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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 33 credit hour M.Ed. School Administration and Supervision program prepares students for positions of leadership as school administrators. The M.Ed. program fulfills, in part, the requirements for the Building-Level Administration License prescribed by the Division of Professional Standards, Indiana Department of Education.

🌿 Outcomes Library

ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011

Standard 1.0: Vision
A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 vision of learning for a school.</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 school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school 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 school improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 1.4</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Standard 3.0: Management

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support 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 school 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 to manage school operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.3</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Element 3.4</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can develop school 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 teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 4.0: Collaboration

A building-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 on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school 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 school’s educational environment.

---

**Standard Element 4.2**

Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

---

**Standard Element 4.3**

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

---

**Standard Element 4.4**

Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

---

### Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

A building-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 school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 5.1</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 5.2</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 5.3</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 5.4</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 5.5</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment

A building-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 through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 6.1</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Element 6.2</strong></td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard Element 6.3
Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.
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Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011

Standard 1.0: Vision
A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

Standard Element 1.1
Candidates understand and can collaborate to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Responsible Individual(s):

Standard Element 1.2
Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Responsible Individual(s):

Standard Element 1.3
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
**Responsible Individual(s):**

| Standard Element 1.4 | Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders. |

| Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment |
| Direct - Portfolio |

| Details/Description: | The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements. |

| Target: |
| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Responsible Individual(s): |

| Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program | A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment high expectations for students. |

| Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment |
| Direct - Portfolio |

| Details/Description: | The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements. |

| Target: |
| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Responsible Individual(s): |

| Standard Element 2.2 | Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program. |

| Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment |
| Direct - Portfolio |

| Details/Description: | The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements. |

| Target: |
### Standard Element 2.3
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Responsible Individual(s):**

---

### Standard Element 2.4
Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Responsible Individual(s):**
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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 learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners’ needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Standard Element 1.2 Articulate a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate
**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Standard Element 1.3 Implement a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources.

---

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Standard Element 1.4 Steward a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to utilize effective communication skills, design and adopt data-based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision through various methods of stewardship.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

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

Candidates demonstrate ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts, as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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 assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
Standard Element 2.2
Provide Effective Instructional Program
Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction, make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs, and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Standard Element 2.3
Apply Best Practice to Learning
Candidates demonstrate ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning, human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process, and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement.

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Findings

#### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

#### ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

**ELCC Standard 1 (2001)**
Standard Element 1.1
Develop a Vision
Candidates demonstrate understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners' needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 67% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: 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:

SPA Ongoing Assessments, Continued (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
This report details the progression of data-mindfulness in our University Supervisor Evaluation for M.Ed. Leadership students.

SPA Ongoing For Assessments in Data Findings (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
This report details the progression of data-mindfulness in our Portfolio Assessments for M.Ed. leadership students.

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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; 46% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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 1.2 Articulate a Vision**

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

---

**Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Those not meeting expectations are the subject of Departmental Discussion. 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**
(Proposal Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title: Instructional Efficacy**
(Proposal 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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**
(Proposal Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

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

**Standard Element 1.3 Implement a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 52% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Those not meeting expectations should be the subject of discussion. 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 55% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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 utilize effective communication skills, design and adopt data-based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision through various methods of stewardship.

---

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June 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: 36% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Scrutinize closely the factors that may have contributed to anyone not meeting expectations in this area. 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 involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts, as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
   Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 52% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Evaluate closely those not meeting expectations. 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  
(Proposal Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Action Item Title:** Instructional Efficacy  
(Proposal 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 58% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Analyze closely the factors that may have resulted in those not meeting expectations. 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  
(Proposal Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

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

---

**ELCC Standard 2 (2001)**

**Standard Element 2.1**  
**Promote Positive School Culture**

Candidates demonstrate
Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met
**Recommendations**: Evaluate the circumstances of those not meeting standards. 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  
(Reply Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

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

---

**Standard Element 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction, make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs, and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement.

**Measure**: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description**: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Look carefully at the 3% above in order to evaluate program through self-reflection. 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  
(Reply Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct - Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Details/Description:** University Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June 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: 64% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** This jumped from the ceiling of 3% not meeting expectations to 6% ... it needs a bit of scrutiny in an upcoming Department meeting. 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 2.3**

**Apply Best Practice to Learning**

Candidates demonstrate ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning, human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process, and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement.

---

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
Summary of Findings: Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June 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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Interesring that across two different assessments, the "does not meet expectations" rose to 6%. Worth some careful analysis. 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 implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals, as well as strategies to form comprehensive professional growth plans with personnel and themselves that reflect a commitment to life-long learning.

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** Findings from the 2012-2013 school year for this ELCC Standard Element included the following: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45 % Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June 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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 49% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Examine the 6% collaboratively to determine if program modifications are needed as a result of these, which are legitimate, given candidate quality and programmatic supports. 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**

It appears that we have met our expectations in these ELCC Standard Element areas, yet it is interesting that the modest increase in those “not meeting expectations” occurred rather consistently in specific ELCC Standard Element areas, across assessment contexts. Thus, it would behoove the department to examine these as it moves to ELCC 2011 Standards in the 2014-2015 academic year. As much as can be accomplished, examining inter-rater reliability in those courses taught by different instructors would be a positive in program evaluation.

**Overall Reflection**

It is refreshing that all program faculty have lent 100% support to closing the loop through data-driven instruction and leadership ... a great collaborative spirit fostered by Department leadership.

**Action Plan**

**Actions**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**

**ELCC Standard 1 (2001)**

**Standard Element 1.1 Develop a Vision**
Candidates demonstrate understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners’ needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change.

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

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 67% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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; 48% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 67% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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; 48% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 1.2
Articulate a Vision
Candidates demonstrate ability to articulate components of a vision, use data-based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources to assess student learning and communicate such to stakeholders.

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

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 1.3 Implement a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources.

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

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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; 45% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 55% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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; 45% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 55% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 1.4 Steward a Vision**  
Candidates demonstrate ability to utilize effective communication skills, design and adopt data-based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision through various methods of stewardship.

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

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 36% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 36% Exceeds Expectations; 61% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision**

Candidates demonstrate ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts, as well as to acquire and demonstrate
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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 58% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 52% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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: 39% Exceeds Expectations; 58% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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.

the skills for effective school communication of the vision.
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
Candidates demonstrate ability to assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture.

Action: Action Item Title: Assessment-Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 42% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.
**Standard Element 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction, make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs, and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement.

**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:** Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 64% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 3% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 64% Exceeds Expectations; 39% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning, human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process, and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement.

---

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

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45% Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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: 58% Exceeds Expectations; 36% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

**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
Professional Growth Plans
Candidates demonstrate ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals, as well as strategies to form comprehensive professional growth plans with personnel and themselves that reflect a commitment to life-long learning.

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45 % Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 49% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 M. Ed. Portfolio 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: 55% Exceeds Expectations; 45 % Meets Expectations, and 0% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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: 45% Exceeds Expectations; 49% Meets Expectations, and 6% Does Not Meet Expectations.

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

**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 Report**

**Action Statuses**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**

**ELCC Standard 1 (2001)**

**Standard Element 1.1 Develop a Vision**

Candidates demonstrate understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners’ needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change.

**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:** Ongoing 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: Ongoing mindful effort.

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:** Ongoing 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 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 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:** Ongoing mindful effort.

**Standard Element 1.3 Implement a Vision**

**Action: Action Item Title: Assessment Synthesis**
Candidates demonstrate ability to formulate initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources.

**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:** Ongoing 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**
**Standard Element 1.4 Steward a Vision**
Candidates demonstrate ability to utilize effective communication skills, design and adopt data-based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision through various methods of stewardship.

**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:** Ongoing 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 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 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:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

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

Candidates demonstrate ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts, as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the 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:** 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:** Ongoing 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:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

**ELCC Standard 2 (2001)**

**Standard Element 2.1 Promote Positive School Culture**
Candidates demonstrate ability to assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture.

**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: Ongoing 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 SIRIII’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: Ongoing mindful effort.

**Standard Element 2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program**

Candidates demonstrate ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction, make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs, and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement.

**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:** Ongoing 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:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

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

Candidates demonstrate ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning, human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process, and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement.

**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:** Ongoing 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:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

**Standard Element 2.4**

**Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans**

Candidates demonstrate ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals, as well as strategies to form comprehensive professional growth plans with personnel and themselves that reflect a commitment to life-long 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: Ongoing 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: Ongoing 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 effort.
2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

ELCC Standard 3 (2001)

Standard Element 3.1
Manage the Organization

Candidates demonstrate ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction, and time management.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Standard Element 3.2
Manage Operations

Candidates demonstrate ability involve staff in

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio
Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Standard Element 3.3 Manage Resources
Candidates demonstrate ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use of fiscal, human, technological, and material resources that focus on teaching, learning, and school management.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

ELCC Standard 4 (2001)

Standard Element 4.1
Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members

Candidates demonstrate ability to bring together the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning, including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy, collaboration based on research, data-based outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships ... in a model of collaboration that involves community agencies, the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Standard Element 4.2
Respond to Community Interests and Needs

Candidates demonstrate ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with divergent stakeholders, using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse school community dynamics, while providing leadership to programs serving students with exceptional and diverse needs.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

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 school goals, and serve the community.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 compile into an overall piece representative of the work that has been done and the proficiencies attained. Students can develop these Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Assessment Findings
Finding per Measure

ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

ELCC Standard 3 (2001)

Standard Element 3.1
Manage the Organization

Candidates demonstrate ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction, and time management.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (50%)
- Meets (50%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more “telling” and “accurate” assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting “developing” as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, “developing” in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

MED Data for Both Measures 2013-2014 (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Assessment Synthesis
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: n = 16

- Exceeds (69%)
- Meets (31%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

Reflections/Notes: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Assessment Synthesis
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Standard Element 3.2 Manage Operations

Candidates demonstrate ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision, as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws.

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Findings** for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (42%)
- Meets (58%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate's portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings** for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (42%)
- Meets (58%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to
enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes**: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Standard Element 3.3 Manage Resources**
Candidates demonstrate ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use of fiscal, human, technological, and material resources that focus on teaching, learning, and school management.

**Measure**: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description**: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate's proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings**: n = 26

- Exceeds (23%)
- Meets (77%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more “telling” and “accurate” assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting “developing” as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, “developing” in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes**: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate's portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: n = 16
Exceeds (36%)
Meets (61%)
Does Not Meet (0%)

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually is, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

Reflections/Notes: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:
Assessment Synthesis
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

ELCC Standard 4 (2001)

Standard Element 4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members
Candidates demonstrate

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal
Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (58%)
- Meets (42%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
### Summary of Findings: n = 16

- Exceeds (94%)
- Meets (6%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading practices – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Standard Element 4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs**

Candidates demonstrate ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with divergent stakeholders, using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse school community dynamics, while providing leadership to programs serving students with exceptional and diverse needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings: n = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more "telling" and "accurate" assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting "developing" as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, "developing" in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to...
enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates. **Reflections/Notes**: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

**Findings** for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (69%)
- Meets (31%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more “telling” and “accurate” assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting “developing” as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, “developing” in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes**: We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)
**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 school goals, and serve the community.

---

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (65%)
- Meets (35%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more “telling” and “accurate” assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting “developing” as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually IS, “developing” in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**  
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (63%)
- Meets (37%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Continue with the university and field supervisor evaluation perspective for the coming year on SPA assessments, as this has the potential to result in a more “telling” and “accurate” assessment of candidate competencies. We also are moving toward a 4-point measurement scale of competencies, noting “developing” as an additional category, so we recommend substantive dialogue regarding what actually is, “developing” in our candidates. We also plan more dialogue among university supervisors on grading practices, as per standards, to enhance the inter-rater reliability of scores based on similar competencies among candidates.

**Reflections/Notes:** We have revised our specialized program association assessment system to reflect more balance and direct supervision in the evaluation process. To do so, we have maintained the university supervisor as the primary evaluator of the candidate’s portfolio; however, we have moved to the more direct field supervisor/mentor evaluation of overall candidate performance. This allows for more eyes on the candidate and a more accurate evaluation perspective. This past year as in years prior, we have noticed a disparity among university supervisors in grading perspectives – some much lighter in approach, and others much heavier. The speaks to the need for more training and thus, the potential for greater inter-rater reliability in assessment.

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

**Assessment Synthesis**
(announcement; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Overall Recommendations**

As Standard 4 addresses the candidate's competencies with community relations and Standard 3 addresses the candidate’s competencies with the management of a school, it appears that overall, candidates are doing a bit better with Standard 4. This is particularly interesting in that they typically focus more on Standard 3 in their reflective journals, under the direct supervision of their field supervisors. The department may wish to examine the potential incongruence here, along with an analysis of candidate dispositions (Question: Because of positive dispositions, could supervisors and mentors be making assumptions?). Just something for further dialogue, as it was interesting to note with the data provided.

---

**Overall Reflection**

The big question is as follows: What can university supervisors implement with respect to their own professional development in order to more tightly align their standards-based grading practices? It behooves us to have these conversations in upcoming program and department meetings, as this has been much-the-focus since our curriculum alignment activities began in 2011. Much credit should be given to faculty for their openness to collect and share data transparently, as it indicates much trust and collaboration under the leadership of our department chairperson.

---

**Action Plan**

**Actions**

**ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set**
ELCC Standard 3 (2001)

**Standard Element 3.1 Manage the Organization**
Candidates demonstrate ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction, and time management.

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings:

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (50%)
- Meets (50%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (69%)
- Meets (31%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**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 3.2 Manage Operations**
Candidates demonstrate ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision, as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws.

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

This Action is associated with the following Findings:

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (42%)
- Meets (58%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (42%)

---

Program Outcomes Assessment
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Meet (58%)
Does Not Meet (0%)  

**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 the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning, including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy, collaboration based on research, database outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships ... in a model of collaboration that involves community agencies, the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community.

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (58%)
- Meets (42%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (94%)
- Meets (6%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**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 for active involvement within the community, including interactions with divergent stakeholders, using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse school community

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (62%)
- Meets (38%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)
Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (69%)
- Meets (31%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**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 school goals, and serve the community.

**Action:** Assessment Synthesis

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

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 26

- Exceeds (65%)
- Meets (35%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**Findings for University Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** n = 16

- Exceeds (63%)
- Meets (37%)
- Does Not Meet (0%)

**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 Report

Action Statuses

ELCC 2001 Outcomes Set

ELCC Standard 3 (2001)

Standard Element 3.1
Manage the Organization
Candidates demonstrate ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction, and time management.

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.
Candidates demonstrate ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision, as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws.

**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 problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use of fiscal, human, technological, and material resources that focus on teaching, learning, and school management.

**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 the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning, including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy, collaboration based on research, data-based outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships ... in a model of collaboration that involves community agencies, the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger 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.

---

#### Standard Element 4.2

**Respond to Community Interests and Needs**

Candidates demonstrate...
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 school 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, curriculum redesign, and collaborative instructional planning.
2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011

Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics
A building-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 school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

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

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

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 school.

| Standard Element 5.3 | 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year. | Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan |

|  | Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment | Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty. | Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation. |

|  | Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment | Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year. | Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan |
be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard Element 5.4

**Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.**

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard Element 5.5

**Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.**

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of
each calendar year.

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

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Standard 6.0: Macro-Environment**

A building-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 through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

---

**Standard Element 6.1**

Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during
the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

### Standard Element 6.2

Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

### Standard Element 6.3

Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment  
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

### MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011

#### Standard 5.0: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

A building-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 school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

#### Standard Element 5.1

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

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

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

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.1 Skills  
Exceeds: 23%  
Meets: 69%  
Developing: 8%  
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.1 Skills

- Exceeds: 23%
- Meets: 69%
- Developing: 8%
- Does Not Meet: 0%

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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.

**Reflections/Notes**: 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.

---

**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 school.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings**: 5.2 Skills
- Exceeds: 23%
- Meets: 69%
- Developing: 8%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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**: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio
Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.2 Skills

- Exceeds: 23%
- Meets: 69%
- Developing: 8%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 school.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 =
Implementation Plan (timeline): Evidence will be collected and analyzed in May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 5.3 Skills
Exceeds: 20%
Meets: 72%
Developing: 8%
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Summary of Findings: 5.3 Skills
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 school.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.4 Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>21%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as a school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 5.4 Skills

- Exceeds: 21%
- Meets: 64%
- Developing: 15%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

**Summary of Findings**: 5.5 Skills
- Exceeds: 20%
- Meets: 67%
- 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 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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**: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description**: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal
Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

### Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** 5.5 Skills  
Exceeds: 20%  
Meets: 67%  
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 building-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 through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

### Standard Element 6.1

Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 6.1 Skills
- Exceeds: 31%
- Meets: 56%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Summary of Findings: 6.1 Skills
Exceeds: 31%
Meets: 56%
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 school environment.

