

## Educational Leadership [EdS] [ELDO]

**Cycles included in this report:**

Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

## **Program Name: Educational Leadership [EdS] [ELDO]**

**Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018**

### **1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?**

100% Distance only

### **2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?**

No

### **2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.**

### **3 Example of Program Improvement**

2015-2016:

Program faculty have analyzed available data in an effort to improve the program. Four students took the SLLA exam in 2014-2015. This exam is required for state certification in Louisiana. All four candidates that took the exam successfully passed the exam. Faculty were able to retrieve specific data on three of the four candidates that passed the exam. Following an analysis of these results it was concluded that the area of Ethics and Integrity was the lowest scored area on the SLLA exam. Faculty have thus added new activities and field experiences in the EDLD 630 Professional Ethics and School Law course. An action research project involving school law and ethics has also been added to the EDLD 698 Elements of Educational Research Design course. These two additions to these two courses are an attempt to improve the program. These two new activities and assessments will be implemented in the spring of 2017. In addition to the above changes there are five new major assessments to the program that align with the specialty standards of the ELCC. Specific field experiences have also been added to the courses. These field experiences also align with ELCC standards. Another improvement to the program being currently implemented is that candidates will be required to formally select mentors with approval of program faculty in order to ensure that high quality field experiences are experienced by candidates so that program improvement is enhanced.

2016-2017:

There are multiple improvements for the EDLD program since its redesign initiative a year ago (2015-2016). A specific example is the increase of SLLA test takers due to this added requirement. Although the sample size is small due to this being new we are just now able to retrieve data relative to our program, our candidates with data specific to the SLLA test components. That has not been available to the program faculty before. Although the data scores are low, they are present. This provides an excellent baseline for program improvement on the required licensure exam.

2017-2018:

Program content was realigned to ELCC standards. As a result, candidates are performing well on the assessments within the program and on the SLLA.

### **4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year**

2015-2016:

Several new assessments were piloted this academic year, and a few more will be piloted in Spring 2017. Student learning outcomes for the program were revised and additional outcomes were added.

2016-2017:

We have been able to strengthen our faculty pool. This has been very positive in promoting course development, aligning required elements with consistency and broadly improving the learning experience for candidates.

2017-2018:

Enrollment and completer numbers are steadily increasing. Faculty will continue to promote the

program to eligible candidates.

## 5 Program Mission

The Education Specialist with a concentration in Educational Leadership is an advanced degree designed for the candidates who wish to develop advanced knowledge and theory beyond the master's degree level. The degree prepares practicing educators to serve as school and district level leaders and satisfies requirements for Educational Leadership endorsement by the Louisiana State Department of Education.

## 6 Institutional Mission Reference

McNeese State University is primarily a teaching institution whose mission is the successful education of the undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. McNeese uses a traditional admissions process based on courses completed, GPA, and standardized test scores.

## 7 Assessment and Benchmark School Leadership Licensure Assessment

Assessment: School Leadership Licensure Assessment

The SLLA assesses candidates' content knowledge related to the principles for developing, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a school vision of learning; advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; ensuring the management of the organization, operations, and resources, support a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; developing strategies for collaborating with faculty and community members, understanding diverse community interests and needs, and best practices for mobilizing community resources; acting with integrity, fairness, and engaging in ethical practices; and responding to and influencing the political, social, economic, legal and cultural context within the school and school. All candidates must take the SLLA by the end of their next-to-last semester of the program.

Specific program standards (number and description) include:

- 1.1: Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school
- 1.2: Collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals
- 1.3: Promote continual and sustainable school improvement
- 2.1: Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for all students
- 3.1: Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems
- 3.2: Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations
- 3.3: Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within school
- 4.1: Collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment
- 4.4: Respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners
- 5.1: Acts with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success
- 5.2: Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles in school
- 5.3: Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity within school
- 5.4: Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in school
- 5.5: Promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling
- 6.1: Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers
- 6.2: Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

Benchmark: Major Assessment #1 SLLA Exam Passing score is  $\geq 166$ . There will be 50% increase in test takers prior to graduation with 50% increase in passing rates for 1st time testers.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was a minimum of 80% percent of graduates pass the SLLA exam on the first attempt.

