(10%) (87%) (3%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 4</td>
<td>(23%) (73%) (4%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 5</td>
<td>(3%) (97%) (0%)</td>
<td>ELCC Standard 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Findings from the Evidence: Data results from Standard 2 more align with what would be expected in a standard distribution of Standards-based assessment data, yet those from Standard 5 are more in line with the second of the two assessments above (pedagogical skills and dispositions), than it is the other two.
Faculty’s Interpretation of Findings: Faculty’s speculate on the attentiveness may have gone in to assessing ELCC Standard Element 5 analytically in 2011, compared to that currently, as more focus was placed then on the dispositions as measured by our college’s Unit Assessment System. ELCC Standards were then assessed more on a holistic basis, than analytical (program reviewer noted last year). We are now much more analytical and intentional.

Changes Made in -- or Planned for -- the Program as a Result: In late 2011, a comprehensive realignment of curriculum, with a gap analysis, mapping process, and a ELCC coverage compact of three-times-per-Standard Element in each program sequences, was conducted by faculty, based on assessment results and our initial SPA report receipt.

Steps Taken to Use Information for Improvement of:

a. Candidate Performance: Faculty, between 2011 and 2012, trained students not only to be more ELCC-mindful as they are completing assignments, but also to study further the intricacies of the concepts embedded within each Standard Element, to enhance their content knowledge, practical application of program skills, and making a positive difference on student learning. Students, program wide, got training in the use and interpretation of program rubrics.

b. Program: New curriculum maps, syllabi, and assessments in all courses were completed by K-12 faculty at the Ed.S. level and implemented in classes.

Overall 2012 ELCC Standard Assessment Results

ELCC Standard Overall Analysis 3= Exceeds Expectations 2 = Meets Expectations 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
ELCC Standard 1 (54%) (41%) (5%)
ELCC Standard 2 (52%) (46%) (2%)
ELCC Standard 3 (41%) (58%) (1%)
ELCC Standard 4 (52%) (46%) (2%)
ELCC Standard 5 (50%) (50%) (0%)
ELCC Standard 6 (39%) (55%) (6%)

Principal Findings from the Evidence: The data in “Exceeds Expectations” has shifted quite heavily from that of 2011 in all areas. We are also confident that our rubrics measure more analytically the concepts embedded within each Standard Element and that Assessments #2 - #7, standing on their own, have more fidelity and validity. We question the reliability, as per the interpretation below.

Faculty’s Interpretation of Findings: Faculty discussions noted no sweeping difference in the candidates enrolling in our programs, nor in the difference in candidate competencies to such a degree when completing assignments or evidencing content knowledge, skills, or impact on student learning. Thus, the shift to “Exceeds Expectations” seems incongruent with the evidence of preparation and learning that is taking place.

Changes Made in (or Planned for) the Program as a Result: A shift occurred in the number of students getting “3’s” in assessment at the same time that students were receiving training and awareness in the analytical use of ELCC rubrics. Whether students are becoming more efficacious at handling instructions or whether instructors are hesitant on awarding students “2’s” is open to interpretation. A skewed distribution exists that needs further study; the Department intends to do so as a focus over Summer and Fall 2013.

Steps Taken to Use Information for Improvement of:

a. Candidate Performance: Enhanced delineation and instructor modeling of assignment artifacts and evidence of learning experiences that would result in a “3,” a “2,” and a “1,” so that students have clear expectations for their performance, in line with the depth of rigor described by the concepts embedded within the Standard Elements.

b. Program: Inter-rater reliability training on assessment rubrics are planned for faculty members. Student orientation sessions will also increase the focus on authentic assessment performance expectations. TK-20 assessment management software training will be conducted.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx

For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponseConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)
Dear Response to Conditions Reviewing Team:

Thank you for the opportunity to learn from your guidance as reported to us in your National Recognition Report dated August 1, 2012. Ryan Donlan here, Assessment Coordinator for the Indiana State University Bayh College of Education’s Department of Educational Leadership.