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

Summary of Findings: 6.2 Skills
Exceeds: 15%
Meets: 64%
Developing: 21%
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Summary of Findings: 6.2 Skills
Exceeds: 15%
Meets: 64%
Developing: 21%
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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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 school-based leadership strategies.

#### 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

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

---

### Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

**Summary of Findings:** 6.3 Skills
- Exceeds: 15%
- Meets: 64%
- Developing: 21%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

**Summary of Findings:** 6.3 Skills

- Exceeds: 15%
- Meets: 64%
- Developing: 21%
- 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 M.Ed. 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 combined ranking was utilized for both field supervisor and portfolio 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**

We have developed a positive, contributory assessment culture in the Department of Educational Leadership. Political
shifts in State Standards, as compared to those authorized by our accreditation agencies, have made our assessment efforts a bit challenging as we try not to confuse our students with what are competing standards, yet we remain steadfast in focusing on our teaching and learning, as well as our discussions regarding data toward overall program improvement.

### Action Plan

#### MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011

##### Standard 1.0: Vision

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.1</th>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.</td>
<td><strong>This Action is associated with the following Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element 1.2</th>
<th>Action: Continue with Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.</td>
<td><strong>This Action is associated with the following Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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.
**Standard Element 1.3**
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school 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:** 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.

**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 school progress and revise school plans supported by school 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:** 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.

**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 building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within a school environment.

Standard Element 2.1
Candidates understand and can sustain a school 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: 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.

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 school 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: 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.

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.
**Standard Element 2.3**
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 technologies to support teaching and learning in a school 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:** 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.

**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
**Priority:** Medium

**Standard 3.0: Management**

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.

**Standard Element 3.1**

Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

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

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 to manage school operations.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

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

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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.
Standard Element 3.3
Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school 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:** 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.

**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 teacher and organizational 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: 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.

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 building-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 on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school 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 school’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: 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.

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 an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school 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:** 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.

**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

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments
and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: 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.

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 building-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 school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

Standard Element 5.1
Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school 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: 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.

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 school.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: 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.

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 5.3
Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: 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.

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

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.
making in the school.

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school to ensure that 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:** 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.

**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 building-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 through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

---

**Standard Element 6.1**
Candidates understand and can advocate for school 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: 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.

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 school 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: 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.

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 school-based 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: 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.

**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**

**MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011**

**Standard 1.0: Vision**

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

**Standard Element 1.1**

Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 1.2
Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 1.3
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school 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:** 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.

**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 2.1
Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.
### 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 school program.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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

---

No Status Added

---

**Standard Element 2.3**
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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

---

No Status Added
Standard Element 2.4
Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: 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.

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 building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.

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

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: 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.

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.
Standard Element 3.2
Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 3.3
Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school capacity for distributed leadership.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 building-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 on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school 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 school’s educational environment.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: 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.

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 4.2
Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

Action: Continue with Program Assessments

Action Details: 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.

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

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 4.4**
Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

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

### Standard Element 5.1

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

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 5.2

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

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 building-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 through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

---

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

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school environment.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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 school-based leadership strategies.

**Action:** Continue with Program Assessments

**Action Details:** 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.

**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*

---

**Status Summary**

*No text specified*

**Summary of Next Steps**

*No text specified*
**Assessment Plan**

**Outcomes and Measures**

**MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011**

**Standard 1.0: Vision**

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

**Standard Element 1.1**

Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

**Standard Element 1.2**

Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school

**Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

Direct - Other
goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

Details/Description: Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

Standard Element 1.3
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must
be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard Element 1.4

**Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard 2.0: Culture and Instructional Program

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

### Standard Element 2.1

**Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

**Standard Element 2.2**

Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must
be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard Element 2.3

**Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.**

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

### Standard Element 2.4

**Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.**

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

**Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

**MED in Sch Administration & Supervision Outcome Set - 2011**

**Standard 1.0: Vision**

A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

**Standard Element 1.1**

Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

No Findings Added
### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

### Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

*No Findings Added*

---

### 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

*No Findings Added*
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

No Findings Added

Standard Element 1.3
Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

No Findings Added

Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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): Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

Responsible Individual(s): All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

No Findings Added

Standard Element 1.4
Candidates understand and can evaluate school

Measure: Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment
Direct - Other
progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.

**Details/Description:** Field Supervisors have provided ongoing supervision, guidance, and assessment of Candidate Interns throughout the course of their Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

No Findings Added

**Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

No Findings Added

---

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

---

**Standard Element 2.1**
Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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
### Standard Element 2.2
Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

#### 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Measure: M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

---

**Findings** for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

*No Findings Added*

---

**Standard Element 2.3**
Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**▼ 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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership’s Building 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 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

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

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings** for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment

*No Findings Added*

---

**▼ Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment
Direct - Portfolio

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.
**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

No Findings Added

**Standard Element 2.4**

Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

**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 Principal Internships, a culmination of their M.Ed. experiences in the Department of Educational Leadership's Building 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 May and June of each calendar year.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Field Supervisor ELCC Summative Assessment**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment

- **Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:** The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the 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):** Data are collected in June of each year and analyzed during the summer months, in collaboration with program faculty.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All program faculty for data collection; Ryan Donlan for stewardship of analysis and interpretation.

**Findings for M. Ed. Portfolio Assessment**

No Findings Added

**Overall Recommendations**

No text specified
Overall Reflection

No text specified
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Indiana State University
Department of Educational Leadership

Assessment #6 M.Ed.
Content-Based Assessment – Application of Content – EDLR 758/793

Assessment Name: Portfolio Assessment: Intern Application of Content Knowledge

Brief Description of Assessment

The Portfolio Assessment is the culminating evidentiary piece in the Principal Internship that represents a candidate’s proficiency in his/her professional competencies as school building leader. Throughout the semester, Interns frame their immersion into building 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 Portfolios in a variety of formats yet all must be anchored clearly in the Standard Elements.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with Standards

To understand how this Assessment’s Standard Elements coverage aligns with the overall ELCC competencies evaluated in our Program, the following chart is included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD ELEMENTS</th>
<th>EDLR 758/793</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 develop a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 articulate a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 implement a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 steward a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 promote community involvement</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 promote positive school culture</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 provide effective instructional program</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 apply best practice to student learning</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 design comprehensive growth plans</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 manage the organization</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 manage operations  x  
3.3 manage resources  x  

| 4.1 collaborate with families and other community |  x  |
| 4.2 respond to community interests and needs |  x  |
| 4.3 mobilize community resources |  x  |

| 5.1 acts with integrity |  x  |
| 5.2 acts fairly |  x  |
| 5.3 acts ethically |  x  |

| 6.1 understand the larger context |  x  |
| 6.2 respond to the larger context |  x  |
| 6.3 influence the larger context |  x  |

Alignment of Standards Narrative

Candidates are encouraged throughout the semester to widen their panoramic lenses through which they view the business of teaching and learning. With rich dialogue, job shadowing, and through relationships with their on-site Mentors, Interns are exposed to a variety of experiences pertaining to the larger picture of school leadership. Through such, they see others in leadership positions [1.1] Develop a School Vision for Learning, [1.2] Articulate a School Vision of Learning, [1.3] Implement a School Vision for Learning, [1.4] Steward a School Vision for Learning, and [1.5] Promote Community Involvement in School Vision. Once a proper amount of modeling and coaching has taken place, Interns are then involved directly in the aforementioned, themselves. Because many come directly from the classroom, they readily assume responsibilities during their Internships that align with Standard 2, including responsibilities that [2.1] Promote a Positive School Culture, [2.2] Provide Effective Instructional Program, [2.3] Apply Best Practice to Student Learning, and [2.4] Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans. One popular example of these is our Interns’ opportunities to participate in the Professional Performance Review Process of faculty during teacher evaluations. However, we have to be mindful of local collective bargaining agreements in these instances. As their perspectives widen, their on-site mentors begin to expand Interns’ roles in areas in which they assist their Principals, such as [3.1] Manage the Organization, [3.2] Manage the Operations, and [3.3] Manage the Resources. Collaboration is a large part of the experience as well, as our Interns [4.1] Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members, [4.2] Respond to Community Interests and Needs, and [4.3] Mobilize Community Resources. These are often experienced as part of their Long-Term Project, as Site Mentors evaluate to the extent that each Intern [5.1] Acts with Integrity, [5.2] Acts Fairly, and [5.3] Acts Ethically. Over time, especially nearing the end of the Internship and during our Saturday on-campus seminars, we are better able to provide experiences for the Interns in which they [6.1] Understand the Larger Educational Contexts, [6.2] Respond to the Larger Educational Context, and [6.3] Influence the
Larger Educational Context. Throughout this entire experiences, [7.3] Candidates apply skills and knowledge articulated in the first six ELCC Standards, as well as state and local standards for educational leaders while allowing candidates’ individual needs to drive their leadership journey.

**Alignment to Indiana Content Standards for Educators:**

*Indiana’s Content Standards for Educators – School Leader-Building Level* are presented to educators in a different format than the National Policy Board for Educational Administration’s Educational Leadership Licensure Consortium’s (ELCC) Standards; however, the Indiana State Department of Education has aligned key Standard Elements to its own Content Standards. Presented below is information on that alignment (*Assessment #6 Specific Alignment in Blue*), taken and adapted from *Indiana Content Standards for Educators: School Leader-Building Level, December 2010*, published and made available on-line by the Indiana Department of Education (pp. 6-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiana Educator Standards for School Leader-Building Level</th>
<th>NPBEA Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Human Capital Management</strong></td>
<td>1.3.a, b, 2.4.a, b, 3.1.a, b, c, 3.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Instructional Leadership</strong></td>
<td>1.3.a, b, 1.4.b, 2.2.a, b, 2.3.a, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Personal Behavior</strong></td>
<td>1.5.a, 2.4.c, 3.1.c, 4.1.a, 5.1.a, 5.2.a, 5.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4: Building Relationships</strong></td>
<td>1.2.c, 1.3.a, 1.4.a, 1.5.b, 3.2.a, 4.1.a, 4.2.a, 4.3.a, 6.1.h, 6.2.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For ease of evaluation and consistency with our Specialized Program Association’s expectations for our ongoing assessment of our instructional program, we will focus our reporting of Assessment data to those of the ELCC Standards, leaving a general cross-referencing of ELCC Standard Elements with Indiana’s new Content Standards in this section of each Assessment Report. We are moving to a model where we will be incorporating information to students on the alignment of both ELCC Standards and Indiana Content Standards to their coursework in new syllabi of courses.

### Analysis of Data Findings

At this time, one semester of data is available for review and analysis. We consider this formative data as students are assessed twice each year on the Portfolio Assessment with ELCC Standard review. It is our hope that we see growth between the first and second sets of data, indicating increased proficiency at meeting the ELCC Standard Elements. As this set of data is provided from a mid-year review, it comes as no surprise to use that higher growth areas are found to be in areas of managing operations, responding to community, and responding to and influencing the larger educational context, as these Standard Elements, as noted above, receive more attention and Intern involvement during the 2nd semester of the experience.

In particular, data show that our areas of highest proficiency include [2.4] Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans, which was good to see in our Interns, as earlier Assessments revealed that these are not competencies that are strong earlier in the Program experience for students. We are perplexed and are studying why Standard 2 seemed to be the lowest area of competency in the SLLA (Assessment #1) with last year’s group, yet Standard 2 in Assessment #6 for this year’s group, was much higher. Is it simply a difference in groups? Once data arrives from this group’s School Leader’s Licensure Assessment, we will have more data with which to compare apples to apples, yet even without, it appears that something is allowing these candidates to demonstrate positive performance on Standard 2, and that is promising.

Data for some candidates in Standard Element [3.2] was also high, which demonstrated that these Interns are growing (as compared also to earlier Program assessment data) in their efficacy or at least their demonstration of knowledge in Management of Operations.
Candidates continue to be high in areas of values, ethics, and integrity, good to know as they are not backsliding through the duration of the program. Assessors may remember that students are evaluated quite high in these areas in our Foundations Assessment.

Areas of most need of growth include, ironically, area [3.2] as well (same that was evaluated quite high above). This tempers our perspective a bit and adds a bit of polarity to our assessment, indicating to us that some Interns are receiving more opportunities to develop efficacy and knowledge in the areas of management than others. We may need to review what and how we are communicating with Site Mentors based on these data, so as to assure those needing support receive the opportunity to practice their craft.

Standard Element 4.2 was identified a bit lower as well, leading us to the conclusion that our Interns may be disproportionately immersed in opportunities for building management and instructional leadership during these experiences, and not so much in the development of social capital through increased and more frequent community contact. We will need to study this further.

Finally, although candidates seem to [6.1] Understand the Larger Context, they are not demonstrating that they know how to [6.2] Respond to the Larger Context or [6.3] Influence the Larger Context. As Department members discussing these data, we have surmised that with the rapid changes in education taking place from the State-downward, in Indiana, principals may not have the time to work with their Interns on how to best formulate responses and tactics for influencing the larger picture. Could it be that they are too immersed in understanding, grappling with, and reacting to change, themselves, at present? We will keep close watch where these data go and work to improve our programs accordingly, filling-gaps in field experiences with our own coursework, cohort discussions, and professional development opportunities.

**Interpretation of how Data Provide Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Overall, candidate mid-year performance with one semester’s worth of data indicated solid ELCC Standard Element proficiency. This year is the first year of Element-specific Standard assessment for Principal Interns, and the deepened focus on the rigors of leadership was a bit daunting at first for our students, but Faculty Supervisors worked particularly hard to articulate and embrace them through modeling their meaningfulness to a leader’s career responsibilities.

Standard Element evidence is provided below:

1.1 – Develop a School Vision of Learning: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.2 – Articulate a School Vision of Learning: 91% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.3 – Implement a School Vision of Learning: 89% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.4 – Steward a School Vision of Learning: 92% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.5 – Promote Community Involvement in School Vision: 87% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.1 – Promote a Positive School Culture: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.2 – Provide Effective Instructional Program: 91% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.3 – Apply Best Practice to Student Learning: 99% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.4 – Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.1 – Manage the Organization: 92% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.2 – Manage the Operations: 81% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.3 – Manage the Resources: 89% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.1 – Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members: 92% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.2 – Respond to Community Interests and Needs: 83% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.3 – Mobilize Community Resources: 89% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.1 – Acts with Integrity: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.2 – Acts Fairly: 99% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.3 – Acts Ethically: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.1 – Understand the Larger Educational Context: 98% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.2 – Respond to the Larger Educational Context: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.3 – Influence the Larger Educational Context: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

Assessment Documentation

Students are given the following Handbook Language pertaining to the Portfolio Project at the outset of the Internship:

**PORTFOLIOS**

Each intern will develop a portfolio throughout the internship. Each portfolio will be used to show the extent to which the internship meets the requirements of the Indiana Professional Standards for Building Level Administrators. Contents of the portfolio will reflect professional growth and should be suitable for use as supplementary material the student may choose to use during future interviews for administrative positions. A general outline for portfolio development is included in Appendix H. Interns will learn more about the portfolio expectations at the July meeting.

**Internship Portfolio Activities**

The following standards have been identified by the seven Educational Leadership Constituents Council as critical to becoming an effective administrator. Standard seven is related to internship experiences and is not reflected in this activity. By November 6, 2011, you will need to have entered a minimum of one paragraph per item regarding your initial impressions of the activity described. The final portfolio, which will include a more comprehensive perspective, will be due April 11, 2012.

**Standard 1 – A Vision of Learning**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community. The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
1. The vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members; the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised.

2. The vision is developed with and among stakeholders, thus the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated.

3. Assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals so that barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed.

Standard 2 – School Culture and Instructional Program
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. The school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis.
2. Student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques, thus multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students so that barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed.
3. There is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance.

Standard 3 – Management
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. Operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning and to achieve the vision and goals of the school.
2. The school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively, thus potential problems are identified and are confronted and resolved in a timely manner.
3. Confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained.

Standard 4 – Collaboration with Families and the Community
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. A comprehensive program of community relations is established whereas community services are integrated with school programs.
2. Diversity is recognized and valued, thus there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations, which support individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict.
3. Effective media relations are developed and maintained.