Outcome Links

**Content, Principles, & Practices [Program]**

Education Specialist candidates demonstrate knowledge of content and leadership principles and practices as relevant to school leadership.

**7.1 Data**

Previous Data:

Term	% students who passed on first attempt	Benchmark met?
2015-2016	100%	Yes

School Leadership Licensure Assessment for EDLD Specialist Program ELCC Standards 1-6  
Summary of Results:

2014-2015 N=8							2015-2016 N=0						
# not taken	# taken	# of attempts	% pass	avg. score	Range	% >166 of mean score	# not taken	# taken	# of attempts	% pass	avg. score	Range	% >166 of mean score
4	4	1	100	169	166-177	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2016-2017* N=0							
# not taken	# taken	# of attempts	% pass	avg. score	Range	% >166 of mean score	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

\*Up until September 2017

			2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
Overall Score Information			N=4	Mean 171	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean 174
				Range 166-177		Range		Range		Range 174
Passes on 1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt			N=4	100%	N=0	%	N=0	%	N=1	100%
ELCC Sub-component	Standard Alignment	Possible points/# of questions	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
Vision & Goals	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4	18	N=3	Mean 10	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean
				Range 8-11		Range		Range		
				55%		%		%		
Teaching &	2.1, 2.2,	25	N=3	Mean 18	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean
				Range						

Learning	2.3, 2.4			14-21		Range		Range		Range
				72%		%		%		%
Managing Organizational Systems & Safety	3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5	15	N=3	Mean 9	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean
				Range 7-11		Range		Range		
				60%		%		%		
Collaborating With Key Stakeholders	4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4	21	N=3	Mean 13	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean
				Range 12-14		Range		Range		
				62%		%		%		
Ethics & Integrity	5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2	21	N=3	Mean 12	N=0	Mean	N=0	Mean	N=1	Mean
				Range 11-13		Range		Range		
				57%		%		%		

No breakdown available for 2017-2018

### 7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2014-2015:

This is the first year to administer this assessment.

Although all that took the exam passed the exam it was detected that the lowest area of scoring was on the Ethics and Integrity portion of the SLLA exam. Field experiences and activities have been added in at least two courses that relate to this area.

2016-2017:

Most of the data reported on this assessment reflect performance of candidates who were enrolled in the EDLD Specialist program prior to full implementation of program redesign. Nonetheless, analysis of candidate data on SLLA performance is/has been key to program renewal and effectiveness.

The chart above presents data relative to five SLLA sub-components: Vision & Goals, Teaching & Learning, Managing Organizational Systems & Safety, Collaborating with Key Stakeholders and Ethics and Integrity. Also noted on the chart are the ELCC standard elements aligned with SLLA sub-components.

The findings detailed in the chart below represent candidates in the EDLD Specialist program that have taken the SLLA examination and who have reported their score to the EPP. This chart shows that for 2014-2015, 100 % of the four candidates who took the exam were successful and passed the SLLA examination. This is an indication that candidates in our program demonstrated knowledge of the content associated with educational leadership. For both the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 reporting periods, five candidates have not attempted the SLLA. The average SLLA passing score for 2014-2015 was 169, which is 2% above the required 166, with a reported score range of 166-177.

The sub-component Vision and Goals comprises 18% of the multiple-choice section of the SLLA and is aligned with all 4 ELCCC standard elements: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4, which refers to candidates understanding and collaboratively developing, articulating, implementing, and being a steward of a shared vision of learning for a school. For 2014-2015, the mean for correct responses out of 18 questions for this sub-component was 10 (55%) with a range of 8-11. No scores were reported for either 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 collections cycles.

The sub-component Teaching and Learning comprises 25% of the multiple-choice section of the SLLA and is aligned with all 4 ELCCC standard elements: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, which

refers to candidates understanding, creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program. The mean for correct responses out of 25 questions for this sub-component was 18 (72%) with a range of 14-21. No scores were reported for either 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 collections cycles.

The sub-component Managing Organizational Systems and Safety comprises 15% of the multiple-choice section of the SLLA and is aligned with all 5 ELCCC standard elements: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5, which refers to candidates understanding, monitoring and evaluating school management and operational systems, and to candidates understanding and promoting school based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of the students and staff within the school. The mean for correct responses out of 15 questions for this sub-component was 9 (60%) with a range of 7-11. No scores were reported for either 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 collections cycles.