We are continually mindful of the need for ongoing curricular improvements. I was fortunate to have join the faculty of this Department in July 2011 and have enjoyed working with faculty to refine our methods of presenting data, as well as making ongoing programmatic adjustments, as we first noted in our March 14, 2012 submission. Our desire to more effectively report the details of our Standards-based instructional approaches continues.

National Recognition with Conditions

The following conditions were to be addressed in this submission by March 15, 2014, listed after PART G – DECISIONS in the August 1, 2012 Report:

1. Assessments #2 - #6: Please revise and submit assessment descriptions, scoring guides, and aggregated data tables that address the concerns outlined in Section C.1, C.2, and C.3.

2. Assessment #7: Please submit revised assessment description, scoring guide, and aggregated data table (one application) to address the concerns outlined in the previous team report.

3. Section V. Please provide updated analysis of the data finding relative to candidate mastery of ELCC standard elements across the content assessments, skill assessments, and P-12 student learning assessment.

4. Please provide a narrative explanation on how the internship/field experiences are structured to meet ELCC Standard Elements 7.1 and 7.2.

This submission, we trust, will satisfy your expectations.

Note Regarding March 2012 Submission

You are undoubtedly aware with documents at your disposal that our submission in March 2012 included for the most part, an entirely different selection of assessments than that of March 2011. In such, we moved our assessment practices closer to a reporting level that would satisfy a full ELCC Standard Element alignment. Our department learned from your August 2012 report that we needed to more clearly demonstrate how we were measuring candidate competencies via the Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standard Elements, particularly by analytically utilizing concepts embedded into each element. You will note such in your review of our attached Assessments.

In March 2012, we made a procedural error and only included five (5) assessments in our report. At the time, we believed that this was all that was required. We now better understand that 7 assessments have been required all along and are glad to provide evidence of such, as they have been ongoing.

You will note throughout Assessments #2 - #7 provided to you with this submission (#1 was not requested, as last submission's sufficed), that we have ensured a more careful and intentional analytical alignment of assignment criteria to ELCC Standard Elements, and especially the concepts embedded within each. This has resulted in many of the rubrics looking similar, but we believe that this is a good thing, as it has assisted with fidelity of implementation and candidate understanding of what is expected of them.

In particular, we are now more clearly denoting for candidates as well, at your suggestion, how their performance on the activities we assign and the experiences they undergo Exceed Expectations, Meet Expectations, and/or Do Not Meet Expectations, as well as the criteria for performance in each (aligned with Standard Element concepts).

Improvement in syllabus language, as well as redesigned rubrics from input received in Sections C.1, C.2, and C.3, is provided on the attachments to the AIMS submission template. Ongoing, aggregated data on ELCC Standard Element candidate competencies are presented in table/chart form with each of these Assessments.

NCATE has also provided us guidance on how better to present evidence in Section V of our candidate mastery of ELCC standard elements across the content assessments, skills assessments, and P-12 student learning assessment – keeping such at the broader level of Standard Attainment (1 – 6) across our program as a whole. This has been helpful in making programmatic decisions and in working with faculty and department staff to plan for the future.

What follows in this section, Section VI, is a brief, yet detailed, description of the revisions and modifications we have made to each Assessment submitted to you in our Response to Conditions. We are also including at the end, information pertinent to Standard 7.1 and 7.2, at your request (as well as 7.3) from the August 2012 report.

Thanks for your thoughtful and detailed evaluation of our ongoing efforts toward programmatic excellence. We value your guidance and have made great strides because of it.

Assessment Revision and Modification Details
Assessment #2: Foundations Assessment – Assessment of Content Knowledge in Educational Leadership.