Standard 5 – Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. The administrator:

1. Serves as a role model, demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance and demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics.
2. Treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect and thus demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community.
3. Fulfills legal and contractual obligations, applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately.

**Standard 6 – The Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by understanding, responding to and influencing the longer political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. Communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate.
2. There is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups.
3. The school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities.

---

**Scoring Guide for Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.Ed. Program ELEMENTS</th>
<th>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDLR 758 Portfolio Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student: _____________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Develop a Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrates through visioning for the success of all students (1.1.a.) a complete understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners' needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change</td>
<td>Demonstrates through visioning for the success of all students (1.1.a.) a sufficient understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners' needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change</td>
<td>Demonstrates through visioning for the success of all students (1.1.a.) little or no understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners' needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End Handbook Language
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>(1.1.b.)</th>
<th>(1.1.b.)</th>
<th>(1.1.b.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2  Articulate a Vision</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to articulate components of a vision (1.2.a.), use data based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources to assess student learning (1.2.b.) and communicate such to stakeholders (1.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to articulate components of a vision (1.2.a.), use data based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources to assess student learning (1.2.b.) and communicate such to stakeholders (1.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to articulate components of a vision (1.2.a.), use data based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources to assess student learning (1.2.b.) and communicate such to stakeholders (1.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3  Implement a Vision</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, (1.3.a.) develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources (1.3.b.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders (1.3.a.), develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources (1.3.b.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders (1.3.a.), develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources (1.3.b.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4  Steward a Vision</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to utilize effective communication skills (1.4.a.), design and adopt data based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision (1.4.b.) through various methods of Stewardship (1.4.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to utilize effective communication skills (1.4.a.), design and adopt data based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision (1.4.b.) through various methods of stewardship (1.4.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to utilize effective communication skills (1.4.a.), design and adopt data based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision (1.4.b.) through various methods of stewardship (1.4.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5  Promote Community Involvement in the Vision</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts (1.5.a.), as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision (1.5.b.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts (1.5.a.), as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision (1.5.b.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts (1.5.a.), as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision (1.5.b.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Promote Positive School Culture</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to assess school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Score:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Assess School Culture</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture (2.1.a.).</td>
<td>culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture (2.1.a.).</td>
<td>culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture (2.1.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Provide Effective Instruction Program</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction (2.2.a.), make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs (2.2.b.), and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement (2.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction (2.2.a.), make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs (2.2.b.), and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement (2.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction (2.2.a.), make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners’ diverse needs (2.2.b.), and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement (2.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning (2.3.a.), human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process (2.3.b.), and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement (2.3.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning (2.3.a.), human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process (2.3.b.), and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement (2.3.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning (2.3.a.), human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process (2.3.b.), and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement (2.3.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals (2.4.a.), as</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals (2.4.a.), as</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals (2.4.a.), as well as strategies to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Manage the Organization</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency (3.1.a.), as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction (3.1.b.), and time management (3.1.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency (3.1.a.), as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction (3.1.b.), and time management (3.1.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency (3.1.a.), as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction (3.1.b.), and time management (3.1.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Manage Operations</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision (3.2.a.), as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders (3.2.b.) and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws (3.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision (3.2.a.), as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders (3.2.b.) and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws (3.2.c.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability involve staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision (3.2.a.), as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders (3.2.b.) and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws (3.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Manage Resources</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests and Needs</td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Interests and Needs</td>
<td>Score:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to bring together the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning (4.1.a.), including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy (4.1.b.), collaboration based on research (4.1.c.), database outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships (4.1.d.) ... in a model of collaboration that involves various methods of outreach (4.1.e.), involvement of families in decision making (4.1.f.) collaboration with community agencies (4.1.g.), the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community (4.1.h.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to bring together the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning, (4.1.a.), including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy (4.1.b.), collaboration based on research (4.1.c.), database outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships (4.1.d.) ... in a model of collaboration that involves various methods of outreach (4.1.e.), involvement of families in decision making (4.1.f.) collaboration with community agencies (4.1.g.), the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community (4.1.h.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to bring together the resources of family members and the community to positively affect student learning, (4.1.a.), including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy (4.1.b.), collaboration based on research (4.1.c.), database outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships (4.1.d.) ... in a model of collaboration that involves various methods of outreach (4.1.e.), involvement of families in decision making (4.1.f.) collaboration with community agencies (4.1.g.), the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community (4.1.h.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with individuals with conflicting perspectives (4.2.a.), using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with individuals with conflicting perspectives (4.2.a.), using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with individuals with conflicting perspectives (4.2.a.), using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>4.3 Mobilize Community Resources</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete understanding of and ability to use the community resources, social service agencies, and public funds to support student achievement, solve problems, achieve school goals (4.3.a.), serve the community (4.3.b.), and to encourage communities to provide new resources to address emerging student problems (4.3.c.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>5.1 Acts with Integrity</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete understanding for the respect and rights of others with regard to confidentiality and dignity and engage in honest interactions (5.1.a.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>5.2 Acts Fairly</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to combine sufficient sensitivity to student diversity, and ethical considerations in their interactions with others (5.2.a.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Score: | 5.3 Acts Ethically | Demonstrates complete ability to make and explain decisions based upon ethical and legal principles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>principles (5.3.a.)</th>
<th>principles (5.3.a.)</th>
<th>(5.3.a.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Understand the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to act as informed consumers and practitioners of educational theory, research, and concepts appropriate to school contexts (6.1.a.); and to explain how legal and political systems have shaped education (6.1.b.) and has knowledge of complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on learning (6.1.c.), as well as to be aware of the laws, regulations, and economical principles that affect schools and improve educational opportunities (6.1.d.); and how economic factors have an effect on local schools (6.1.e.) and how cultural diversity, norms, and values relate to promoting social justice, conflict resolution, and change (6.1.f.g.h.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to act as informed consumers and practitioners of educational theory, research, and concepts appropriate to school contexts (6.1.a.); and to explain how legal and political systems have shaped education (6.1.b.) and has knowledge of complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on learning (6.1.c.), as well as to be aware of the laws, regulations, and economical principles that affect schools and improve educational opportunities (6.1.d.); and how economic factors have an effect on local schools (6.1.e.) and how cultural diversity, norms, and values relate to promoting social justice, conflict resolution, and change (6.1.f.g.h.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to act as informed consumers and practitioners of educational theory, research, and concepts appropriate to school contexts (6.1.a.); and to explain how legal and political systems have shaped education (6.1.b.) and has knowledge of complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on learning (6.1.c.), as well as to be aware of the laws, regulations, and economical principles that affect schools and improve educational opportunities (6.1.d.); and how economic factors have an effect on local schools (6.1.e.) and how cultural diversity, norms, and values relate to promoting social justice, conflict resolution, and change (6.1.f.g.h.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>principles (5.3.a.)</td>
<td>principles (5.3.a.)</td>
<td>(5.3.a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Respond to the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to communicate with members of a school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which the school operates, including maintenance of an on-going dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups (6.2.a.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to communicate with members of a school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which the school operates, including maintenance of an on-going dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups (6.2.a.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to communicate with members of a school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which the school operates, including maintenance of an on-going dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups (6.2.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>principles (5.3.a.)</td>
<td>principles (5.3.a.)</td>
<td>(5.3.a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Influence the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete ability to</td>
<td>Demonstrates sufficient ability to</td>
<td>Demonstrates little ability to engage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
engage students, parents, and community members in advocating for adoption of improved policies and laws (6.3.a.), as well as an understanding of the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts to develop programs that benefit stakeholders (6.3.b.) and promote equitable learning opportunities for all students regardless of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, gender, disability, or other individual characteristics (6.3.c.).

students, parents, and community members in advocating for adoption of improved policies and laws (6.3.a.), as well as an understanding of the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts to develop programs that benefit stakeholders (6.3.b.) and promote equitable learning opportunities for all students regardless of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, gender, disability, or other individual characteristics (6.3.c.).

---

**Chart that Provides Candidate Data Derived from the Assessment**

**From Fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 36</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n =36</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>21 (58%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13 (36%)</td>
<td>19 (53%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (56%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>20 (56%)</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>21 (58%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13 (36%)</td>
<td>23 (63%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14 (39%)</td>
<td>16 (44%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15 (42%)</td>
<td>14 (39%)</td>
<td>7 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>21 (58%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>19 (52%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10 (28%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 7.0: Internship

Assessment of Standard 7.0: Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified on 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.

Please check all the following that apply for this Assessment and support with commentary:

_x_ 1. Synthesis of Standards 1 – 6 is reflected in design and evident in assessment mechanism submitted above. Comments: All Standard Elements were included for the first time in Fall 2011 for Principal Interns. While this resulted in some challenge for the Interns at first, and even among University Supervisors who were attempting to align their expectations of rigor with much finer degrees of acuity, the experience proved remarkably powerful in aligning expectation standards in a setting of relevance and criterion-referenced competencies.

_x_ 2. Substantial, sustained, standards-based work took place in real settings. Comments: All activities took place in K-12 schools in which the Interns were employed (or other schools within the school corporation). By the conclusion of the school year, Interns will have put more than 300 hours each into the activities referenced in Assessment #6.

_x_ 3. Experience was planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Comments: University Supervisors allowed Candidate/Interns and Site Mentors (in most cases, their Principals) to design and coordinate the activities that were referenced and reflected in their Portfolios. Indiana State University personnel then facilitated how Interns could best work to align their efforts to ELCC Standard Elements, as well as to facets of the Bayh College of Education’s Conceptual Framework.

Element-Specific Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 (50%)</th>
<th>17 (47%)</th>
<th>1 (3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
<td>19 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>19 (52%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13 (36%)</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 – 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.

Please check all the following that apply for this Assessment and support with commentary:

__x__ 1. Application of ELCC Standard skills and knowledge is evident in candidates’ work. Comments: Portfolios are constructed and evaluated, Standard-by-Standard, Element-by-Element, as the rubric (Scoring Assessment) above illustrates.

__x__ 2. State and local standards are reflected in this Assessment. Comments: Assessment # 6 is aligned – reflected as such near the beginning of this Assessment document – to the Indiana Content Standards for Educators – Building-Level.

__x__ 3. Experiences are designed with respect to candidates’ individual needs. Comments: Constructivism with respect to the candidates’ interests, aptitudes, and abilities served as the springboard for the development of the experiences highlighted in the Portfolios used as the base for evaluation in Assessment #6.
From Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>23 (67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>24 (71%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>23 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6 (17=8%)</td>
<td>27 (79%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28 (82%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>27 (79%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>22 (65%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>23 (67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## From Spring 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21 (67%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (66%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21 (64%)</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (66%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>21 (67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indiana State University
Department of Educational Leadership

Assessment #4 M.Ed.
Assessment of Internship/Clinical Practice

Assessment Name: University Supervisor Evaluation of Interns and Internship, EDLR 758/793

Brief Description of Assessment

University Supervisor Evaluation of Interns and Internship were carefully and critically designed through an analysis of the concepts embedded within each ELCC Standard Element. After input provided in our National Recognition Report that we needed to more carefully align our teaching and learning in leadership to Element-specific concepts, the Department of Educational Leadership undertook a comprehensive review of its curriculum and offerings. Consensus was reached among Department faculty that strict fidelity to the Educational Leadership Constituents Council would be necessary in our capstone assessments of Principal Intern graduating from the program. Although for internal purposes, the assessments also measure Intern Dispositions of Educator as Person, Educator as Mediator of the Learning Environment, and Educator as Member of Communities, in line with our Unit’s Conceptual Framework, Becoming a Complete Professional, as well as the Intern’s understanding of Diversity, data presented here will specifically relate to ELCC Standard Elements for focus and clarity of review and programmatic assessment.

Note on Long-Range Data Plans: The long-term intent of this Assessment is to compare University Supervisor summative evaluation results of the Intern/Internship experience from year to year.

However, as this year is the first gathering of this data under the ELCC Standard Elements (with only formative data available at this time), we are also including two other formative data collections in order to triangulate results with as many data points as possible—those formative data from the Site Mentors and those from the Interns, themselves.

Whether we assess three data points each semester to this degree of specificity in future years will depend upon the usefulness of these data in evaluating program curriculum and direction, determined in Summer 2012 by the Department of Educational Leadership, as well as any input or direction provided by SPA reviewers as to their utility in telling a story from which we can learn.
Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with Standards

Through a comprehensive curricular alignment process initiated in Summer 2011, we built upon our prior year's Mentor Evaluation Forms, presented later in the report, enhancing them through careful study of the document, *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors*, authored by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002).

This work has resulted in the construction of ELCC Standard-Element Rubrics clearly identifying ALL concepts embedded within each Element for University Supervisors and Field Mentors for the Internship experience, as well as an on-line assessment via *Qualtrics* (on-line survey instrument adopted by Indiana State University) for Interns.

ELCC Standard Elements are scored on a 3-Point Rubric: (3) Exceeds Expectations, (2) Meets Expectations, and (1) Does Not Meet Expectations. Standard Elements used for the purpose of Assessment #4 were the following:

1.1 – Develop a School Vision of Learning (Concepts 1.1.a. and 1.1.b.)
1.2 – Articulate a School Vision of Learning (Concepts 1.2.a, 1.2.b, and 1.2.c.)
1.3 – Implement a School Vision of Learning (Concepts 1.3.a. and 1.3.b.)
1.4 – Steward a School Vision of Learning (Concepts 1.4.a., 1.4.b, and 1.4.c.)
1.5 – Promote Community Involvement in School Vision (Concepts 1.5.a. and 1.5.b.)
2.1 – Promote a Positive School Culture (Concept 2.1.a.)
2.2 – Provide Effective Instructional Program (Concepts 2.2.a., 2.2.b, and 2.2.c.)
2.3 – Apply Best Practice to Student Learning (Concepts 2.3.a., 2.3.b, and 2.3.c.)
2.4 – Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans (Concepts 2.4.a., 2.4.b, and 2.4.c.)
3.1 – Manage the Organization (Concepts 3.1.a., 3.1.b., and 3.1.c.)
3.2 – Manage the Operations (Concepts 3.2.a., 3.2.b., and 3.2.c.)
3.3 – Manage the Resources (Concepts 3.3.a., 3.3.b., and 3.3.c.)
4.1 – Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members (Concepts 4.1.a., 4.1.b., 4.1.c., 4.1.d., 4.1.e., 4.1.f, 4.1.g, and 4.1.h.)
4.2 – Respond to Community Interests and Needs (Concepts 4.2.a., 4.2.b., 4.2.c, and 4.2.d.)
4.3 – Mobilize Community Resources (Concepts 4.3.a., 4.3.b., and 4.3.c.)
5.1 – Acts with Integrity (Concept 5.1.a.)
5.2 – Acts Fairly (Concept 5.2.a.)
5.3 – Acts Ethically (Concept 5.3.a.)
6.2 – Respond to the Larger Educational Context (Concept 6.2.a.)
6.3 – Influence the Larger Educational Context (Concepts 6.3.a., 6.3.b., and 6.3.c.)
To understand how this Assessment’s Standard Elements coverage aligns with the overall ELCC competencies evaluated in our Program, the following chart is included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD ELEMENTS</th>
<th>EDLR 758/793</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 develop a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 articulate a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 implement a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 steward a vision</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 promote community involvement</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 promote positive school culture</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 provide effective instructional program</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 apply best practice to student learning</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 design comprehensive growth plans</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 manage the organization</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 manage operations</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 manage resources</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 collaborate with families and other community</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 respond to community interests and needs</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 mobilize community resources</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 acts with integrity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 acts fairly</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 acts ethically</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 understand the larger context</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 respond to the larger context</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 influence the larger context</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alignment to Indiana Content Standards for Educators:**

*Indiana’s Content Standards for Educators – School Leader-Building Level* are presented to educators in a different format than the National Policy Board for Educational
Administration’s Educational Leadership Licensure Consortium’s (ELCC) Standards; however, the Indiana State Department of Education has aligned key Standard Elements to its own Content Standards. Presented below is information on that alignment (Assessment # 4 Specific Alignment in Blue), taken and adapted from *Indiana Content Standards for Educators: School Leader-Building Level, December 2010*, published and made available on-line by the Indiana Department of Education (pp. 6-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiana Educator Standards for School Leader-Building Level</th>
<th>NPBEA Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Human Capital Management</strong></td>
<td>1.3.a, b, 2.4.a, b, 3.1.a, b, c, 3.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Instructional Leadership</strong></td>
<td>1.3.a, b, 1.4.b, 2.2.a, b, 2.3.a, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Personal Behavior</strong></td>
<td>1.5.a, 2.4.c, 3.1.c, 4.1.a, 5.1.a, 5.2.a, 5.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4: Building Relationships</strong></td>
<td>1.2.c, 1.3.a, 1.4.a, 1.5.b, 3.2.a, 4.1.a, 4.2.a, 4.3.a, 6.1.h, 6.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5: Culture of Achievement</strong></td>
<td>1.3.b, 1.5.a, 2.2.a, 2.3.c, 3.1.b, 3.2.c, 4.1.a, b, c, d, e, 4.3.a, c, 6.3.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6: Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management</strong></td>
<td>3.1.a, b, c, 3.2.a, c, 3.3.a, b, c, 4.3.c, 5.1.a, 5.3.a, 6.1.d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For ease of evaluation and consistency with our Specialized Program Association’s expectations for our ongoing assessment of our instructional program, we will focus our reporting of Assessment data to those of the ELCC Standards, leaving a general cross-referencing of ELCC Standard Elements with Indiana’s new Content Standards in this section of each Assessment Report. We are moving to a model where we will be incorporating information to students on the alignment of both ELCC Standards and Indiana Content Standards to their coursework in new syllabi of courses.