The sub-component Collaborating with Key Stakeholders comprises 21% of the multiple-choice section of the SLLA and is aligned with all 4 ELCCC standard elements: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, which refers to candidates understanding and collaborating with faculty and community members and mobilizing community resources within the school community. The mean for correct responses out of 21 questions for this sub-component was 13 (62%) with a range of 12-14. No scores were reported for either 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 collections cycles.

The sub-component Ethics and Integrity 21% of the multiple-choice section of the SLLA and is aligned with all 5 ELCCC standard elements: 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 6.1, 6.2, which refers to the candidate understanding and acting with integrity, fairness, being a model of ethical behavior within the school setting, safeguarding the values of democracy, equity and diversity, being an advocate for school students, families, and caregivers, and acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions that affect student learning in the school environment. The mean for correct responses out of 21 questions for this sub-component was 12 (57%) with a range of 11-13. No scores were reported for either 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 collections cycles.

Interpretation of Data: The increase in the percent pass rate for between collection cycles 2014 and 2016 charted below suggests candidates who complete the Educational Leadership Master's program possess the skills and knowledge required to become effective school leaders. However, the data reported is inconsistent with unreliable given the fact that candidates were not required to take the course before graduation. Thus, the EPP is most intrigued by the data reported in 2016-2017 as it reflects program policy and thus can serve as a baseline for such as well as inform program development and candidate support. Interpretation for each sub-component is discussed below.

#### Vision & Goals (ELCC 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

Between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, candidates report an 11% improvement on correct responses related to the ability to demonstrate knowledge and skill for promoting stewardship of a shared school vision and using multiple sources of data to promote informed, sustained and continual school improvement. Likewise, increase in range scores indicate candidates' responses are improving from year to year. Although there is an increase in scores in this subcomponent, that is, the highest reported correct percentage of 12/18 or 66%, indicating that these ELCC standard elements require more program and course support. For 2016-2017 candidates, who reflect the EPP required exam policy, decrease in mean and range scores indicate candidates' responses require support in program and course support.

#### Teaching and Learning (ELCC 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

Between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, candidates report a 12% improvement on correct responses related to the ability to demonstrate conceptual understanding of how to sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning. Likewise, increase in range scores indicate candidates' responses are improving from year to year. Although there is an increase in scores in this subcomponent, that is, the highest reported correct percentage of 18/25 or 72%, indicating that ELCC standard elements in this sub-component requires more program and course support. For 2016-2017 candidates, who reflect the EPP required exam

policy, decrease in mean and range scores indicate candidates' responses require support in program and course support.

#### Managing Organizational Systems and Safety (ELCC 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5)

Between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, candidates report a 7% improvement on correct responses related to the ability to demonstrate conceptual understanding of how to promote high quality learning experiences and study success through school organization processes, resource management and school safety. Likewise, increase in range scores indicate candidates' responses are improving from year to year. Although there is an increase in scores in this subcomponent, that is, the highest reported correct percentage of 9/15 or 60%, indicating that ELCC standard elements in this sub-component requires more program and course support. For 2016-2017 candidates, who reflect the EPP required exam policy, decrease in mean and range scores indicate candidates' responses require support in program and course support.

#### Collaborating with Key Stakeholders (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, candidates report a 15% improvement on correct responses related to the ability to demonstrate understanding of working collaboratively with diverse campus and community stakeholders to promote success for all students. Likewise, increase in range scores indicate candidates' responses are improving from year to year. Although there is an increase in scores in this subcomponent, that is, the highest reported correct percentage of 13/21 or 62%, indicating that these ELCC standard elements requires more program and course support. For 2016-2017 candidates, who reflect the EPP required exam policy, decrease in mean and range scores indicate candidates' responses require support in program and course support.

