

**Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16**

**Due to your dean by June 1**

**Due from dean to assessment office by June 15**

**Degree Program Name:** \_M.Ed. School Building Administration\_ **Contact Name and Email** \_Bobbie Jo Monahan, Program Director, and Ryan Donlan, Assessment Coordinator

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

**Part One**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p>1.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>recruiting, hiring, assigning, retaining,</b> and supporting effective teachers who share the school's vision/mission</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would be a score of approximately 3.2 overall, probably because students were between developing and meeting expectations at that time of the year that the assessment would be given with their experiences. Students were getting ready for the interviews with the superintendents, which in the curriculum came just after coursework asked them to be reflective in their journaling, regarding recruiting, hiring, assigning, and retaining teachers.</p> <p>1.1                      Score of 4: 6 (40%)                      Score of 3: 6 (40%)                      Score of 2: 3 (20%)                      Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>80% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, at the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.2 Demonstrates ability in <b>prioritizing teacher evaluation</b> over competing commitments</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan</p>

<p>and using teacher evaluation systems that credibly differentiate the performance of teachers</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>		<p>Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>of the outcome would be a score of around a 3, yet we were betting we might see scores between a 2 and a 3, closer to a 2, because just a handful of the Interns had the experience of sitting in on teacher evaluations. This was more a collective bargaining restriction in the field than it was anything else. Probably not even the majority had an opportunity to do this directly.</p> <p>1.2  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 5 (33%)  Score of 2: 3 (20%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>80% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, at the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard</i></p>	<p>analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

			<p><i>equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>orchestrating aligned, high-quality coaching;</b> workshops; team meetings; and other professional learning opportunities tuned to staff needs based on student performance</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were closer to a 3, because many of the interns had the opportunity to lead professional development meetings while in their clinical experiences. A handful even got to present at school board meetings.</p> <p>1.3  Score of 4: 10 (67%)  Score of 3: 5 (33%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these</i></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p><i>areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.4 Demonstrates ability in designing and <b>implementing succession plans</b> (e.g., career ladders) for every position in the school, and providing formal and informal opportunities to mentor emerging leaders and promote leadership and growth</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students engage in and meaningfully</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would have been a 3, yet we were forecasting that we would see scores closer to a 2, as this type of opportunity – i.e. for every position in the school – would be quite rare.</p> <p>1.4  Score of 4: 6 (40%)  Score of 3: 6 (40%)  Score of 2: 3 (20%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further</i></b></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

<p>contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>			<p><b>Thoughts</b></p> <p>80% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, at the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>delegating tasks</b> and responsibilities appropriately to competent staff members, monitoring their progress,</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and</p>	<p><b>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would be quite high, closer to a 3, because in the</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared</p>

<p>and providing support as needed</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>		<p>4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>clinical internship, they were in charge of a lot of committees and had to monitor the progress of their teams.</p> <p>1.5  Score of 4: 8 (53%)  Score of 3: 6 (40%)  Score of 2: 1 (7%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard</i></p>	<p>intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

			<p><i>Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.6 Demonstrates ability in <b>counseling out or recommending the dismissal</b> of ineffective teachers, carefully following contractual requirements</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would be a 3, yet we were forecasting at the time of this assessment that actual scores would be around a 2. Interns are typically not provided the opportunity because of collective bargaining agreements.</p> <p>1.6  Score of 4: 6 (40%)  Score of 3: 5 (33%)  Score of 2: 4 (27%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>73% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p>As noted in the discussion notes to the left, the limitations posed on the involvement of Principal Interns in terms of collective bargaining agreements may have had an adverse impact on these scores, by virtue of candidates not being involved in such activities.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative</i></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>



			<p><i>assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>1.7 Demonstrates ability in <b>strategically assigning teachers and other staff</b> to support school goals and maximize achievement for all students</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would be quite high, closer to a 3, because in the clinical internship, they were in charge of a lot of committees and had to monitor the progress of their teams.</p> <p>1.7  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 7 (47%)  Score of 2: 1 (6%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p>94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>cultivating commitment</b> to and ownership of the school's instructional vision, mission, values, and organizational goals, and ensuring that all key decisions are aligned to the</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were around a 3, and we forecasted that the actual scores were most probably going</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year</p>