**Analysis of Data Findings**

As this is the first semester of the project’s launch under the final evaluation system via Standard Elements, only formative data is available. We anticipate having Standard Element Summative Data in May 2012.

Initial analysis of data reveals that University Supervisors are rating Interns quite high on promoting a positive culture (2.1) and providing effective instructional program (2.2), as well as best practice (2.3). Interns, however, report that they have a bit more growth needed in designing comprehensive professional growth plans (2.4), which does not surprise us, as oftentimes they are not allowed to be involved directly in real-world application of this Standard Element because of collective bargaining agreement prohibitions. Interns also report that they have the need for growth in responding to the larger educational context (6.2), which does not surprise us as even their Site Mentors are struggling with this, given the comprehensive push for educational reform currently taking place in Indiana. Mentor’s ratings of Interns are disproportionately high, all the way across the Standard Element spectrum, giving pause for concerns of grade inflation in the field, and we will discuss this further as faculty. After all, these data are formative. We were pleased, however, to see that Site Mentors agreed with Interns regarding their qualities of ethics, fairness, and integrity. University supervisors rated Interns slightly lower here, yet still “sufficient,” supporting the notion that we may be looking at these qualities from a deeper, more theoretical perspective, rather than from a day-to-day practitioner’s perspective. Discussions will sort out these findings for the Department.

**Interpretation of how Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Site Mentors and Candidates have provided us initial or formative data on their success in their Principal Internship Experiences, as reflected in ELCC Standard Elements. Mentors have also provided us evaluations of candidates on Unit Conceptual Model Dispositions and Understanding of Diversity. Results for the ELCC Standard Elements are provided below:
From the University Supervisors:

1.1 – Develop a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.2 – Articulate a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.3 – Implement a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.4 – Steward a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.5 – Promote Community Involvement in School Vision: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

2.1 – Promote a Positive School Culture: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.2 – Provide Effective Instructional Program: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.3 – Apply Best Practice to Student Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.4 – Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

3.1 – Manage the Organization: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.2 – Manage the Operations: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.3 – Manage the Resources: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

4.1 – Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.2 – Respond to Community Interests and Needs: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.3 – Mobilize Community Resources: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

5.1 – Acts with Integrity: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.2 – Acts Fairly: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.3 – Acts Ethically: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

6.1 – Understand the Larger Educational Context: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.2 – Respond to the Larger Educational Context: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.3 – Influence the Larger Educational Context: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

From the Site Mentors:

1.1 – Develop a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.2 – Articulate a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.3 – Implement a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.4 – Steward a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.5 – Promote Community Involvement in School Vision: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

2.1 – Promote a Positive School Culture: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.2 – Provide Effective Instructional Program: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.3 – Apply Best Practice to Student Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.4 – Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

3.1 – Manage the Organization: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.2 – Manage the Operations: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.3 – Manage the Resources: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.1 – Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.2 – Respond to Community Interests and Needs: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.3 – Mobilize Community Resources: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.1 – Acts with Integrity: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.2 – Acts Fairly: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.3 – Acts Ethically: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.1 – Understand the Larger Educational Context: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.2 – Respond to the Larger Educational Context: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.3 – Influence the Larger Educational Context: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.

From the Candidates:

1.1 – Develop a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.2 – Articulate a School Vision of Learning: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.3 – Implement a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.4 – Steward a School Vision of Learning: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
1.5 – Promote Community Involvement in School Vision: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.1 – Promote a Positive School Culture: 94 % Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.2 – Provide Effective Instructional Program: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.3 – Apply Best Practice to Student Learning: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
2.4 – Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans: 91% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.1 – Manage the Organization: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.2 – Manage the Operations: 97 % Met or Exceeded Expectations.
3.3 – Manage the Resources: 97 % Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.1 – Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.2 – Respond to Community Interests and Needs: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
4.3 – Mobilize Community Resources: 94% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.1 – Acts with Integrity: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.2 – Acts Fairly: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
5.3 – Acts Ethically: 100% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.1 – Understand the Larger Educational Context: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.2 – Respond to the Larger Educational Context: 91% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
6.3 – Influence the Larger Educational Context: 97% Met or Exceeded Expectations.
Assessment Documentation

Students are provided the following Handbook Language pertaining to the respective roles of those involved in the Internship, as well as the Mentor and University Supervisor. Self-Assessment is also discussed.

**Role of the Intern:**

The internship program requires the intern to work under the supervision of a mentor for approximately 10 hours per week. Ideally, the intern will be assigned a wide range of administrative duties and responsibilities with corresponding authority. Opportunities for the intern to assume a leadership role or to participate/observe in the decision-making process are encouraged. Additionally, the intern is expected to seek opportunities at both the elementary and secondary levels. The intern must take the initiative to broaden his or her professional experiences as this range of experience is needed to support the K-12 principal license. The intern is required to make weekly reports to the university supervisor. Mentors may request a copy of these reports. Visits at the school site provide opportunity for the intern and the university supervisor to discuss any concerns that might arise. Interns are further required to attend all on-campus seminars scheduled during the year.

Interns must realize that they may find themselves “in between” teachers and administrators. Interns that serve as building union representatives may want to consider not serving in that capacity during the internship. *It is essential that interns keep privileged information confidential.* If difficulties or problems arise during the internship, the issue should be brought to the attention of the University supervisor as soon as possible. If the problem remains unresolved, a new mentor may be assigned or termination of the internship may occur (refer to Appendix L). If the internship fails prior to completion, the student will be asked to provide a brief statement with copies forwarded to all parties involved, including the Registrar.

The intern is not an employee or agent of the University, and worker’s compensation benefits are not provided to the intern in his/her capacity. The University provides guidance and facilitates internship activities only as a component of the educational experience and accepts no responsibility for loss, damages, or injury to persons or property caused by the intern or others while participating in the internship. The University is not responsible for matters beyond its control.

The intern is required to provide personal health and accident insurance. Neither the Trustees of Indiana State University nor the faculty sponsor is responsible for any medical or legal expenses that may result from injury or illness sustained while participating in the internship. If an intern drives or provides a motor vehicle for transportation to or from the internship site or while performing internship duties, then the intern is responsible for individual acts and the safety and security of the vehicle. The intern accepts full responsibility for insurance, and the liability of the driver and passengers.

The intern must have a limited criminal background check on file with the school(s) they intend on performing internship duties.

**Role of the Host Administrator (Mentor):**

The role of the mentor includes recommending individuals for admission to the internship, on-site supervision for the intern, meeting with the university supervisor, assigning administrative duties and tasks, guiding the intern, and assessing progress of the intern. It is recommended that the mentor introduce the intern to the faculty at the
beginning of the school year and explain the function and duties of the intern. It is important that the mentor and intern have ample opportunity to communicate with each other.

The mentor faces both challenges and opportunities in sponsoring an intern. The opportunities lie in being able to make a significant contribution to the field of education, since the intern’s growth is strongly influenced by the model provided by the mentor. The challenges lie in the ability of the mentor to put the intern to work in ways that make the intern a valuable contributor to the school’s operation and, at the same time, provide for the intern’s mastery of the many important competencies of the principalship. Mentors will assist the intern with a framework for proposed intern activities that meet the requirements of each standard for certification of building level administrators as well as complete an administrative intern evaluation form at the end of the internship (Appendix F). To facilitate this, the intern’s experience should include:

- A wide range of experiences that help the intern develop a building-level perspective,
- opportunities to observe the mentor in a variety of situations,
- duties of increasing responsibility as the year progresses,
- responsibility for at least one major project, which will make a special contribution to the school’s program.
- experiences across the K-12 level with a variety of personnel/services offered by the corporation.

Mentors are welcome to attend any or all of the seminars. Attendance is especially encouraged at the summer seminar as we lay the foundation for our expectations. Graduate credit may be available for serving as a mentor when additional requirements are met. Mentors interested in obtaining graduate credit to apply toward license renewal should contact the Department Chair in Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations. (See Appendix G for additional information.)

**Role of the University Supervisor:**

Members of the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, & Foundations will provide overall guidance for the intern program. This includes screening applicants, overseeing the intern’s experiences, on-site visitations (minimum two per semester), and facilitating on-campus and regional seminars. University supervisors will facilitate each monthly seminar with a variety of activities and experiences designed to complement the internship, develop the portfolio, and to prepare interns for the SLLA test.

The university supervisor will provide the ultimate assessment of the intern. This decision will be made using formative evaluations acquired from the mentor, the intern, and personal observations. Throughout this process many events will impact that assessment. Should issues or concerns arise related to the success if the intern, the university supervisor will determine actions to be taken, according to the due process chart found in Appendix L.

Interns are also provided ELCC Standard-Specific Logs to organization and make sense of their building-level activities, as the following Handbook chart offers:

---

**PRINCIPAL INTERN ACTIVITIES RECORD**
Please consult with your mentor and university supervisor as you develop this record.

Some activities may satisfy more than one standard. In such events, list them in both places. It is important to address each standard in some capacity in all three grade levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1 - A Vision of Learning</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</th>
<th>Total time spent in hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2 - School Culture and Instructional Program</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</th>
<th>Total time spent in hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3 - Management</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</th>
<th>Total time spent in hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4 - Collaboration with Families and Communities</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</td>
<td>Total time spent in hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5 - Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</td>
<td>Total time spent in hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6 - The Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>E=Elementary M=Middle H=High School</td>
<td>Total time spent in hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also included in the Internship Handbook: ELCC Language Pertaining to Mentor Evaluation:

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERN EVALUATION

Mentor: (Superintendent, Principal, Assistant Principal)—(CIRCLE ONE): Complete this evaluation of the intern. Share your evaluation with your intern and then send the evaluation, or have your intern send the evaluation, to the university supervisor.

General Instructions: The evaluator should evaluate the growth/development in each of the Standards for Certification of Building Level Administrators and their disposition. The six standards are listed below, plus areas regarding dispositions and working in diverse environments. Please provide a written analysis of how you feel the intern has developed within each section. Please include a general overview of each standard as to whether the intern has exceeded, met, or failed to meet each standard in the space provided.

Exceeds Expectations: Candidate demonstrates competence that exceeds a given standard through superior mastery of course content and/or application of course learning that is evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that differentiates their performance above what would be expected of a building administrator.

Meets Expectations: Candidate demonstrates competence that meets a given standard through mastery of course content and/or application of course learning as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that match what would be expected of a building administrator.

Does not Meet Expectations (DME): Candidate demonstrates deficiencies in key aspects of a given standard as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that suggests areas of need for improvement.

STANDARD I: A VISION OF LEARNING
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD II: SCHOOL CULTURE, CLIMATE, AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD III: DAILY MANAGEMENT OF OPERATIONS
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD IV: COLLABORATION WITH FAMILIES AND THE COMMUNITY
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD V: ACTING WITH INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS AND IN AN ETHICAL MANNER
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations
STANDARD VI: THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

☐ Exceeds Expectations  ☐ Meets Expectations  ☐ Does not meet Expectations

GENERAL PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION:

As a person
Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

As a Mediator of the Learning Environment
Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

As a Member of the School Community
Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

WORKING IN DIVERSE (STUDENT DIVERSITY) ENVIRONMENTS:

1. Candidate has worked with diverse populations during this internship.
   Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

2. Candidate has acquired knowledge and skills to incorporate diversity into his/her ability to establish a positive school climate.
   Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

3. Candidate exhibited cultural competency by incorporating multicultural understanding and appreciation in their administrative actions.
   Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

4. Candidate demonstrated the knowledge and skills to work with diverse families.
   Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

5. Candidate showed capacity to develop a plan to help teachers as they respond to issues of diversity.
   Exceeds expectations  Meets expectations  Does not meet expectations  No Basis

Beginning in Summer 2011 and thereafter throughout Fall 2011, the Department of Educational Leadership worked to fine-tune those assessment documents to better reflect Standard Element-based competencies for the Internship experience. This effort resulted in the Scoring Guide presented below:

Scoring Guide for the Assessment

PRINCIPAL INTERN Mid-Year EVALUATION
Indiana State University  
2011 - 2012

Name of Intern: ________________________________________________________________

Date: ________________

Name of Mentor/Evaluator: ______________________________________________________

Name of School: __________________________________________________________________

General Instructions: The evaluator should evaluate the Intern’s current growth/development in each of the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) Standard Elements and Disposition. The six standards are listed below, plus areas regarding dispositions and working in diverse environments. Please provide a score (3: Exceeds Expectations; 2: Meets Expectations; and 1: Does Not Meet Expectations) for how you feel the intern has developed within each section in a formative sense at this time.

Exceeds Expectations (Score of a “3”): Candidate demonstrates competence that exceeds a given standard through superior mastery of course content and/or application of course learning that is evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that differentiate his/her performance above what would be expected of a building administrator.

Meets Expectations (Score of a “2”): Candidate demonstrates competence that meets a given standard through mastery of course content and/or application of course learning as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that match what would be expected of a building administrator.