The Foundations Assessment has been redesigned to clear up any confusion resulting from multiple rubrics and overly holistic descriptions of ELCC Standard Element criteria formerly presented for this assessment. We now clearly demonstrate in this assessment description and scoring guide, how our assessment activities have a specific relationship to the ELCC Standard Elements.

As one example in how we have handled this, the assignment’s focus as per syllabus language is now on development of a Leadership and Management Training Manual, a representation of candidate content knowledge competencies with ELCC Standards 2 and 3, as opposed to the focus spread out in a manner in which candidates were allowed to select from among the six available.

In our last submission, we combined results from three separate activities and rubrics (1) a project and presentation, (2) a book analysis, and (3) a reflective journal, into an overall ELCC-aligned rubric. Where we fell a bit short was on ensuring tight alignment between competencies assessed and ELCC Standard Elements. We have corrected that.

Syllabus language and rubric presentation now clearly identify ONE rubric as being used to evaluate candidate knowledge so as to bear out a direct relationship.

Assessment #3: Supervisory Assessment – Assessment of Ability to Design, Align, and Evaluate Curriculum, Guide Professional Learning.

In our March 2012 submission, we inaccurately applied our latitude to design a Course Grades Option assessment to Assessment #3. We have corrected that.

Our first task was redesigning this assessment to align more analytically with ELCC Standards 2 and 3, which comprised those measured on this assessment, with the specific activity inherent in the evaluation activity.

Our former submission was a compilation of scores resulting from four activities: (1) Personnel Policy Review, (2) Evaluation of Administration Assessment Measures, (3) Professional Development Project, and (4) a Small Group Project Presentation. This is now not the case.

This assessment is comprised now of only ONE activity, entitled the District Curriculum and Professional Learning Desk Audit.

A newly aligned assessment rubric has been developed for the activity, which measures Standard Element competencies by virtue of the candidates’ demonstration that they have mastered concepts within those Standard Elements.

Assessment #4: Field Assessment/University Supervisors’ Evaluation of Interns – Assessment of Internship/Clinical Practice.

Reviewers will note with a review of our attachments that we have now CLEARLY specified the specific, intern/field experiences that comprise this assessment:

The assessment experience is now comprised of a Summative Portfolio Review, a culminating reflective performance assessment that includes artifact and leadership log evidence analysis for ELCC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 through the Standard Elements and concepts embedded within those Standard Elements.

We have further delineated what is expected of candidates for each Standard Element and clearly presenting language highlighting the performance expectations for Exceeding, Meeting, or Not Meeting the expected performance criteria for each Standard Element measured (denoted in each rubric field).

Assessment #5: Long-Term Project – Learning Impact Initiative – Assessment of Ability to Support Student Learning and Development.

This assessment has undergone arguably the most comprehensive revision or practice for participating school districts, shifting a paradigm of selection of Long-Term Project from literally “anything that would benefit a district” to a focused activity that has a clear impact on developing and showcasing candidate skills in supporting P-12 student learning.

The new project is now an action-research project entitled the Learning Impact Initiative.

In the project, candidate interns conduct a comprehensive audit of student learning in the district, identifying and prioritizing learning needs through a gap analysis of achievement, while working efficaciously with stakeholders to design and implement an initiative that can be evaluated through action research.

We have further delineated what is expected of candidates for each Standard Element and are clearly presenting language highlighting the clear performance expectations for Exceeding, Meeting, or Not Meeting each Standard Element measured. Concepts embedded within each Standard Element are also identified in the rubric, to ensure a direct linkage between ELCC Standard Elements and the performance expectations on the activity.

Assessment #6: Philosophical Application Conceptual Model – Content-Based Assessment – Application of Content.

Assessment #6, a Philosophical Application Conceptual Model, is included as our Content-Based Application of Content from EDLR 710, Social Foundations in Education
This summative assessment asks candidates to apply their content knowledge of leadership by developing a Conceptual Model of their Philosophy of Education, evidencing specifically how it has informed (and has applied), as well as how it will inform and apply to, their work as district-level leaders.