<p>vision</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p> <p>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>		<p>for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>to be a 3, as they were side-by-side with the principals, selling those visions and missions. Lots of experience throughout.</p> <p>2.1  Score of 4: 10 (67%)  Score of 3: 4 (27%)  Score of 2: 1 (6%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard</i></p>	<p>as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			<p><i>Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.2 Demonstrates ability in planning, <b>organizing, supervising, and supporting a rigorous instructional program</b> based on research-supported best practices regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were at a 3, yet the actual scores were predicted at this juncture to be between a 2 and a 3, because of the word rigorous. They are developing in that, as we touch on this in coursework, but they probably don't get the opportunity to make this rigorous, as of yet. That will come in time.</p> <p>2.2  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 4 (47%)  Score of 2: 1 (6%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities,</i></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p><i>so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>using frequent classroom observation</b> and student performance data to evaluate instructional quality, and regularly providing teachers with prompt, high-quality feedback aimed at improving student outcomes</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were a 3, yet we predicted that scores would be between a 2 and a 3. Candidates use the data, but not all of them had the opportunity to observe. One example was an action research project where it was provided an opportunity for teachers to observe each other, yet this was the exception rather than the rule.</p> <p>2.3  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 6 (40%)  Score of 2: 2 (13%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>87% of candidates scored a 3 or</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p>higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.4 Demonstrates ability in <b>establishing a culture of collaboration</b> in which teamwork, reflection, conversation, sharing, openness, and problem solving about student learning and achievement are aligned to clear instructional priorities</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were a 3, and we were hoping that this would come in at a 3 – “sufficient” because they better be doing that in their schools. There’s really</p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took</p>

<p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p>			<p>no excuse for this one not to be on board, as this is related to their dispositions as well, and they score relatively high, consistently, on dispositions.</p> <p>2.4  Score of 4: 11(73%)  Score of 3: 3 (20%)  Score of 2: 1 (7%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>93% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of</i></p>	<p>place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>ensuring the use of practices with proven effectiveness</b> in promoting academic success for students with diverse characteristics and needs, including English Learners and students with exceptionalities, including high-ability and twice exceptional students</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome were a 3, and we forecasted that scores would come in around a 3, as they had such diverse clientele that they dealt with. For example, getting an ESL teacher, etc.</p> <p>2.5  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 5 (33%)  Score of 2: 3 (20%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>80% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, at the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside</i></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>



			<p><i>leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
<p>2.6 Demonstrates ability in <b>promoting the sanctity of instructional time</b>, and ensuring that every minute is maximized in the service of student learning and achievement</p> <p><b>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their profession.</p> <p>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p>	<p>Principal Intern Summative Evaluation, completed in EDLR 758-793, The Principal Internship</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>The expectations we had for establishment of the achievement of the outcome would be a 3. This was mostly seen in collaboration with the building leader.</p> <p>2.6  Score of 4: 7 (47%)  Score of 3: 7 (47%)  Score of 2: 1 (6%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>94% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><i>In terms of assessment results, we found that most of these candidates, by the time they are ready for their internship, will score at least a 3 or a 4 in these areas, as it is more a summative</i></p>	<p>Bobbie Jo Monahan was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. Formative information was shared intermittently throughout the year as available at program meetings, and final interpretation took place at a program meeting on May 19, 2016.</p>

			<p><i>assessment of performance.</i></p> <p><i>They are individuals who have been successful building level teachers who in many cases have been tapped on the shoulder for future leadership opportunities, so they have been active participants within their programs, working alongside leaders. So in terms of Standards 1 and 2, our candidates are in actuality teacher leaders, as part of those performance standard equations.</i></p> <p><i>Individuals who scored more than others at a level of a 2 or a 1 are typically those who have dispositional issues that get in the way of their learning content and demonstrating mastery of performance, or those Standard Elements that are more difficult to break-into during one's Internship because of the rigidity of collective bargaining agreements.</i></p>	
Indiana Principal Licensure Composite Scores	Indiana Principal Licensure Exam	We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would pass this exam, which is a requirement for National Recognition through our Accreditation Agency.	Currently, 48 of 54 (91%) candidates passed the Indiana Principal Licensure Exam in the period from June 1, 2015 to May 24, 2016.	The office staff of Judy Sheese was responsible for collecting the results; Ryan Donlan tabulated the results, and Bobbie Jo Monahan and Ryan Donlan analyzed the results. They are the subject of ongoing review in Program Meetings, as these results are provided, on time, on a weekly basis to the Bayh College of Education.
Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a				

focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).				
--	--	--	--	--

\* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

*If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.*

#### Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

#### Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

*If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.*

*Narrative in the following section, in answer to the questions above, is gleaned from department review of assessment results, which include informal, indirect feedback from candidates in our program and stakeholders in the field, as well as faculty program meeting reflections and conversations:*

(1) Discoveries that assessment have allowed us to make about student learning: Assessment results and candidate feedback reveal that there is a definite increase of diverse learning styles, even at the graduate level AND between the millennials and their specific clientele in schools. They are having to think differently about their educational practices, not only in their leadership roles, but also in their communities and families. The picture is so much bigger than it used to be – so much more diverse, global, affected by social media. Candidate PK-12 leaders have to approach their students differently now as well. It could not be further away from a one size fits all.