Does not Meet Expectations (Score of a “1”): Candidate demonstrates deficiencies in key aspects of a given standard as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that suggests areas of need for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) Standard Elements for Success of Building Leaders</th>
<th>Please rate each Standard Element below by circling a (3) Exceeds Expectations, a (2) Meets Expectations, or a (1) Does Not Meet Expectations, as described above in the narrative. Please do so in the box to the left of each Standard Element descriptor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Develop a Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrates visioning for the success of all students (1.1.a.) a complete understanding of the learning goals in a pluralistic society, diversity and learners’ needs, schools as interactive systems, and social and organizational change (1.1.b.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Articulate a Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to articulate components of a vision (1.2.a.), use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>data based research strategies, draw on relevant information sources to assess student learning (1.2.b.) and communicate such to stakeholders (1.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Implement a Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to formulate the initiatives necessary to motivate stakeholders, (1.3.a) develop plans and processes for implementing the vision, facilitating collaboration and utilizing appropriate resources (1.3.b.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to utilize effective communication skills (1.4.a), design and adopt data based research strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision (1.4.b.) through various methods of Stewardship (1.4.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Steward a Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to involve community members in the realization of the vision in school improvement efforts (1.5.a), as well as to acquire and demonstrate the skills for effective school communication of the vision (1.5.b.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs and culture (2.1.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Promote Positive School Culture</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to facilitate activities that apply principles of effective instruction (2.2.a), make recommendations regarding the curriculum that fully accommodate learners' diverse needs (2.2.b), and use technology and information systems to enrich teaching and provide staff assistance needed for improvement (2.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to assist school personnel in understanding and applying best practices for student learning (2.3.a.), human development theory, concern for diversity to the learning process (2.3.b.), and appropriate research strategies to promote student achievement (2.3.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to implement context-appropriate professional development programs based on reflective practice and research consistent with school visions and goals (2.4.a.), as well as strategies to form comprehensive professional growth plans with personnel (2.4.b.) and themselves that reflect a commitment to life-long learning (2.4.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to optimize the learning environment by applying appropriate models of organizational theory including data-driven decision making with indicators of equity, effectiveness, and efficiency (3.1.a.), as well as developing plans of action for effective management of fiscal human and material resources giving priority to student learning, safety, curriculum, instruction (3.1.b.), and time management (3.1.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Manage the Organization</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to staff in setting priorities using needs assessments, research-based data, and skills to build consensus and resolve conflicts to align resources with vision (3.2.a.), as well as to develop communication plans to include stakeholders (3.2.b.) and to ensure that leaders demonstrate an understanding of relevant laws (3.2.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to use problem-solving skills and knowledge of strategic planning in the effective, legal, and equitable procurement and use of fiscal, human, technological, and material resources that focus on teaching, learning (3.3.a.), procurement of new resources (3.3.b.) and utilization of technologies and business procedures for enhanced school management (3.3.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Manage Resources</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to bring together the resources of family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Other Community Members</td>
<td>and the community to positively affect student learning (4.1.a.), including a belief in positive family intent and efficacy (4.1.b.), collaboration based on research (4.1.c.), data-based outreach and marketing strategies, knowledge of effective partnerships (4.1.d.) in a model of collaboration that involves various methods of outreach (4.1.e.), involvement of families in decision making (4.1.f.) collaboration with community agencies (4.1.g.), the media, and the school as an integral part of the larger community (4.1.h.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability for active involvement within the community, including interactions with individuals with conflicting perspectives (4.2.a.), using appropriate research and assessment to understand and accommodate diverse school community dynamics (4.2.b.), while providing leadership to programs serving students with exceptional and diverse needs (4.2.c.) and an ability to capitalize on the diversity to improve school programs (4.2.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Mobilize Community Resources</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of and ability to use the community resources, social service agencies, and public funds to support student achievement, solve problems, achieve school goals (4.3.a.), serve the community (4.3.b.), and to encourage communities to provide new resources to address emerging student problems (4.3.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Acts with Integrity</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding for the respect and rights of others with regard to confidentiality and dignity and engage in honest interactions (5.1.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Acts Fairly</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to combine sufficient sensitivity to student diversity, and ethical considerations in their interactions with others (5.2.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Acts Ethically</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to make and explain decisions based upon ethical and legal principles (5.3.a.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Understand the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to act as informed consumers and practitioners of educational theory, research, and concepts appropriate to school contexts (6.1.a.); and to explain how legal and political systems have shaped education (6.1.b.) and has knowledge of complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on learning (6.1.c.), as well as to be aware of the laws, regulations, and economical principles that affect schools and improve educational opportunities (6.1.d.); and how economic factors have an effect on local schools (6.1.e.) and how cultural diversity, norms, and values relate to promoting social justice, conflict resolution, and change (6.1.f,g,h.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Respond to the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to communicate with members of a school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which the school operates, including maintenance of an on-going dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups (6.2.a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Influence the Larger Context</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to engage students, parents, and community members in advocating for adoption of improved policies and laws (6.3.a.), as well as an understanding of the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts to develop programs that benefit stakeholders (6.3.b.) and promote equitable learning opportunities for all students regardless of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, gender, disability, or other individual characteristics (6.3.c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION: (Circle One)

Your Principal Intern:

As a Person ...
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

As a Mediator of the Learning Environment ...
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

As a Member of the School Community ...
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION:

WORKING IN DIVERSE (STUDENT DIVERSITY) ENVIRONMENTS: (Circle One)

6. Candidate has worked with diverse populations during this internship.
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

7. Candidate has acquired knowledge and skills to incorporate diversity into his/her ability to establish a positive school climate.
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

8. Candidate exhibited cultural competency by incorporating multicultural understanding and appreciation in their administrative actions.
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

9. Candidate demonstrated the knowledge and skills to work with diverse families.
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

10. Candidate showed capacity to develop a plan to help teachers as they respond to issues of diversity.
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations
- No Basis

Additional Comments:

________________________________________
Evaluator's Signature

_________
Date

Charts that Provide Candidate Data Derived from the Assessment

| Standard Element, Conceptual | Exceeds (Number of Candidates & | Meets (Number of Candidates & | Does Not Meet (Number of |
Presented as well to help inform the University Supervisor formative data gathered to this point on Assessment #4 is Site Mentor data, as well as those from Candidates, themselves. They are provided below:

**Site Mentor Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element, Conceptual Framework Disposition Element, and Diversity Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 30</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 30</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20 (67%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>22 (73%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and develop the skills identified on Standards 1 – 6 through substantial, sustained, opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified on Standards 1 – 6 through substantial, sustained, candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified on Standards 1 – 6 through substantial, sustained, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 32</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 32</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21 (66%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>16 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12 (38%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>16 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12 (38%)</td>
<td>20 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12 (38%)</td>
<td>19 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>19 (59%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28 (87%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25 (78%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>24 (75%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate Self-Evaluation

Standard 7.0: Internship

Assessment of Standard 7.0: Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified on 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.

Please check all the following that apply for this Assessment and support with commentary:

_x_ 1. Synthesis of Standards 1 – 6 is reflected in design and evident in assessment mechanism submitted above. Comments: All Standard Elements of all six Standards are evaluated in Assessment #4, as evidenced in this submission and in the Candidates’ work during the Internship.

_x_ 2. Substantial, sustained, standards-based work took place in real settings. Comments: All work evaluated through Assessment #4 took place in the Candidates’ field placement settings, K-12 schools.

_x_ 3. Experience was planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Comments: Candidates and Site Mentors designed the framework of the Internship experiences for Assessment #4 collaboratively, with review, amendment suggestions, and oversight by University Supervisors, who were authorized to award graduate credit.

Element-Specific Analysis:

7.3 – 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.

Please check all the following that apply for this Assessment and support with commentary:

_x_ 1. Application of ELCC Standard skills and knowledge is evident in candidates’ work. Comments: Candidates report and University Supervisors assess through Weekly Journals, as well as through on-site visits and collaborative conversations, the application of ELCC Standards. This is further enhanced through monthly campus gatherings in which Interns have Regional Group Meetings with their University Supervisors and professional development opportunities. Two yearly regional meetings are also coordinated to discuss and evaluate progress.

_x_ 2. State and local standards are reflected in this Assessment. Comments: Noted in Assessment #4 are the Indiana Content Standards for Educators (Building-Leader), aligned with ELCC Standard Elements as per the details evaluated in this activity.

_x_ 3. Experiences are designed with respect to candidates’ individual needs. Comments: The Internship is specifically tailored to meet the individual circumstances
of the Candidate, reflected in part through the site placement of the individual and the activities designed to best make sense, given the interests, aptitudes, and abilities of students under the watchful eye of their Site Mentors.

Data for Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element, Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24 (71%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>22 (65%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>22 (65%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>27 (79%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Mentor Evaluation Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element, Conceptual</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage)</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage)</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework Disposition Element, and Diversity Element</td>
<td>Percentage) n = 27</td>
<td>Percentage) n = 27</td>
<td>Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22 (81%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>17 (63%)</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22 (81%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17 (63%)</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>23 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16 (59%)</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>23 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20 (74%)</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17 (63%)</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25 (93%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25 (93%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18 (67%)</td>
<td>9 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17 (63%)</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Self-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element, Conceptual Framework Disposition Element, and Diversity Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22 (66%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>23 (70%)</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26 (79%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>22 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>33 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>30 (91%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University Supervisor Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Element, Conceptual Framework Disposition Element, and Diversity Element</th>
<th>Exceeds (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Meets (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
<th>Does Not Meet (Number of Candidates &amp; Percentage) n = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21 (64%)</td>
<td>10 (39%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15 (45%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>21 (64%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22 (66%)</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>22 (66%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Document #2: “CONTENT PROGRAM SPECIFICS” will include the following:

**A. Content Curriculum Section**

1. Submit a copy of the advising sheet (e.g., curriculum guide, program sheet) that describes this program. Attached.

2. Course Descriptions
   a. Submit a listing of content courses and descriptions for this content area, OR
   b. Submit an online link to a course catalog with direct link to content course pages or a listing of those pages. (This link should be incorporated into Document #2.)
   
   http://elaf.indstate.edu/sam/sam.htm

**B. CONTENT Standards Matrix Section**

Submit a matrix indicating where all of the ISLLC standards are addressed and the type of assessment used in program courses and field experiences, including assessment evidences.

| Principal Preparation Program M.Ed. and Non-Degree |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| ELAF 605                        | ELAF 650 | ELAF 655 | ELAF 656 | ELAF 681 | ELAF 683 | ELAF 758 | ELAF 793 |
| Standard 1                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 1                               | 1,7   | 1     | 1,7   | 1,7   | 1,7   | 4,5   | 3,7   |
| Standard 2                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 2                               | 1,3   | 1,2   | 2,8   | 4,5   | 4,5   | 3,7   |
| Standard 3                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 3                               | 1     | 1     | 2,8   | 4,5   | 4,5   | 3,7   |
| Standard 4                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 4                               | 1     | 1,3   | 1     | 4,5   | 4,5   | 3,7   |
| Standard 5                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 5                               | 1,3   | 1,8   | 1,8   | 4,5   | 4,5   | 3,7   |
| Standard 6                      | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     | X     |
| 6                               | 1     | 8     | 1     | 4,5   | 4,5   | 3,7   |

X = standard addressed
Performance Assessment Examples: (1) test, (2) paper, (3) project, (4) portfolio artifact, 5) observation (6) lesson plan, (7) presentation (8) other
C. Assessment Data Section

1. Provide aggregated program assessment data for the last three years. Use the following chart format for presentation of information for each assessment to be reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Assessed</th>
<th>Describe the Assessment Activity</th>
<th>When is it assessed?</th>
<th>Title of the Instrument or Rubric (Attach copies)</th>
<th>Aggregated Summary Data for last 3 years</th>
<th>Curriculum/Program/Unit operations modifications made based on this data *</th>
<th>Content Standards addressed by this Assessment Activity (Be consistent with #B Standards Matrix)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge for Other School Candidates</td>
<td>1) Licensure assessment</td>
<td>End of Program</td>
<td>SLLA Pass Rate=100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Portfolio</td>
<td>End of Internship</td>
<td>Internship Rubric Attached</td>
<td>Student Work Samples are hard copy and are located in Coord’s office</td>
<td>Portfolio adaptations to meet needs of the field mentors</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of ability to develop supervisory plan</td>
<td>One assessment activity required:</td>
<td>End of Internship</td>
<td>Long-Term Project Rubric Attached</td>
<td>Pass Rate=100% Samples are hard copy and are located in Coord’s office</td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of internship/clinical practice</td>
<td>One assessment activity required:</td>
<td>During internship</td>
<td>Mentor Evaluation Form Attached</td>
<td>Pass Rate=100% Samples are hard copy and are located in Coord’s office</td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of ability to support student learning and development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment activity required:</th>
<th>One Assessment activity required:</th>
<th>During Internship</th>
<th>Portfolio Rubric</th>
<th>Pass Rate=100% Student Work Samples are hard copy and are located in Coord’s office</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Reflections and Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*History of Change Document Attached*
HISTORY OF CHANGE 2006 – 2009
Principal Preparation Program: M.Ed. & Non-Degree

Changes during the past three years have come primarily from feedback received from practitioners/mentors we work with in the field. This feedback comes in the form of formal program evaluations and intern evaluations completed at the end of each spring semester and through informal conversations as University supervisors visit the school sites. Additional changes have been supported through the efforts of the ELAF Advisory Council, monthly meetings with University staff, full-time and adjunct professors, and from data aggregated at the program and unit levels. The following are highlights of the major changes that have occurred in the past three years:

• Portfolio adaptations to meet needs of the field mentors. Feedback on program evaluations continue to reveal a need to change portfolio prompts from generic to more specificity relevant to the issues the local school is facing. We reduced the number of prompts and increased the rigor for those we kept.

SUMMARY STATEMENT RELATIVE TO AGGREGATED DATA

Aggregated data have revealed that our program is quite strong when it comes to meeting standards and preparing students to pass the SLLA exam. Some students are getting jobs across the state as our employers relate how well they are doing in leadership capacities. However many are choosing to not look for jobs and stay in their home school.
# Program of Study: Summary of Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hrs</th>
<th>When Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIMT 610</td>
<td>Research in Education <strong>OR</strong> COUN 620 Foundations of Research <strong>OR</strong> EPSY 620 Foundations of Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 621</td>
<td>Life Span Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 605</td>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 650</td>
<td>Foundations of Educational Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 655</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of School Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 656</td>
<td>School and Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 681</td>
<td>The School Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 683</td>
<td>Curr., Instr., and Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMT 660</td>
<td>Secondary Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship (12 hours) - ELAF 758 and ELAF 793 taken concurrently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 758</td>
<td>Principal Internship (Fall)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 793</td>
<td>Seminar for Principals (Fall)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 758</td>
<td>Principal Internship (Spring)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 793</td>
<td>Seminar for Principals (Spring)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected License Acquisition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total semester hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Internship Portfolio Rubric

**2007-2008**

Student responses will be scored according to the following scale:

- E = Exceeds expectations
- M = Meets expectations
- D = Does not meet expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1 – A Vision of Learning, the student as a person and mediator of the learning environment…</strong> promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community. The administration facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members; the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The vision is developed with and among stakeholders, thus the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals so that barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2 – School Culture and Instructional Program, the student as a person and mediator of the learning environment…</strong> promotes the success of all students and staff by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The administration facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques, thus multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students so that barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3 – Management, the student as a mediator of the learning environment…</strong> promotes the success of all students and staff by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. The administration facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning and to achieve the vision and goals of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively, thus potential problems are identified and are confronted and resolved in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4 – Collaboration with Families and the Community, the student as a member of the learning community…</strong> promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. The administration facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A comprehensive program of community relations is established whereas community services are integrated with school programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity is recognized and valued, thus there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations, which support individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effective media relations are developed and maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard 5 – Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner, the student as a member of the learning community…**

promotes the success of all students and staff with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. The administration:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Serves as a role model, demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance and demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect and thus demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fulfills legal and contractual obligations, applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 6 – The Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context, the student as a member of the learning community…**

promotes the success of all students and staff by understanding, responding to and influencing the longer political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The administration facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>There is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

**Overall Assessment of the Portfolio:**

- [ ] Exceeds Expectations
- [ ] Meets Expectations
- [ ] Does not Meet Expectations

**Discussion:**
Completed Long Term Project Abstract Outline and Scoring Rubric

Name: __________________________________________ Date: _____________

University Supervisor: ___________________________________________

The intern will complete this form and return it to their University supervisor on the date of the presentation. The intern will complete the questions below. The supervisor will check the appropriate boxes once the project has been reviewed.

**Exceeds Expectations (E):** Candidate demonstrates competence that exceeds a given standard through superior mastery of course content and/or application of course learning that is evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that differentiates their performance above what would be expected of a building administrator.

**Meets Expectations (M):** Candidate demonstrates competence that meets a given standard through mastery of course content and/or application of course learning as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that match what would be expected of a building administrator.

**Does not Meet Expectations (D):** Candidate demonstrates deficiencies in key aspects of a given standard as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that suggests areas of need for improvement.

A. **Title of Project:**

B. **Description/Presentation of Project:**

- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations

How was the problem identified, how was it analyzed, what data were collected?

C. **Description/Presentation of what steps were taken to complete the project, along with the technology used to support it.**

- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations

Were there any barriers to success, what would you do differently?
D. Description/Presentation of final product that was developed.

☐ Exceeds expectations
☐ Meets expectations
☐ Does not meet expectations

Has this been presented to the faculty, is it easy to understand?

E. Presentation of the process used to determine how well this project supports the learning environment of the school.

☐ Exceeds expectations
☐ Meets expectations
☐ Does not meet expectations

Are there any measurable/observable differences in the school environment by virtue of this project?

Overall Supervisor Assessment:

☐ Exceeds expectations
☐ Meets expectations
☐ Does not meet expectations

Supervisor Signature: ____________________________ Date: ______________
ADMINISTRATIVE INTERN EVALUATION

Name of Intern _________________________________________________________________

Date _______________________________

Name of Evaluator _(mentor)____________________________________________________

Name of School __________________________

Address ______________________________________________________________________

Phone (       ) ______________________________  Extension _________

Mentor:  (Superintendent, Principal, Assistant Principal)--(CIRCLE ONE): Complete this evaluation of the intern. Share your evaluation with your intern and then send the evaluation, or have your intern send the evaluation, to the university supervisor.

General Instructions: The evaluator should evaluate the growth/development in each of the Standards for Certification of Building Level Administrators and their disposition. The six standards are listed below, plus areas regarding dispositions and working in diverse environments. Please provide a written analysis of how you feel the intern has developed within each section. Please include a general overview of each standard as to whether the intern has exceeded, met, or failed to meet each standard in the space provided.