The addition of this assessment in this March 2013 submission, as well inclusion of the data presented, was seamless in that the project and its assessment via ELCC Standard Elements have been operational.

Reviewers will note clear syllabus language aligning the specific candidate assignment to ELCC Standards, as well as an analytical rubric detailing how candidate competencies will be measured as per the Standards Elements and the concepts embedded.

Assessment #7: Administrative Standards Assessment in Organizational Management and Community Relations – Assessment of Abilities in Organizational Management and Community Relations.

Please note that although we did not submit Assessment #7 in March 2012 (we thought mistakenly that we were allowed to forgo this submission, as mentioned in the introduction to this section of our report), it was never our intent to rest on a presumption that our 2011 Assessment #7 Alumni Survey evidence would suffice. This Assessment is a complete replacement of what we submitted prior.

This submission is our clarification of how we have been measuring candidate skills in Organizational Management and Community Relations. We do so through an Administrative Standards Assignment project aligned to ELCC Standards 3 and 4.

In such, candidates present evidence that they have carried out two authentic projects during the course of their Internship/Clinical Practice, one aligned with ELCC Standard 3 and its Elements and concepts pertaining to Organizational Management; another aligned with ELCC Standard 4 and its Elements and concepts pertaining to Community Relations.

Standard 7 Narrative
March 2013

Submission Directions also state for Assessment #4: In addition to the assessment a one-page description should be submitted to inform reviewers how the internship/clinical experience(s) have been designed to meet ELCC standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6.

Program Reviewers noted in August, 2012 that they wished for more detailed information, stating:

4. Provide a narrative explanation on how the internship/field experiences are structured to meet ELCC Standard Elements 7.1 and 7.2.

Here is our response:

We now provide evidence of our following Standard Element 7.1, 7.2 (and 7.3) by articulating the concepts embedded within each and offering a check (x) and narrative in support of our providing evidence that such are integral components of our Internship:

7.1 Substantial

_x__ a. Candidates demonstrate the ability to accept genuine responsibility for leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of those made by district leaders. The experience(s) should provide interns with substantial responsibilities that increase over time in amount and complexity and involve direct interaction and involvement with staff, school board members, students, parents, and school and community leaders.

The initial experience in the District-Level Internship takes place during the summer month, strategically scheduled so that Interns can work alongside their superintendent and central office mentors, accepting genuine responsibility for leading, facilitating, and making decisions for the school corporation (district). This is not simply a job-shadowing experience; it is real-time, high-impact district leadership, in which Interns begin working on projects that involve direct interaction with central office staff, then branch out beyond that to include initiatives with increasing, in-depth contact with district and building staff, parents, students, board members, and community stakeholders. Interns are required to complete projects aligned with each ELCC Standard and are evaluated on such based on the Standard Elements and concepts embedded within those Elements. Assessed as such, the frequent and ongoing contact with each of the aforementioned constituent groups and responsibility areas is inescapable, which we find incredibly important to building candidates’ efficacy in leadership at both the macro and micro level. Through their Long-Term Projects, Interns become intimately familiar and responsible for making a positive difference in student learning and achievement, district-wide, and thus develop a broader-panned perspective into the deep responsibilities a community places in its district leader for the care and welfare of its children. It is our hope that by the conclusion of the consecutive summer internship portion, and through in-district application of the Long-Term Project beyond, constituents will begin to associate with the identity and empowerment of a “district leader,” as they develop a deepened skill and talent base for operating at that level.

_x__ b. Each candidate should have a minimum of six-months (or equivalent, see note below) of full-time internship experience.