Discoveries that assessment have allowed us to make about the curriculum: We are greatly benefiting from the fact that we are continuing to enjoy curriculum mapping and all getting on the same page. This process really accelerated in 2011. For example, Adjunct Dr. Karen Goeller, Assistant

Superintendent from the Vigo County Schools, is outstanding. We are excited to coordinate the assignments, the texts, etc. We also feel fortunate to be able to hire such outstanding adjuncts who are practicing and bring so much to the table. Our PK-12 side is cohesive in putting students 1<sup>st</sup> always. We change as students' needs change, and we are not afraid and can all agree to do that. Assessment results show us that we are being successful in these endeavors.

Discoveries made about department processes, through assessment: We as a department have outstanding people who use assessments in a variety of circumstances to improve departmental processes. What the department needs to do in order to increase transparency is to increase the frequency of communication regarding assessment so as to examine values, perspectives on pedagogy, philosophies about curriculum, and management.

Discoveries regarding the Assessment Plan itself: We are finding it very difficult to manage two sets of Standards (one mandated by Indiana and another mandated by our Specialized Program Association (SPA) National Recognition Group, and then to select one over the other for purposes of internal reporting, as the concepts embedded within the standard elements do not crosswalk well. We are particularly grateful of the opportunity for a once-per-year snapshot, rather than the quarterly reporting under the old system, as we work to make sense of what we are to do, and how we are to do it. What we very much like about our assessment processes are the monthly opportunities to have discussions regarding how we are doing in program meetings, and having these conversations in quarterly department meetings as well. We find the ISU Assessment Office has always been very supportive of us, as we wish to learn, grow, and improve through assessment.

(2) Changes – Our program faculty love the idea of continued, true curriculum mapping and collaborating with experts who come from outside and offer the great things they bring to the table. To continue to have adjuncts, the practicing professionals (PK-12 leaders), is priceless, because they are out in the field dealing with real issues of PK-12 leadership and management, day in and day out. We would like to continue to expand upon these to ensure that we're relevant, as well as to avail ourselves more professional opportunities such as AdvancEd each year.

(3) Assessment Plan, Next Year: At this point in the coming year, our Assessment Plan will focus on realigning itself with a new outcomes library to align with SPA expectations, as we have realigned the Standard Elements (divided by knowledge standard elements and skills standard elements) among courses, and we do not know whether we are going to keep the current rotation of two Standards (with corresponding Standard Elements). This will be the subject of summer 2016 discussions, and we are excited to embrace the challenge. Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).

\*\* Point to Note: This year, we are between Specialized Program Association data collection models, and thus our OUTCOMES LIBRARY on file is currently incongruent with the 2 standards assessed this year. We are including the outcomes that we used this year in the sample rubric below. The Standards (Standard Elements) included are from Indiana's licensing standards for school leaders, and next year, we will be transitioning for reporting purposes into the Educational Leadership Licensure Council's (ELCC) 2011 Standards and Standard Elements, yet with a new Outcomes Library, because of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Programs (CAEP), our accreditation agency, expectation that all Standard Elements will be collapsed and assessed under their parent Standards for the purposes of assessment. This new curriculum map is available and is being submitted with this Student Learning Summary Form, yet the two systems of Standards do not currently align, which is challenging, at times, yet provides us opportunities for crosswalk considerations as well.

APPENDIX 2

**Indiana Content Standards for Educations  
School Leader – Building-Level  
Standards Rubric  
Department of Educational Leadership**