**Exceeds Expectations:** Candidate demonstrates competence that exceeds a given standard through superior mastery of course content and/or application of course learning that is evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that differentiates their performance above what would be expected of a building administrator.

**Meets Expectations:** Candidate demonstrates competence that meets a given standard through mastery of course content and/or application of course learning as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that match what would be expected of a building administrator.

**Does not Meet Expectations (DME):** Candidate demonstrates deficiencies in key aspects of a given standard as evidenced through projects, assignments, in-class discussion, or in-field activities that suggests areas of need for improvement.

**STANDARD I: A VISION OF LEARNING**

☐ Exceeds Expectations  
☐ Meets Expectations  
☐ Does not meet Expectations

**STANDARD II: SCHOOL CULTURE, CLIMATE, AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM**

☐ Exceeds Expectations  
☐ Meets Expectations  
☐ Does not meet Expectations
STANDARD III: DAILY MANAGEMENT OF OPERATIONS
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD IV: COLLABORATION WITH FAMILIES AND THE COMMUNITY
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD V: ACTING WITH INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS AND IN AN ETHICAL MANNER
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations

STANDARD VI: THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT
☐ Exceeds Expectations
☐ Meets Expectations
☐ Does not meet Expectations
GENERAL PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION: (Circle one)

As a person
Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

As a Mediator of the Learning Environment
Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

As a Member of the School Community
Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION:

WORKING IN DIVERSE (STUDENT DIVERSITY) ENVIRONMENTS: (Circle one)

1. Candidate has worked with diverse populations during this internship.
   Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

2. Candidate has acquired knowledge and skills to incorporate diversity into his/her ability to establish a positive school climate.
   Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

3. Candidate exhibited cultural competency by incorporating multicultural understanding and appreciation in their administrative actions.
   Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

4. Candidate demonstrated the knowledge and skills to work with diverse families.
   Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

5. Candidate showed capacity to develop a plan to help teachers as they respond to issues of diversity.
   Exceeds expectations Meets expectations Does not meet expectations No Basis

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING DIVERSITY:

__________________________________________________________________________
Evaluator's Signature Intern's Signature

_______ Date ___________ Date
Program-Related Data

For Assessment Day and UAS

Program Field Experiences

Complete the chart showing the relationship among the program’s courses and the field experiences provided for all candidates. Programs in the initial teacher preparation program do not need to include student teaching hours, or field experiences taken as part of the professional education program in the College of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #/Title or Program Requirement</th>
<th>Purpose of Field Experience</th>
<th>Number of required hours in P-12 classroom</th>
<th>Candidate required tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELAF 758, two semesters</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>300 hours beyond normal school day</td>
<td>Completion of portfolio prompts and mentor needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Please provide a list of content faculty and the program chair responsible for the delivery of the program. Adjuncts teaching content courses should be included in the chart, if they are the sole providers of content or content-specific methods courses. Each faculty person is to be identified by highest degree attained, area of specialization, courses taught in the program, and additional responsibilities related to the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Attained</th>
<th>Area(s) of Specialization</th>
<th>Courses Taught in Program</th>
<th>Additional Responsibility in Program</th>
<th>Years of P-12 Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gruenert</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>ELAF 650, 656, 681, 683, 758, 793</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Whitaker</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>See above, plus 655</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Fulford</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>ELAF 681, 758, 793</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Gambaiani</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>ELAF 681, 758, 793</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmatic Changes Made (2006-08)

Please provide a description of any program-related changes made in the last 2 years and the reasons behind the change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Made (curricular, operations, policies, etc.)</th>
<th>Changed based on what source of data?</th>
<th>Level of Data (Indicate Unit or Programmatic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed prompts in portfolio</td>
<td>Feedback from mentors in the field</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROGRAM REPORT FOR THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS**  
(School Building Leadership Level)  
Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)  
Option A (2001 Standards)

**NOTE:** This form uses the ELCC standards approved by NCATE in 2001. Programs have the option to use either the 2001 or 2011 programs submitting reports through Fall 2012. Beginning in Spring 2013 ALL programs must use the new standards.

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

**COVER SHEET**

1. **Institution Name**
   
   Indiana State University

2. **State**

   Indiana

3. **Date submitted**

   MM  DD  YYYY
   
   03  / 14  / 2012

4. **Report Preparer’s Information:**

   **Name of Preparer:**
   
   Ryan Donlan
   
   **Phone:**
   
   (812) 237-8624
   
   **E-mail:**
   
   ryan.donlan@indstate.edu

5. **NCATE Coordinator’s Information:**

   **Name:**
   
   Denise Collins
   
   **Phone:**
   
   (812) 237-2918
   
   **E-mail:**
   
   denise.collins@indstate.edu

6. **Name of institution’s program**

   School Administration

7. **NCATE Category**

   Educational Leadership-Principal

8. **Grade levels**

   (1) for which candidates are being prepared
   
   K-12

   *(1) e.g. K-6, P-12*

9. **Program Type**

   ☐ Advanced Teaching
   
   ☐ First Teaching License
   
   ☑ Other School Personnel
10. Degree or award level
- Baccalaureate
- 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
- K-12 Building Level Administration License

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 III. 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)

Institutional policies at Indiana State University influence the application of Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) Standards quite positively, through a clear expectation that our Specialized Departmental Program aligns with the overall University Mission, which is to combine a tradition of strong undergraduate and graduate education with a focus on community and public service, integrating teaching, research, and creative activity in an engaging, challenging, and supportive learning environment to prepare productive citizens for Indiana and the world.

The ELCC Standards allow us to accomplish this through quality school leadership development under our Departmental Mission, which is to prepare today's practicing and promising educator to be tomorrow's complete educational professional. The notion of "complete" is embedded within our Unit's Conceptual Framework as well, which envisions educators as experts or mediators of learning, educators as persons, and educators as members of communities.

Upon receiving feedback from our prior year's National Recognition Report, the Department of Educational Leadership began a process of comprehensive curriculum alignment that has allowed us to more effectively prepare school leaders through a focus on not only the Standards of the Educational Leadership Constituents Council, but also the Elements and Concepts embedded within them. You will find this effort evidenced in our submission. Through this endeavor, we have produced a more natural integration of teaching, learning, assessment, and data-supported decision making through a lens of ELCC-mindfulness, with consideration of the natural alignments that exist with the Indiana Content Standards for School Leaders.

The Master of Science in Education (MSE) Degree in Educational Leadership offers educators a planned program of study including 27
credit hours and 12 hours of Internship experiences designed to improve performance as leaders in public school systems. It is research-based, yet practitioner-oriented as is historically guaranteed by our institutions, designed with recommendations from professional associations and accrediting associations. An additional, a non-degree, individualized licensure program of study is available for students who hold graduate degrees in related disciplines and who wish to obtain building-level administrator licensure, if those individuals commit to a program of study identical in substance to the degree program aligned with ELCC Standard Elements and Concepts.

Throughout the planned program of study, students are assessed on Dispositions aligned with our Unit's Conceptual Framework noted above and on the Technology Standards for School Administrators (TSSA). In addition, students are comprehensively assessed three times on demonstrated competencies reflecting each Standard Element of the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC). The Department relies upon ELCC Standard Element assessment results in monthly data analysis meetings to study student achievement and to unearth program trends that may result in programmatic adjustments or modifications.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issues the Building Level Administrator License to applicants who exit our program meeting statutory requirements and having passed successfully the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA). It is our belief that even with our high success rate on the SLLA, our curriculum alignment work and the focus on the concepts embedded within each ELCC Standard Element, our leaders will be even better prepared to not only score well on that instrument, but will subsequently make an even bigger impact as school leaders who ensure engaging, challenging, and supportive learning environments to prepare productive citizens for Indiana and the world, of course closing the loop on the expectations of Indiana State University through its mission as noted at the outset of this report.

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)

The nine-month internship experience is framed around the Unit’s notion of Becoming a Complete Professional, with an educator as expert or mediator of learning, educator as person, and educator as member of communities; it is anchored with learning experiences aligned with the Standard Elements and Concepts of the Educational Leaders Constituent Council. The Internship includes 300 hours of field experiences/internship experience near the candidate’s completion of coursework.

Each candidate typically serves as an intern in the school in which he/she is employed. Those who choose not to work in their own school are assisted by the University supervisor to find an appropriate setting to serve as the home for the internship experiences. Given the license is composed of grades K-12, candidates are required to document their experiences at all grade levels.

The Site Mentor is selected prior to the Internship and must be approved by the School Superintendent and the Coordinator of the Principal Preparation Program. The Site Mentor assists the candidate in setting objectives, completing required objectives, discussing the practical benefits of a focus on ELCC Standard Elements, identifying others with whom the candidate may wish to complete some of the activities, and identifying opportunities for experiences in other settings (elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, and/or community agencies.)

Candidates must acquire substantive field/internship experiences in each of the following settings for licensure as a building administrator: the K-12 district level, the elementary level, the middle level, and the secondary level. The minimum field experience/internship hours for a candidate completing the program is 300. The hours are accumulated through the Internship over the course of 30 weeks (two semesters).

Candidates are provided a comprehensive list of field/internship activities required for internship as well as a list of preferred activities. These activities may be modified by the mentor to meet the conditions of the internship site, as long as the University Supervisors approve them as aligned with ELCC Standard Elements. Additional activities may be selected, modified, or created to better prepare the Intern for leadership as found relevant and aligned by the University Supervisor.

The following courses within the program have been designated as defining the Internship:

- ELAF 758 Internship (6 hours)
- ELAF 793 Internship Seminar (6 hours)

For assessment of the Internship experience, the candidates maintain a log of all experiences by activity, date, time, setting, and relevant ELCC Standard Elements. These activities are reviewed with the Mentor and University Supervisor on a monthly basis. The candidates share their experiences in a confidential manner with their assigned University Supervisor during the Internship and maintain communication with the assigned Supervisors through weekly reflections via e-mail. In addition the candidates are required to meet with the university supervisor, on site, a minimum of four times throughout the internship experiences.

In addition to other internship activities, each candidate develops a collaborative leadership activity in which the candidate demonstrates, through performance activities, the skills and behaviors (similar to those exhibited by an effective administrator) to successfully design and complete a longer-term project. The candidate and the Site Mentor discuss any overall educational issues that could be strengthened in existing practices or to identify a new emphasis for the leadership project. Regardless of the decision, the school’s ability to provide an improved learning environment should be enhanced greatly because of the candidate’s chosen project.

The site mentor completes a formative and summative evaluation of the candidate and his/her performance in internship experiences looking through the lens of the ELCC Standard Elements and with careful consideration of the Concepts embedded within those elements. University Supervisors provide detailed rubrics for this purpose. At the conclusion of the longer-term project, candidates provide an abstract and brief presentation to support their activities and to help other candidates interested in deploying the same project.

Cumulative Internship competencies are evidenced through a capstone assessment of a Portfolio within an approved format with the required
documentation which is evaluated using a scoring rubric, based on the ELCC Standard Elements and Concepts. This Portfolio in its entirety requires a high level of organizational proficiency, deft understanding of the competencies exacted though adherence to Educational Leadership Constituents Council Standard Elements, and it allows for a clear sense of the candidate’s development over the duration of the Internship experiences.

3. Attach the following contextual information:
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.)

| Program of Study M.Ed. Indiana State University |

See Attachments panel below.

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.

<p>| Program: Master of Education: BUILDING-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR |</p>
<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>2010-2011</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</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>Steve Gruenert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(3)</td>
<td>Ph.D. Educational Administration, University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)</td>
<td>Chair, Department of Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(5)</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7), List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)</td>
<td>Consultant with Clay, Vigo, and Beech Grove Schools: 2009-Current National Middle School Presenter, Fall 2009 AASA Publication: Fall 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Terry McDaniel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(3)</td>
<td>Ph.D. Educational Leadership, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)</td>
<td>Advisor for Administrative Licensure Programs and the Ed.S. in Educational Leadership Instructor in all graduate levels of courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(5)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Member: Todd Whitaker

**Highest Degree, Field, & University:** Ph.D., Educational Administration, University of Missouri-Columbia  
**Assignment:** Instructor, Field Supervisor  
**Faculty Rank:** Full Professor  
**Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service:** Author of over 23 books and publications, including Leading School Change and The Ball; presenter to thousands of K-12 educators throughout the world.  
**Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools:** Taught mathematics and business education, and served as an Assistant Principal, Principal, and Middle School Coordinator.

### Faculty Member: Ryan Donlan

**Highest Degree, Field, & University:** Ed.D., Educational Leadership, Central Michigan University  
**Assignment:** Faculty Member, Field Supervisor, SPA Report Writer, Unit Assessment Committee Member  
**Faculty Rank:** Assistant Professor  
**Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools:** Superintendent/Director, Bay-Arenac Community High School, MI (2000-2011), Secondary Principal, Caseville Public School, MI (1999-2000), High School Principal, West Iron County Public Schools, MI (1997-1999), Assistant Principal and Alternative Education Director, Petoskey High School and Area Vocational Center (1995-1997), High School Teacher, Petoskey High School and Area Vocational Center (1991-1995). Current Teaching Certificate and School Administration Certificate.

### Faculty Member: Bobbie Jo Monahan

**Highest Degree, Field, & University:** Ed.S., Educational Administration, Indiana State University  
**Assignment:** Faculty, Field Supervisor  
**Faculty Rank:** Lecturer III  
**Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service:** 2010 Federal Grant Author  
**Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools:** Leadership Experience in K-12 Schools, Creation and Implementation of K-12 Curriculum Plan, Co-Director of Administrative Program, Indiana Secondary Teaching, Facility Experience.

### Faculty Member: Karen Goeller

**Highest Degree, Field, & University:** Ph.D., Educational Administration, Indiana State University  
**Assignment:** Faculty Member  
**Faculty Rank:** Adjunct Instructor  
**Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service:** Math and Science Education - Indiana School Boards Association Link 2009 Primary Grant Writer for the following grants: Smaller Learning Communities; Math and Science Partnership Grant; 23st Century Learning Centers Grant; Indiana Early Intervention Grant; Reading First Grant, as well as Service as a Board Member of the Indiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Board Member of the University Admissions Advisory Board, and Advisory Board Member for the Indiana State University Educational Leadership Department.

---

*Note: The table contains all relevant information extracted from the document.*
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools\(^{(9)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Danny Tanoos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(3)})</td>
<td>Ed.S., Educational Administration, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(4)})</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Lecturer Level III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(6)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (^{(7)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(8)})</td>
<td>President, Covered Bridge Special Education District, Vice-President Board of Trustees at Ivy Tech State College-Region 7, Chairman of Scholarship Committee for Union Hospital Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(9)})</td>
<td>Current Superintendent of the Vigo Co. School Corporation, with prior experiences as a Middle School Principal, Elementary Principal, and Sixth Grade Teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Joyce Fulford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(3)})</td>
<td>Ph.D., Educational Leadership, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(4)})</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Lecturer III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(6)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (^{(7)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(8)})</td>
<td>Associate State Director of AdvancED/NCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(9)})</td>
<td>Teaching Experience P-12; Special Education (8 years), First Grade (1 year), Third Grade (1 year); Elementary Assistant Principal (4 years); Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction (9.5 years); Superintendent (6 years).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Robert Watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(3)})</td>
<td>Ph.D., Educational Leadership, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(4)})</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(6)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (^{(7)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(8)})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(9)})</td>
<td>Faculty Member at St. Mary-of-the-Woods College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Larry Gambaini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(3)})</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(4)})</td>
<td>University Field Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(6)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (^{(7)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(8)})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(9)})</td>
<td>Distinguished Lifetime Career in Education, Retired from Indiana K-12 Schools as Superintendent</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</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered</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>Taken near the conclusion of one’s program, this test for the Indiana Principal Licensure requires a score of 163.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership (required)</td>
<td>Foundations Assessment, EDLR 650</td>
<td>Tests of student content knowledge in course, Foundations of Educational Leadership. Targeted, ongoing assessment of students' instructional leadership in course, &quot;The Principalship,&quot; culminating in overall grade.</td>
<td>Administered at examination time periods in EDLR 650, a required course for all students. Assessments are administered throughout the EDLR 681 course and are compiled into a comprehensive course grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: Assessment of ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction (required)</td>
<td>Supervisory Assessment: Course Grade Option - EDLR 681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4: Assessment of internship/clinical practice (required)</td>
<td>Field Assessment: University Supervisor Evaluation of Interns and Internship, EDLR 758/793</td>
<td>Evaluations of Intern by University Supervisor during 2nd 1/2 of Internship.</td>
<td>Formative assessment in January; summative assessment near the end of the school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5: Assessment of ability to support student learning and development (required)</td>
<td>Long-Term Project Assessment: Interns Impact on Institution and Learning, EDLR 758/793</td>
<td>Project implemented in-the-field during Principal Internship to promote a long-term, positive impact on student learning.</td>
<td>Formative Assessment mid-year; summative assessment after final project is submitted in April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6: Content-based assessment: application of content (required)</td>
<td>Portfolio Assessment: Intern Application of Content Knowledge - EDLR 758/793</td>
<td>Portfolio evaluation of a Principal Intern's site-based application of content.</td>
<td>Formative Assessment mid-year; Internship Portfolios are submitted in April, at which time summative assessment takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #7: Assessment of abilities in organizational management and community relations (required)</td>
<td>Community Visioning Project Assessment, EDLR 656</td>
<td>Project designed to enhance community relations through organizational management &amp; visioning.</td>
<td>This assessment is administered near the conclusion of EDLR 656, a required course for all students.</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Standard 1.0</th>
<th>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 school vision of learning supported by the school community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Develop a School Vision of Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Articulate a School Vision of Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Implement a School Vision of Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Steward a School Vision of Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Standard 2.0</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Promote a Positive School Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Provide Effective Instructional Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Standard 3.0</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Manage the Organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Manage the Operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Manage the Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Standard 4.0</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Respond to Community Interests and Needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Mobilize Community Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Standard 5.0</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Acts with Integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Acts Fairly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Acts Ethically.</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>Standard</th>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>Standard</th>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

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
2. Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership. 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. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, essays, and case studies, and portfolio tasks. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively develop supervisory plans for classroom-based instruction, 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 school improvement plans, needs assessment projects, and faculty intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

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, 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.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' ability to support student learning and development. 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.