The District-Level Internship is ideally for most all Interns, a non-consecutive experience with a mid-summer experience and expected follow-up in school districts, as most all are working as principals, assistant principals, or other directors/staff with in-building responsibilities during the school year. It is because of this candidate demographic that we construct the experience initially as 120-150 consecutive hours of mid-summer immersion into the Office of the Superintendent or Central Office Leader in an Indiana School Corporation. Approximately 40 hours of on-campus debriefing and reflection are expected beyond during this summer Internship period
through the Seminar in the Superintendency. Non-consecutive experiences beyond this time period totaling additional hours include the Intern’s extended application of his or her Long-Term Project into the subsequent school year beyond this summertime period. The culminating experience meets or exceeds the length equivalency expected by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

7.2 Sustained

_x_____a. Candidates participate in planned intern activities during the entire course of the program, including an extended period of time near the conclusion of the program to allow for candidate application of skills and knowledge on a full-time basis.

The de-facto Internship experience begins with a planned program of activities, long before the initial phase of summer’s consecutive service alongside the School Superintendent and Central Office leaders. Throughout the course of their Ed.S. experiences, candidates are exposed and are held responsible for a planned sequence of activities that provide the exposure and efficacy to what the skills they will be expected to demonstrate at the beginning of the summer experience. Examples include the requirement of working with guidance from the Business Manager on a finance project in early coursework, as well as conducting an evaluation of the Teacher Evaluation System and rewriting School Board Policies in their personnel courses. Interns also complete substantive, district-wide facilities projects long before they are scheduled to work alongside Central Office leaders on a daily basis. The summer experience then provides that daily interaction with the Superintendent and Central Office staff, supported by on-campus excursions, with rich experiences in instructional leadership, district management, and of course, the facilitation of community social capital through external relations (meetings, service obligations, and civic projects). Beyond this summer immersion, candidates then begin the task of further developing and implementing their Long-Term Projects (focused on student learning) throughout the subsequent school year, which not only extend upon their own learning (i.e. “Guided Practices” and even "Independent Practice,” of sorts), but also provide for the creativity, resiliency, and efficacy needed in order to assume employment in Central Office Leadership, having met all other program requirements by the Department of Educational Leadership of Indiana State University.

7.3 Standards-based (This Standard Element was marked “with conditions” in the last submission, so we are presenting it again with clarification).

_x_____a. Candidates apply skills and knowledge articulated in these standards as well as state and local standards for educational leaders.

The Internship experience is designed with mindfulness of the skills, knowledge, and applications embedded in ELCC Standard Elements, as well as State Standards and Local Criteria, evidenced through three different levels of program assessments. As you will note from our submission of Assessment #4 (Assessment of Internship/Clinical Practice), Assessment #5 (Assessment of Ability to Support Student Learning and Development), and Assessment #7 (Assessment of Abilities in Organizational Management and Community Relations), the Internship activities have direct alignment with District-Level ELCC Standards (first level of articulation), evident through rubric delineation of ALL Standard Element criteria, linking learning outcomes to the concepts embedded within those Standard Elements. As well, candidate assignments and experiences are also formulated, as syllabus language articulates, with the Indiana Content Standards for Educators/School Leader-District Level (second level of articulation), and the Conceptual Framework of the Bayh College of Education (third level of articulation), which includes measurements of candidate dispositions in the areas of (1) candidate as expert or mediator of learning, (2) candidate as person, and (3) candidate as member of communities.

_x_____b. Experiences are designed to accommodate candidates’ individual needs.

Local context is continually taken into consideration when students work with university faculty and field mentors to design experiences. Take for instance, the autonomy students have to design the manner in which they present the Portfolios for Assessment #4 (note scoring guide page 3 and the list of nearly 25 non-exhaustive options available for activities), the autonomy students have to design their Learning Impact Initiatives (with district leadership) in Assessment #5, and their selection among myriad possibilities in the autonomy they have in selection of their Administrative Standards Assessment projects for Assessment #7. So from a content-to-local context and individual interest standpoint, they have a great deal of accommodation available.

The Bayh College of Education policies and practices regarding DIVERSITY and making accommodations for those with handicapping conditions are also evidenced in syllabus language and faculty practice.