Indiana Standard	Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
<b>Standard 1: Human Capital Management</b> <b>School building leaders use their role as human capital manager to drive improvements in teacher effectiveness and student achievement, including:</b>	1.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>recruiting, hiring, assigning, retaining</b> , and supporting effective teachers who share the school's vision/mission  <b>Score:</b>
	1.2 Demonstrates ability in <b>prioritizing teacher evaluation</b> over competing commitments and using teacher evaluation systems that credibly differentiate the performance of teachers  <b>Score:</b>
	1.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>orchestrating aligned, high-quality coaching</b> ; workshops; team meetings; and other professional learning opportunities tuned to staff needs based on student performance  <b>Score:</b>
	1.4 Demonstrates ability in designing and <b>implementing succession plans</b> (e.g., career ladders) for every position in the school, and providing formal and informal opportunities to mentor emerging leaders and promote leadership and growth  <b>Score:</b>
	1.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>delegating tasks</b> and responsibilities appropriately to competent staff members, monitoring their progress, and providing support as needed  <b>Score:</b>
	1.6 Demonstrates ability in <b>counseling out or recommending the dismissal</b> of ineffective

teachers, carefully following contractual requirements

**Score:**

1.7 Demonstrates ability in **strategically assigning teachers and other staff** to support school goals and maximize achievement for all students

**Score:**

**Standard 2: Instructional Leadership**

**School building leaders are acutely focused on effective teaching and learning, possess a deep and comprehensive understanding of best instructional practices, and continuously promote activities that contribute to the academic success of all students, including:**

2.1 Demonstrates ability in **cultivating commitment** to and ownership of the school's instructional vision, mission, values, and organizational goals, and ensuring that all key decisions are aligned to the vision

**Score:**

2.2 Demonstrates ability in planning, **organizing, supervising, and supporting a rigorous instructional program** based on research-supported best practices regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment

**Score:**

2.3 Demonstrates ability in **using frequent classroom observation** and student performance data to evaluate instructional quality, and regularly providing teachers with prompt, high-quality feedback aimed at improving student outcomes

**Score:**

2.4 Demonstrates ability in **establishing a culture of collaboration** in which teamwork, reflection, conversation, sharing, openness, and problem solving about student learning and achievement are aligned to clear instructional priorities

**Score:**

2.5 Demonstrates ability in **ensuring the use of practices with proven effectiveness** in promoting academic success for students with diverse characteristics and needs, including English Learners and students with exceptionalities, including high-ability and twice exceptional students

<p><b>Score:</b></p> <p>2.6 Demonstrates ability in <b>promoting the sanctity of instructional time</b>, and ensuring that every minute is maximized in the service of student learning and achievement</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>Standard 3: Personal Behavior</b></p> <p>School building leaders model personal behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the school, including:</p> <p>3.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>modeling professional, ethical, and respectful behavior</b> at all times and expecting the same behavior from others</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>3.2 Demonstrates ability in establishing <b>yearly, monthly, weekly, and daily priorities</b> and objectives, relentlessly keeping the highest-leverage activities front and center</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>3.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>actively soliciting and using feedback</b> and help from all key stakeholders in order to drive student achievement</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>3.4 Demonstrates ability in <b>going above and beyond typical expectations</b> to attain goals, taking on voluntary responsibilities that contribute to school success, and taking risks to achieve results</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>3.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>using reflection, self-awareness, ongoing learning</b>, and resiliency to increase effectiveness in leading school improvement efforts</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>Standard 4: Building Relationships</b></p> <p>School building leaders build relationships to ensure that all key stakeholders work effectively with each other to achieve transformative results, including:</p> <p>4.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>establishing an organizational culture of urgency</b> in which students, parents/guardians, teachers, staff, and other key stakeholders relentlessly pursue academic and behavioral excellence</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>4.2 Demonstrates ability in skillfully and clearly <b>communicating school goals</b>, needs, plans, and successes (and failures) to all stakeholders (e.g., students, teachers, parents/guardians, the central office, the community, businesses) using a variety of means (e.g., face to face, newsletters, Web sites)</p>

<p><b>Score:</b></p> <p>4.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>using effective strategies to forge consensus</b> for change, manage and monitor change, and secure cooperation from key stakeholders in planning and implementing change</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p> <p>4.4 Demonstrates ability in <b>working collaboratively</b> with individuals and groups inside and outside the school, striving for an atmosphere of trust and respect but never compromising in prioritizing the needs of students</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p> <p>4.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>demonstrating awareness of the public and political nature of the school building leader position</b>, and deftly engaging the public in addressing controversial issues</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>	<p>5.1 Demonstrates ability in <b>empowering teachers and staff to set high and demanding academic and behavior expectations</b> for every student, and ensuring that students are consistently learning, respectful, and on task</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
	<p>5.2 Demonstrates ability in <b>establishing rigorous academic goals and priorities</b> that are accepted as fixed and immovable</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
	<p>5.3 Demonstrates ability in <b>orchestrating high-quality team collaboration to analyze interim assessment results</b> and formulate action plans for immediate implementation</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p>5.4 Demonstrates ability in <b>implementing systems to promote and enforce individual accountability</b> for results</p> <p><b>Score:</b></p>	
<p>5.5 Demonstrates ability in <b>ensuring all students full and equitable access to educational programs, curricula, and available supports</b></p>	