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.
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 school-based strategic plans, school simulations, and school intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment: Abilities in Org. Mgmt. &amp; Comm. Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

8. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, postgraduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, faculty intervention plans, strategic plans, simulations, school intervention plans, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELCC Standards &amp; Curriculum Mapping Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

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.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Feedback from our March 2011 report, as well as work with our Unit Assessment System (UAS) has contributed to changes made in data collection processes and refinement of assessment instruments over this past year. Data shared with faculty during summer retreats, during Internship Seminars, and at faculty meetings, how held monthly, have been critical in our academic program and instructional delivery improvements, with fidelity to ELCC Standard Elements and embedded Concepts. We will now present to you evidence that assessment results have been analyzed and have been and will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.

Principal Findings from the Evidence

From the data and Assessments, as well as our curricular mapping, realignment, and reexamination, we have found the following:

1. Our candidates are very much ready for Licensure at the program’s conclusion.
2. Minor instances of variability existed between Common Metric and Context Bound Assessments in Standard 2. Common Metric results from the SLLA did not reflect as favorably toward candidate proficiency as did other assessments included in this report.
3. Standard 1 and Standard 3 Elements were noted as improving in our candidates as they proceeded through the program, especially in those who had what we considered better and more robust Intern experiences (and more effective mentoring during those experiences).
4. Standard 6 Elements did not see the development as did other Standard Elements, which we surmise was affected by the uncertainties of Indiana’s educational landscape and the scaling back of local control of schools.
5. Excellent selection processes and pre-Program reviews produced candidates that were exceptionally high in Standard 5 element competencies from start to finish.
6. Candidates discerned a difference in program expectations after our curricular alignment and Assessment development, as well as our change of instruction resulting from those, as compared to what they experienced prior. Some were hesitant to embrace change at first but appeared thankful once skillsets were more effectively developed in line with Standard Elements.
7. Internship (Standard 7) Site Mentors provided favorable ratings of Interns to a much larger degree than a normal distribution of scores would suggest should be the case; Interns were tougher judges of their own performance, and it appeared that University Supervisors were able to provide the most empirically sound assessment of their capabilities, as reflected in Standard Element competencies.
8. Standard 1 Element “Stewardship of a Vision” provided a new opportunity for candidates to consider that “stewarding” is “measuring.”

Faculty Interpretation of Findings

Three main interpretations exist:

1. ELCC Standard Element Data analysis, using embedded Concepts therein, has put a greater degree of science to our art of evaluating Candidate performance in measurable terms that can be applied in various contexts and with a greater degree of accuracy and predictability.
We interpret this as being a necessary and lasting component to program justification and improvement.  
2. Competencies and data ratings were more variable between and among candidates than they were between standards. This will allow us a more targeted approach to candidate competency development during the program experience, as we can potentially assume that low data in a candidate will continue to trend as such without intervention. 
3. We will need more than one semester’s worth of data to formulate any deep and lasting interpretations that will effect change in the program.

Changes Made in (or Planned for) the Program as a Result

All courses offered from this point forward will include targeted Assessments in line with our curricular mapping and Standard Element incorporation process to ensure that each Standard Element is being measured, formally, three times during the experience for each candidate.

The Department will better ensure that the efforts and activities associated with the teaching and learning process that are provided by Adjunct Faculty are delivered to candidates with the same degree of rigor and Standard Element alignment as they are delivered with full-time faculty.

Continued, monthly data analysis meetings will examine trends in data as we gather data anew each semester. Data will continually populate our EDLR master data spreadsheet plot as presented in Assessment 8.

As we build our data base, ELCC Standard Element Assessment and data gathering will be revised to reflect the new Standard Elements this coming year, resulting in a modification to all Assessment instruments, and to a degree, to the classroom instruction aligned with such. That, plus Indiana’s movement to its own Content Standards, will require much curricular crosswalking in the months and years ahead. We embrace these challenges as opportunities and will ensure that continuous data streams are provided to SPA for programmatic review and evaluation.

Steps Faculty have Taken from Assessments for Improvement of Candidate Performance and the Program

a. Content Knowledge – Increased rigor in all courses, aligned with efficiency and focus to ELCC Standard Elements. This has resulted in a more targeted approach to Candidate preparation and skill development. Specific steps faculty have taken include:

Rewriting of all course syllabi to reflect ELCC Standard Elements

Collaborative professional development on how ELCC Standard Elements are reflected in the teaching of leadership.

Redesign of courses, discarding content that did not align with new curricular maps and infusing content that allowed for robust learning experiences and assessment opportunities with ELCC.

b. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions – Unit Assessment activities aligned with the Bayh College of Education’s Conceptual Framework have helped to refine Candidate preparation and improvement in these areas (Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning; Educator as Person; and Educator as Member of Communities). Unit Assessment objectives are currently in the process of being aligned with SPA ELCC Standard Elements, making for a snug fit of academic solidity. Specific steps faculty have taken include:

Participation in Unit-wide Assessment Day activities.

Redesign of Course Syllabi to better reflect our Conceptual Framework, including knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Peer observations and evaluations for co-learning and reinforcement that curriculum mapping processes transcend the “academic” into the “pedagogy of practitioners.”

In our program, dispositions are critical. Unit assessment of dispositions in our program has demonstrated that for the most part, all of our candidates are currently at least meeting each disposition criterion. There have been only isolated incidents over the years where candidates received "does not meet" on any disposition item, with no one candidate receiving more than three "does not meet" in any one assessment period. What has been interesting is that in looking at these candidates through other assessments (such as those that align with ELCC Standard Elements), we find that these candidates represent those at the weak end of the cohorts. In discussions with program staff, we have found that there will be, on occasion, candidates who will not make it as a principal. Given that dynamic, we have come to value the disposition assessment and wish to further tighten its particular alignment to ELCC Standard Elements.

c. Student Learning – Focus is much more on the “deliverables,” i.e. Student Learning, as opposed to Content Teaching. Faculty have embraced the fact that stewardship of student learning involves a critical evaluation process to ensure fidelity of content and alignment with ELCC Standard Elements. Specific steps faculty have taken include:

Deep discussions with students about the need to realign and refocus ourselves around ELCC Standard Elements as quality indicators of positive, meaningful leadership preparation.
Training and professional development in students of how they should mindfully use quality rubrics and aligned mapping documents to prepare evidence of their learning in leadership.

Reinforcement in students, through fair yet rigorous evaluation of their work, that only the highest of demonstrated competencies will allow for progression through the Indiana State University planned program toward leadership licensure.

The primary means for assessing our candidates' impact on K-12 student learning is through their completion of the Long-Term Project (Assessment #5). Looking at the data from Long-Term Projects, we find all candidates in this cohort (and in years prior) are providing sufficient evidence for impacting the student learning environment. The reason for such a success rate is the constant monitoring of the project by the mentor and University supervisor. We would not let a weak project continue to exist throughout the school year. Some that were initially found to be weak were either changed or modified. We also provide a portion of early-in-the-year seminars to presenting past projects to the candidates so that they will have a better idea of how their work conducted can have a positive effect on student learning.

As this aspect of the program is most critical and possibly the most challenging for candidates, we continually have asked ourselves if there is a better way to assess candidate impact on learning. We have discussed variables such as test scores, attendance, disciplinary records, attitudinal scales, cultural audits, and GPA's. A strategy contemplated at this time is to visit school - post-assignment of the candidate - and conduct follow-up measurements to see, in retrospect, if the projects had an impact on learning. We are working on refocusing on these challenges and opportunities in the year ahead.

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/ResponsetoConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Included below for Program Reviewers is a concise, yet comprehensive description of the changes or additions that have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Throughout this report, we have provided new responses to questions and even new documents to verify the changes. Provided below is additional information for your consideration:

Changes or Additions to Address Standards

Concerns noted in the August 2011 Part C – Evaluation of Program Report Evidence noted the following, in a nutshell:

1. That the Indiana State University Assessments were cross-referenced, at best, to the ELCC Standards, yet not at all aligned with the Standard Elements.
2. That scoring guide Likert scales were not well-defined.
3. That scoring guides did not relate to the specific concepts, or a majority of specific concepts, within the ELCC Standard Elements.
4. Evaluative criteria in the scoring guides showed little relevancy to the ELCC Standard Elements.
5. Data from limited applications of the Assessments were provided.
6. Internship activities were not related to the ELCC Standard Elements.
7. Alumni survey does not measure candidates' professional skills while they are in the program.
8. No Assessment of candidates' skills in organizational management or community relations existed while candidates were in the program.
9. Assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics, and data charts are vague and poorly defined and lack alignment to ELCC Standards.

The final decision was that our program did not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition.

We are, thus, exercising this opportunity to resubmit our Revised Report by the established deadline of March 15, 2012. We do so confident that this Revised Report has addressed the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in the recognition report dated 8/1/2011.

Let us first explain this the submission of this report is substantively, a completely new Report with new Assessments, as our Department of Educational Leadership has undergone a comprehensive renovation of its curriculum, assessment, and instructional delivery with ELCC Standard Element and Concept curricular fidelity in mind, a process that is now ongoing and began in Summer 2011.

We are only one semester into this new initiative, and thus, we will again only be submitting one round of data, as was your concern in Point #5 made above; however, we have read in technical assistance documents and are, thus, confident that submitting one round of data – "doing things the right way" – is far preferable than hanging on to practices that did not meet your expectations, and in retrospect, did not provide alignment with the three degrees of ELCC sophistication – Standards, Elements, and beyond those … Concepts.

First, you will note clear and focused responses in all ELCC Submission fields in this 2012 Report. Faculty members took the lead in
Specific responses to the target areas of concern, above, are now offered.

1. ALL Indiana State University Assessments are now cross-referenced to the ELCC Standards, as well as aligned with the Standard Elements AND Concepts within them.
2. That scoring guide Likert scales (evidenced via Rubrics) on each Assessment are well-defined and analytically clear in presentation. They were even improved upon, mid-fall, to include specific designation of Concepts (a, b, c, etc.) in each field of the scale descriptions, thanks to the ELCC Technical Assistance provided to us.
3. That scoring guides, thus, now relate to the specific Standard Element Concepts, and each Assessment includes as its main source of measurement, a majority of specific Concepts, within the ELCC Standard Elements.
4. Evaluative criteria in the scoring guides showed full relevancy and complete alignment to the ELCC Standard Elements.
5. Data from summer/fall applications of the Assessments are now provided.
6. Internship activities are now aligned with surgical precision to the ELCC Standard Elements.
7. The Alumni survey has been discarded as a SPA Assessment.
8. Assessment of candidates’ skills in organizational management and community relations is now evidenced in Assessment #7, our Community Visioning Project Assessment.
9. Assessment descriptions, scoring rubrics, and data charts are clear and comprehensively defined with full alignment to ELCC Standards.

New documents have been provided to verify the changes described in this Section and have been attached as Assessments #1 - #8.

Much has changed since your review last year, as you will see upon opening the documents.

Thus, we have simply, yet comprehensively, renovated the entire framework of the way that we do the business of education with ELCC Standard Elements and Concepts since our March 2011 submission. Veteran faculty harnessed and embraced the energy that came with new Department Members who were willing to lead the efforts and have enjoyed Department-wide teamwork to expedite these accomplishments, and all adjuncts now hired are expected to align their teaching and learning to the templates, curriculum documents, syllabi, and Assessments developed in their work with candidates.

Our Department Chairperson encouraged rapid, meaningful change in a manner that could be measured and evaluated to drive and guide Departmental improvements.

Leadership in the Dean’s office provided an expectation of excellence and supported the hard work and experimentation of faculty and students with this new curricular outlook, and stakeholders (students and school leaders in the field) stepped-up their efforts for more mindful measurement of what we are teaching, and how students are learning.

In short, to have a near-categorical “Not Met” determination on our 2011 National Recognition Report has resulted in significant, positive change and a direction for future programmatic improvements that will better reflect the demands on leadership preparation institutions for producing the finest of candidates to lead our nation’s schools.

If you find that you need any additional information through which to make a determination on our programmatic fidelity with ELCC Standard Elements and Concepts, please do not hesitate to contact us, and we will provide such to you expeditiously.

Thank you for this opportunity to present this Revised Report to you.
**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:
The Revised Report appears to have addressed the fundamental recommendations from the previous report. Newly revised key assessments were developed to meet the requirements for ELCC approval process.

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 school vision of learning supported by the school community.

1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning.
Met ❖ Met with Conditions ❖ Not Met
   ☐ ☐ ☒

Comment:

1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.
Met ❖ Met with Conditions ❖ Not Met
   ☐ ☐ ☒

Comment:

1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.
Met ❖ Met with Conditions ❖ Not Met
   ☐ ☐ ☒
1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.
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 in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

3.1 Manage the Organization.

Comment:

3.2 Manage the Operations.

Comment:

3.3 Manage the Resources.

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.

Comment:
4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

5.2 Acts Fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

5.3 Acts Ethically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.

Comment:

6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.

Comment:

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.

Comment:

7.2 Sustained.

Comment:

7.3 Standards-based.

Comment:
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:
Credit is clearly provided for the internship experiences.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidate knowledge of content
The newly revised key assessments designed with rubrics related to candidates' knowledge of content coupled with the passing score rate provide evidence in this area. Newly revised key assessments are well developed but should be implemented and evaluated for more than a year.

C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
The newly revised key assessments designed with rubrics related to candidates' knowledge of content coupled with the passing score rate provide evidence in this area. Newly revised key assessments are well developed but should be implemented and evaluated for more than a year.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning
The newly revised key assessments designed with rubrics related to candidates' knowledge of content coupled with the passing score rate provide evidence in this area. Newly revised key assessments are well developed but should be implemented and evaluated for more than a year.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS
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)

| Newly revised key assessments are well developed and faculty will use the data results to provide information for future revisions to the program. Consideration of more data collection and analyses of the newly revised key assessment outcomes will be helpful in this work. |

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas for consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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"
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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)

The mission of Indiana State University’s Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations (ELAF) is to provide graduate programs for the preparation and licensure of school leaders. The Master of Science in Education (MSE) degree in Educational Leadership offers educators a planned program of study including 27 credit hours of coursework and 12 hours of internship experiences designed to improve their performance as leaders in the public school systems. The curriculum incorporates the Bayh College of Education (BCOE) conceptual framework, the Indiana Standards for School Leaders, the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards, and the Technology Standards for School Administrators (TSSA).

The MSE degree is specifically designed to prepare building level administrators and is based on recommendations from professional organizations and accrediting associations. An additional, non-degree, individualized licensure program of study is planned for students who hold graduate degrees in related disciplines and who wish to obtain building level administrator licensure. This program is identical in substance to the degree program.