#### Ethics and Integrity (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 6.1, 6.2)

The focus of ELCC standard 5 calls for candidates to understand and act with integrity and fairness in equitable and principled ways and elements 6.1 and 6.2 speak to candidates' ability to understand leadership as advocacy for school equity and improvement. Between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, candidates report a 15% improvement on correct responses. Likewise, a slight decrease in range scores indicates candidates' responses are not improving from year to year. Importantly, there was a slight decrease in scores in this subcomponent, that is, the lowest reported correct percentage of 11/21 or 52% (2015-2016). Even with the reported 57% correct responses in 2014-2015, these low scores from both reporting cycles clearly indicate that metrics on ELCC standard elements in this sub-component are an unacceptable value on ethics and integrity in leadership and requires program and course support. For 2016-2017 candidates, who reflect the EPP required exam policy, decrease in mean and range scores indicate candidates' responses require support in program and course support.

The decrease in mean and range scores in this sub-component provides EDLD faculty with important insight to strengthen this knowledge and skill set development. To this end, EDLD faculty implemented a new Assessment 6, "Equity-Oriented Organizational Management and School Community Action Plan," which focuses on many of the elements in this sub-component. Data for this new assessment is collected in EDUC 620: School Culture and Dispositions, and collection began in fall 2016.

Although too soon to tell, the EPP is hopeful future data reflected by candidates in the 2017-2018 academic year will be influenced program redesign, assessment improvements and course development. Scores from 2015-2016 candidates who took their exam in late spring and early summer: April (1) and June (3) of 2016 may have been positively impacted by program redesign improvements that began in the spring semester 2016. While existing data is compelling, future data will be important in our examination and evaluation of the impact of our program redesign.

#### 2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The number of test takers for the EdS program went from zero to one with a 100% pass rate for the first attempt. Breakdown data was not available.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 is to achieve the 100% pass rate for 1<sup>st</sup> time test takers and continue to show an increase in SLLA test takers.

Recommendations to Support the Success of the Plan: Given informational guidelines provided in the EDLD Handbook and in the syllabus for 698, candidates will report to the program advisor and/or the professor in 696 about the status of taken their exam by “study day” of the semester. At this time, candidates cannot be required to take the SLLA prior to completion of the program, although it is highly suggested. However, faculty will discuss the possibilities of and implications for dropping the GRE as a program requirement and picking up the SLLA as a graduation requirement.

## 8 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 630 Constructed Response Scenario Assessment

Assessment: Constructed Response Scenario Assessment

This assessment measure candidates' content knowledge and understanding of all ELCC standards and how the candidate incorporates them into carrying out school leadership functions. Candidates will take this assessment in EDLD 630.

In a written response, candidate demonstrates competent, critical understanding and application of content knowledge needed to correctly address ELCC aligned, multi-layered scenarios and case study.

ELCC Standards 1-6; ELCC Standards(number and description) include:

- 1.1: Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school
- 1.2: Collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals
- 1.3: Promote continual and sustainable school improvement
- 2.1: Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for all students
- 3.1: Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems
- 3.2: Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations
- 3.3: Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within school
- 4.1: Collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment
- 4.4: Respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners
- 5.1: Acts with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success
- 5.2: Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles in school
- 5.3: Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity within school
- 5.4: Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in school
- 5.5: Promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling
- 6.1: Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers
- 6.2: Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

Benchmark: Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 1.00) or higher on each indicator. In addition:

- The mean of each scenario should be  $\geq 1.25$ .
- The mean of the case study should be  $\geq 1.25$ .
- No candidate should have more than one score below benchmark on any of the three sections.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was a minimum overall mean of 1.25 on the Constructed Response Scenario Assessment.



**EDLD630 [Professional Ethics and School Law (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

**Outcome Links**

**Situations and Scenarios [Program]**

Education Specialist candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills in specific situations and scenarios that a school leader might commonly encounter. Candidate responses should reflect knowledge of ELCC standards. The constructed response scenarios measure the candidate’s knowledge and understanding of the ELCC standards and how the candidate actually incorporates the ELCC standards into carrying out school leadership functions.