To Conclude

Again, we thank reviewers for evaluating our "Response to Conditions" that we began working toward in August of 2012 upon receipt of your Report. Our hope to receive positive feedback that our program meets nationally recognized standards as evidenced by our continued hard work and partnership. We value your guidance and consideration.

The Department of Educational Leadership in the Bayh College of Education at Indiana State University.
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.
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PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):
Nationally recognized
Nationally recognized with conditions
Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Summary of Strengths:
Faculty have spent considerable time revamping their assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics, and data tables to align to the ELCC standard elements. Assessment #7 has been submitted and is aligned to the ELCC standards. Data charts are now aggregated and aligned to the levels of the scoring rubrics and the ELCC standard elements. Section V has been reevaluated and the following changes made or planned for: "Collaborative planning will examine curriculum materials and course assignment examination for rigor. Department-level examination of instructional materials and assignments regarding rigorous content and expectations will take place over the summer and during the next academic year. The Department will undertake further processes of curriculum mapping, mindful of Standard Elements that should occur in a program sequence and will hold discussions of how instructional materials can enhance candidate performance. Further training and development will better ensure inter-rater reliability of assessments using ELCC Standard Elements." All conditions outlined in the last report have been satisfied.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a district vision of learning supported by the school community.

1.1 Develop a District Vision of Learning.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

1.2 Articulate a District Vision of Learning.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met
1.3 Implement a District Vision of Learning.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

1.4 Steward a District Vision of Learning.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

1.5 Promote Community Involvement in District Vision.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive district culture, providing effective instructional programs, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

2.1 Promote a Positive District Culture.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Programs within District.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met
2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.

Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met
--- | --- | ---

**Comment:**

### Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources of a district in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

3.1 Manage the District Organization.

Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met
--- | --- | ---

**Comment:**

3.2 Manage District Operations.

Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met
--- | --- | ---

**Comment:**

3.3 Manage District Resources.

Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met
--- | --- | ---

**Comment:**

### Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.

Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met
--- | --- | ---
4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner

5.1 Acts with Integrity.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

5.2 Acts Fairly.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

5.3 Acts Ethically.
Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and
influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

7.1 Substantial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Sustained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Standards-based.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 Real Settings.
Met  Met with Conditions  Not Met

Comment:

7.5 Planned and Guided Cooperatively.
Met  Met with Conditions  Not Met

Comment:

7.6 Credit.
Met  Met with Conditions  Not Met

Comment:

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidate knowledge of content
Assessment #2 and #6: Assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics and data tables have been revised to align more closely to specific competencies found in the ELCC standard elements. Data charts have been revised to show aggregated scores for each category level outlined in the scoring rubrics. Candidate data shows that most have either met or exceeded mastery of the ELCC standards under evaluation. The conditions outlined in the last team report have been satisfied.

C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Assessments #3, #4, and #7: Assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics and data tables have been revised to align more closely to specific competencies found in the ELCC standard elements. Data charts have been revised to show aggregated scores for each category level outlined in the scoring rubrics. Candidate data shows that most have either met or exceeded mastery of the ELCC standards under evaluation. The conditions outlined in the last team report have been satisfied.

C.3. Candidate effects on student learning
Assessments #5: Assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics and data tables have been revised to align more closely to specific competencies found in the ELCC standard elements. Data charts have been revised to show aggregated scores for each category level outlined in the scoring rubric. Candidate data shows that most have either met or exceeded mastery of the ELCC standards under evaluation. The conditions outlined in the last team report have been satisfied.
Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Data for Section V has been reexamined and changes planned for based on the analysis of the data results across all of the assessments. This condition has now been satisfied.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

None

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

None

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

● National Recognition. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle (2 years in advance for a 5-year cycle and 3 years in advance for a 7-year cycle) before the next scheduled accreditation visit. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.