**Standard 5: Culture of Achievement**

**School building leaders develop a school wide culture of achievement aligned to the school's vision of success for every student, including:**



**Score:**

5.6 Demonstrates ability in **using positive and equitable behavior management systems** and ensuring that rules and routines are consistently implemented

**Score:**

5.7 Demonstrates ability in **guiding staff to build productive and respectful relationships** with parents/guardians and engage them in their children's learning

**Score:**

5.8 Demonstrates ability in **developing family and community partnerships** that increase access to resources (e.g., classroom volunteers, funds, equipment), as long as they clearly align with and do not distract from the school's goals for student growth and achievement

**Score:**

**Standard 6: Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management**

**School building leaders leverage organizational, operational, and resource management skills to support school improvement and achieve desired educational outcomes, including:**

6.1 Demonstrates ability in **using data** to identify needs and priorities within the organization and to address organizational barriers to attaining student achievement goals

**Score:**

6.2 Demonstrates ability in **using technological tools** and systems to facilitate communication and collaboration, manage information, and support effective management of the organization

**Score:**

6.3 Demonstrates ability in **using practices for the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the school's physical plant**, equipment, and auxiliary services (e.g., food services, student transportation)

**Score:**

6.4 Demonstrates ability in planning, **managing, and monitoring school budgets** aligned to school improvement goals, and creatively seeking new resources to support school programs

and/or reallocating resources from programs identified as ineffective or redundant

**Score:**

6.5 Demonstrates ability in **managing and supervising compliance with laws** and regulations, such as those governing building management and reporting; human resource management; financial management; school safety and emergency preparedness; student safety and welfare; and the rights and responsibilities of students, families, and school staff

**Score:**

**Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University**

Degree Program: MEd in School Administration Date: 7.18.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.  <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. <b>A couple combine multiple outcomes in one.</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <b>But it's the same one...</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do. <b>The rubric does not specify traits for each level.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<b>3. Results</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <b>1 collects, 2 analyze.</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p>

	<p>about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
<p><b>Overall Rating</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b></p>

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

In next year's report, feel free to include a link to supporting documents rather than attaching them.

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

A majority of the thirteen outcomes are specific, measurable, and student-centered, though the first is too multi-faceted to be assessed by a single item on the standards rubric (and so is 1.4), and the last (licensure score) is not written as an outcome at all. Why not eliminate all the "demonstrate ability in" and cut to the chase: "Recruit, hire...effective teachers"? I understand that you will be developing a new library of outcomes to satisfy CAEP expectations, so you may be able to address these issues then.

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

While you are using one measure to assess thirteen outcomes, it is a summative evaluation of a high impact practice (Principal Internship). Do you worry about restricting your assessment program to this single, end-of-program measure? Also, the rubric does not identify the traits associated with each of the levels, so I cannot tell how you are scoring students' achievement and whether the rubric provides you/your students with specific feedback that would help them improve their performance. Your new curriculum map references additional measures, and I would love to see you implementing some of these in the near future! Thanks also for noting your plans to develop an indirect measure. Your performance goals appear to be appropriate, particularly in the context of the results. Last, your new curriculum map does not suggest that all outcomes are fully addressed (and none at all are addressed in 753). Shall I expect further revisions to this document?

#### 3. Results

You provided a great deal of detail to show that you take student learning assessment seriously, even predicting how well learners will perform based on your knowledge of comparable students' past performance. I'm sure students benefit from these predictions, since they suggest you let them know early on what they need to do to ensure they'll be successful. Rather than repeating the same "interpretations and further thoughts," just include it once in Part Two in your next report, since it is pertinent to all the outcomes. I see that your students met all of the performance targets (including that set for the licensure exam) but one. Is their performance on each outcome typical? If not, why not?

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

Part One indicates that all data are collected by a single faculty member, though Part Two indicates that there is broad involvement in reviewing and analyzing results and that the faculty converse about the data multiple times of the year. Yet little of the attendant narrative specifically relates to the results detailed in Part One. While some needed changes are identified, there are no details about these plans or updates on those previously implemented. Since students did not achieve outcome 1.6, shouldn't there be a plan to ensure that they do in the future? Is there evidence that student learning continuously improves?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!