The time allowed for completion of the MSE degree is seven years. Graduate work completed prior to seven years from the student’s date of completion of the degree cannot be used to satisfy degree requirements. However, work toward the non-degree licensure is accepted from later occurrences.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issues the Building Level Administrator license to allow candidates to serve as a principal, assistant principal, or vice-principal for grades levels P-12. The purpose of the licensure system is to produce a cadre of high-quality instructional leaders possessing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions as they relate to standards and performance-based measures. The Indiana standards guide the performance-based route that encompasses visionary leadership, school management, school culture, community relations, ethical and moral practice, and navigating the political landscape.

The IDOE issues the initial building level license for two years to applicants who hold a standard teaching license with at least two years teaching experience, successfully completed the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), and have completed a program of study based on the Indiana Standards for School Leaders. Additional requirements include an internship and the development of a portfolio assessed by program of study faculty. The initial license is upgraded to a standard license to applicants who
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)

The nine-month internship experience includes 300 hours of field experiences/internship experience near the candidate’s completion of coursework. Each candidate typically serves as an intern in the school in which they are employed. Those who choose not to work in their own school are assisted by the University supervisor to find an appropriate setting to serve as the home for the internship experiences. Given the license is composed of grades K-12, candidates are required to document their experiences at all grade levels. The site mentor is selected prior to the internship and must be approved by the school superintendent and the coordinator of the Principal Preparation Program. The site mentor assists the candidate in setting objectives, completing required activities, and identifying others with whom the candidate may wish to complete some of the activities, and identifying settings for experiences in other settings (elementary, middle, high school, community agencies.)

Candidates must acquire substantive field/internship experiences in each of the following settings for licensure as a building administrator: K-12 district level, elementary level middle level, and secondary level. The minimum field experience/internship hours for a candidate completing the program is 300. The hours are accumulated through the internship over the course of 30 weeks (two semesters).

Candidates are provided a comprehensive list of field/internship activities required for internship as well as a list of preferred activities. These activities may be modified by the mentor to meet the conditions of the internship site. Additional activities may be selected, modified, or created to better prepare the intern for leadership as found relevant by the University supervisor.

The following courses within the program have been designated as defining the internship:
• ELAF 758 Internship (6 hours)
• ELAF 793 Internship Seminar (6 hours)

For assessment of the internship experiences, the candidates maintain a log of all experiences by activity, date, time, setting, and relevant ELCC standard(s). These activities are reviewed with the mentor and University supervisor on a monthly basis. The candidate shares their experiences in a confidential manner with their assigned University supervisor during the internship, and maintains communication with the assigned supervisor through weekly reflections via e-mail. In addition the candidate is required to meet with the university supervisor, on site, a minimum of four times throughout the internship experience.

In addition to other internship activities, each candidate develops a collaborative leadership activity in which the candidate demonstrates, through performance activities, the skills and behaviors (similar to those exhibited by an effective administrator) to successfully design and complete a long-term project. The candidate and the site mentor discuss any overall educational issues that could be strengthened in existing practices or to identify a new emphasis for the leadership project. Regardless of the decision, the school’s ability to provide an improved learning environment should be enhanced greatly because of the candidate’s chosen project. The site mentor completes a summative evaluation of the candidate and his/her performance in internship experiences looking through the lens of the ELCC standards. At the conclusion of the long-term project, candidates provide an abstract and brief presentation to support their activities and to help other candidates interested in deploying the same project.

All work is presented in a portfolio within an approved format with the required documentation which is evaluated using a scoring rubric, based on the ELCC standards. This portfolio in its entirety requires a high level of organizational proficiency and allows a clear sense of the candidate’s development over the duration of the internship experiences.

3. Attach the following contextual information:
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.)

See Attachments panel below.

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.

Program:
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>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>Bobbie Jo Monahan</td>
<td>Ed.S. Indiana State University, Education Leadership</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Lecturer III</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2010 Federal Grant author</td>
<td>Leadership Experience in K-12 School Environment, Creation and Implementation of K-12 Curriculum Plan, Co-Director of Administrative Program, Indiana Secondary Teaching, Facility Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Tanoos</td>
<td>Educational Specialist from Indiana State University</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Lecturer Level III</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>President, Covered Bridge Special Education District, Vice President-Board of Trustees at Ivy Tech State College-Region 7, Chairman of Scholarship Committee for Union Hospital Foundation</td>
<td>Sixth grade teacher, Elementary School Principal, Middle School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Fulford</td>
<td>Ph.D. School Leadership, Indiana State University</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Lecturer III</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Associate State Director AdvancEd/NCA</td>
<td>Teaching Experience P-12: Special Education 8yrs; First Grade 1 year; Third Grade 1 year; Elementary Assistant Principal 4 years; Elementary Principal 4 years; Assistant superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction 9.5 years; Superintendent 6 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Watts</td>
<td>Ph.D. ELAF Indiana State University</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Steve Gruenert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(3)</td>
<td>Ph.D. Education Administration, University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)</td>
<td>Coordinator of Principal Preparation Program Instructor Chair of Educational Leadership department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(5)</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)</th>
<th>Consultant with Clay, Vigo, and Beech Grove schools: 2009-current National Middle School presenter: Fall 2009 AASA publication: Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)</td>
<td>k-12 Art 6 years High school principal 2 years Middle school principal 4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Terry McDaniel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(3)</td>
<td>Ph. D. Educational Leadership, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)</td>
<td>Advisor for Administrative Licensure Programs and the Ed. S. in Educational Leadership Instructor in all graduate levels of Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(5)</td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|---|---|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Todd Whitaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(3)</td>
<td>Ph.D., Educational Administration, University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)</td>
<td>Instructor, Field Supervisors\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(5)</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)</th>
<th>Leading School Change book - solo author, The Ball book - solo author, have presented to thousands of K-12 educators around the world</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)</td>
<td>Taught math and business education; assistant principal; principal; middle school coordinator</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</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1:</td>
<td>School Leaders Licensure</td>
<td>State Licensure Exam</td>
<td>All candidates completing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment (SLLA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>program and applying for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana K-12 building principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>license are required to obtain a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum score of 165 on the SLLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typically during second half of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internship, ELAF 758/ELAF 793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2:</td>
<td>Internship Portfolio</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>The internship portfolio is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessed twice during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internship (November and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April). The internship is a 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hour experience, spanning nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>months. Courses are ELAF 758 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELAF 793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3:</td>
<td>Long-Term Project</td>
<td>Field-Based Project</td>
<td>Project determined in October,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completed in April, assessed at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>end of the internship, ELAF 758.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4:</td>
<td>Mentor Assessment of Intern</td>
<td>Field-Based Assessment</td>
<td>On-site mentor from cooperating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>school assesses candidate at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>end of internship, part of ELAF 758.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5:</td>
<td>ELCC Student Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Self-Assessment/Reflection</td>
<td>Candidates self-assess at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>beginning of the internship, part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of ELAF 793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6:</td>
<td>ELCC Faculty Assessment</td>
<td>Course Assessment</td>
<td>Candidates are assessed by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>member at end of ELAF 655.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #7:</td>
<td>M.Ed. Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Data are collected during Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator Day and at the Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8:</td>
<td>M.Ed. Employer Survey</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Data are collected during Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator Day and at the Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference.</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
SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ELLC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ELLC 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 school vision of learning supported by the school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<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 School Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.</td>
<td>✔️</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>Standard</th>
<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 School Culture.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.</td>
<td>✔️</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>
<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>
<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>Standard</th>
<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 Organization.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Manage the Operations.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Manage the Resources.</td>
<td>✔️</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 families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>Standard</th>
<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>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Acts Fairly.</td>
<td>✔️</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>
<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>Standard</th>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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.

7.3 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.

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

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

| Assessment 1.docx | Relationship of Assessment to Standards.docx |

See Attachments panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership. 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. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, essays, and case studies, and portfolio tasks(13). (Answer Required)
Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2
See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 3.docx
See Attachments panel below.

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.

Assessment 5
See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 6
See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 7
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.

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively develop supervisory plans for classroom-based instruction, 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 school improvement plans, needs assessment projects, and faculty intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 2
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, 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.

Assessment 3.docx
See Attachments panel below.

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' ability to support student learning and development. 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, 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.

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 school-based strategic plans, school simulations, and school intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7
8. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, postgraduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, faculty intervention plans, strategic plans, simulations, school intervention plans, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

| Assessment 8 |

See Attachments panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

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.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Changes that have occurred in the Principal Preparation Program have been based on: assessment data; feedback from alumni, current students, employers of our graduates, instructors; and reports provided to a departmental advisory committee. We have also deployed a survey for our on-site mentors that specifically addresses the activities we engage candidates in, separate from the candidate evaluation. The Unit Assessment System (UAS) has also contributed to changes made in data collection processes and refinement of assessment instruments, i.e. rubric categories. Data are shared with faculty during late-spring or early-summer retreats, during internship Saturday seminars, and at faculty meetings. The following summarizes the discussions from those meetings relative to this report along with explanations of how those have manifest in program changes.

(1) Content Knowledge

Up until the spring of 2010 the SLLA (assessment #1) has been a scenario-based, open-ended response format exam, where candidates are asked to respond to case studies or vignettes. We have always prided ourselves in the delivery of content that is problem-based. In other words, our instructors are all past or current practitioners with a feel for the real world who are able to deliver content within the context of real-world situations. Theories and standards are discussed in contexts that current administrators are facing today. This has given our candidates not only good preparation for the SLLA but also for the real world.

Our candidates performance on the SLLA has been exemplary. While the concept of problem analysis is still the most difficult task relative to the other subscales, we are proud of their performance on the SLLA. We have dedicated additional seminar time to discussing real issues they may bring and then spend time with that issue as if it were a test question asking what is the real problem? what data is needed, what data do we have?, and what might be the first steps in addressing the issue? With each cohort we have shared information from past cohorts regarding test-taking strategies. While this does not address the content knowledge of this test, it does help them be at ease and perform at an optimal level.

The new SLLA format finds the candidate having to respond to 100 multiple choice items. This has supplanted half of the exam. The other half continues to remain as vignettes and case studies. With the new format we have asked ourselves if we need to look at having more multiple choice assessments/exams in their coursework experiences, simply as a response to the new format, not as a means for improving their capacity as a building leader. After each deliberation, with any group we ask, it is determined that the problem-based approach is best since the real world does not ask leaders to pick one response from four choices. Not all candidates take the SLLA, some may take it a few years removed from their program completion, some may even take it without taking a single course. Administration of the SLLA is out of our control. We have had some take it, claim ISU as the University of choice, yet we have no idea who they are.

Other assessments are designed to look at content knowledge. In fact, most of our assessments are framed around the ELCC standards. Standard Two, which looks at the culture and climate of the learning environment, is our strongest standard across the board. Many publications provide evidence stating the how this standard has the greatest influence on leadership success. Standards 1, 3, and 5, are the next strongest as we look across all assessments. Standards 4 and 6 tend to have the greatest standard deviations, if it were possible to aggregate them as such. This finding is also supported with portfolio entries. The engagement of external stakeholders (i.e. community) and understanding, negotiating the political landscape may be the two aspects of administration that burnout good leaders the most. We understand that and thus look for ways to moderate the negative effect it potentially has. We have encouraged more mentors to share with the candidates how the real world of administration functions; to share the dark side of the job and how they negotiate it, without compromising privacy issues. We have included more guest speakers to our internship Saturday seminars to share issues they work through - how to diffuse situations and maintain strong leadership in light of competing demands.

(2) Professional, Pedagogical Skills, and Dispositions

The ELCC standards (previously ISLLC) each contain several sub-scales related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions, totaling well over 100. As a group, we determined which of those subscales were more salient to our program, keeping a manageable number in mind. It was determined by the faculty group that the portfolio should be the artifact that reflects these standards the most, to serve as a guide for the program. From the design of the portfolio, and the iterations that have occurred in the past, we have identified three sub-scales within each of...
the first six standards. A few years back we had as many as 36, six per standard. Feedback from alumni sparked the decision to boil down the list. Changes in the portfolio were supported by on-site mentors and classroom instructors as we combined some items and changed the language. We feel our subscales do a better job. The design of the portfolio has also changed from a scrapbook of experiences to a thoughtful reflection. It was recently determined by the internships supervisors to ask the candidates to respond to the items early (October) in the internship, using it as a baseline to capture their thinking prior to engaging in real experiences, then compare those responses to those candidates provide at the end of the internship (April). This process has been useful in capturing the mental transition that occurs as an educator transforms from teacher to administrator.

The first six standards, with the three sub-scales within each have helped to frame the program in every aspect. They are described in terms of action and purposeful thought rather than theory. They can now be found driving instruction, portfolios, long-term projects, and all program-level assessments. Each summer we ask ourselves if there needs to be some additional sub-scales, or text added to the existing portfolio items. These items have not changed in essence for the past three years.

The internship is the flagship experience of our program and I can say without question it is the best in the state. It officially begins with an orientation in July and ends (officially in April) when the mentor determines the candidate has received a full plate of experiences. Our University supervisors travel to these sites twice per semester and speak with the candidate and the on-site mentor. Our rapport with the on-site mentors is strong and thus the communication between us is very candid. We have recently changed from three visits per semester to two due to the budget constraints. University supervisors will record their visits and use that as part of the final evaluation of the candidates' grade in ELAF 758. The course ELAF 793 is designated as the on campus component. This is when candidates come to campus one Saturday per month. It is a full day of seminar activities and presentations. We continue to alter these seminar experiences as feedback from alumni, instructors, and the advisory committee is provided. We have maintained the first four seminars as times to focus on Leadership Styles, School Culture and Climate, Current Events in Education, and School Improvement Models. The last four seminars have been changed to meet their needs in the areas of Crisis Management, Interviewing/Hiring/Dismissal Processes, School Law, Counseling, and Special Education.

Assessing dispositions has been a source of extended conversations on Assessment Day (an annual Unit-level event) and during committee meetings. The original framework was a compilation of instruments used at other Universities, with an adaptation to our Unit standards. The original instrument was adopted by the college in 2005. This program has not made changes to it since. One recent discussion provided a suggestion that may make the assessment more accurate, to assess frequency rather than magnitude of each candidate's performance within the disposition scale. Even the weakest educator will have moments when they are able to conform to a standard. This will be introduced to the Unit as a potential improvement to this assessment in the spring of 2011.

In our program, dispositions are critical. The assessment of dispositions in our program has demonstrated that for the most part, all of our candidates are at least meeting each standard. There have been only a couple of candidates that have received "does not meet" on any item, with no one candidate receiving more than three "does not meet" in any one assessment period. What is interesting is that looking at these candidates through other assessments, we find they represent those at the weak end of the cohort. In discussions with program staff, we have found that there will be on occasion those candidates that will not cut it as a principal. From a program perspective, there will be those candidates who have sufficient GPAs, can pass classes, and pass the SLLA, but will not do as well on the portfolio and/or dispositions. Given that dynamic, we have come to value the disposition assessment (as it is) more so than perhaps other programs.

(3) Student Learning

The primary means for assessing our candidates' impact on the student learning environment is through the Long-term Project (assessment #3). This is a collaborative project that is developed with the on-site mentor early in the fall semester of the internship. Throughout the internship the candidate works through all the logistical issues, implements the project, collects data, analyzes the data, and presents those findings. Additional assessments and opportunities to reflect contribute to our candidates' impact on the student learning environment, such as the mentor evaluation (assessment #4), site visits from the University supervisor, seminar discussions on campus with the whole cohort, and to some degree, the portfolio process.

Looking at data from Long-term Projects, we find all candidates providing sufficient evidence for impacting the student learning environment. The reason for such a success rate is the constant monitoring of the project by the mentor and University supervisor. We would not let a weak project continue to survive throughout the school year. Some that were initially found to be weak were either changed or modified. Over time we have found some projects to have a weak proclivity, thus we discourage those activities that have in the past been found wanting. Many of our candidates are working with alumni (as mentors) and will have a long-term project in mind prior to starting the internship. Recently, we have found that providing a portion of the September seminar dedicated to presenting past projects to the candidates, as inspiration, they will have a better idea of the scope and expectation for their project.

As this aspect of program assessment may be the most challenging, we ask ourselves if there is a better way to assess candidate impact on the student learning environment. We have discussed variables such as test scores, attendance, disciplinary referrals, attitudinal scales, and GPAs. Each conversation leads us less convinced there is a way to make the link to one project or assessment. One strategy that was discussed is to revisit the schools where we had placed interns, a few years removed from their assignment, and determine whether the long-term project had an impact on the above variables occurred, or if the project is still in effect and/or having some impact. This might also be accomplished as a

**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/ResponseToConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.