**8.1 Data**

Previous Data:

Term	# of students	Mean	Benchmark met?
2015-2016	1	1.6	Yes

Scenario #1 (5 components)		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
		N=1		N=2		N=1	
ELCC Component	2.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.50	Mean	1.00
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning		Range	2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.50	Mean	1.00
Acts with integrity and fairness		Range	2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.2	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.50	Mean	2.00
Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior		Range	2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.3	Mean	1.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.00
Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity		Range	1.00	Range	2.00	Range	1.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.4	Mean	1.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making		Range	1.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
Overall Scenario #1 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.60	Mean	1.70	Mean	1.00
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	0-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	80%
Scenario #2 (4 components)		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
ELCC Component	1.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	3.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%

ELCC Component	3.2	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	3.3	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
Overall Scenario #2 Rubric Scores		Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
Case Study #3 (9 components)		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
ELCC Component	1.2	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.50	Mean	2.00
Collect and use data		Range	2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	1.3	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.00
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	1.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	2.1	Mean	1.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning		Range	1.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	4.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Collaborate with faculty and community members		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
ELCC Component	4.4	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Respond to community interests and needs		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
ELCC Component	5.1	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Acts with integrity and fairness		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
ELCC Component	5.5	Mean	1.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Promote social justice within the school		Range	1.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
ELCC Component	6.1	Mean	1.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers		Range	1.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
ELCC Component	6.2	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00	Mean	0
Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions		Range	2.00	Range	2.00	Range	0
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
Overall Case Study #3 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.67	Mean	1.94	Mean	0.55
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	0-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	66%

Combined Overall Means for Spring 2016, Spring 2017 and Spring 2018 (N=4)

		2016-2017	2017-2018
Scenario #1 Rubric Scores	Mean	1.65	1.43
	Range	1.00-2.00	0-2.00
	%	100%	93%
Scenario #2 Rubric Scores	Mean	2.00	2.00
	Range	2.00	2.00
	%	100%	100%
Case Study #3 Rubric Scores	Mean	1.80	1.38
	Range	1.00-2.00	0-2.00
	%	100%	88.6%

### Course Links

#### EDLD630 [Professional Ethics and School Law (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

##### 8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

###### 2015-2016:

This is the first year to administer this assessment. Although the candidate had an overall satisfactory mean the lowest specific score was in the area of Ethics and Integrity. Field experiences and activities have been added to at least two courses that relate to this area.

###### 2016-2017:

###### Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

In spring 2016, only one candidate took this assessment. For this singular candidate, there was a 100% passing rate on each standard element of the assessment. More specifically, the overall mean for Scenario #1 was 1.60 with individual element means ranging from 1.00-2.00. All standard elements in Scenario #1 received a top rating of 2.00 on all standard elements (2.1, 5.1, and 5.2) except 5.3 and 5.4, both of which scored at the benchmark of 1.00. Likewise, the overall mean for Scenario #2 show a 100% passing rate (range = 2.00) with a 2.00 score for each standard element (1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

Data for the Case Study #3 presented for this candidate had an overall mean of 1.67 (range = 1.00-2.00) with 100% passing rate on all standard elements. A mean score of 2.00 (range = 2.00) was reported for the following Case Study #3 standard elements 2 1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1 and 6.2. Also, Case Study #3 data reported mean score of 1.00 (range = 1.00) on standard elements 2.1, 5.5 and 6.1.

The second data collection for this assessment was spring 2017. For this collection sample two candidates took the assessment. For Scenario #1 both candidates received at or above the benchmark score of 1.00 on each standard element indicating a 100% passing rate. There was an average of 2.00 on standard elements 5.3 and 5.4 (range = 2.00) and data reflected a mean score of 1.5 on standard elements 2.1, 5.1 5.2 (range = 1-2). The overall mean for Scenario #1 was 1.70 (range = 1.00-2.00). For Scenario #2 a mean score on all standard elements (1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) was 2.00 (range = 2.00) with an overall mean of 2.00 for this section of the assessment. Lastly, there was a 100% passing rate on the Case Study #3 assessment, which provided the following data: Standard elements 1.3, 2.1, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.5, 6.1, and 6.2 all received ratings of 2.00 (range = 2.00) with standard element 1.2 being the only one with a mean of 1.50 (range = 1.00-2.00). The overall mean for Case Study #3 was 1.94 with a range of 1.00-2.00.

Combined means across both collection cycles for each scenario reports Scenario #1 was 1.63 (N=3) and Scenario #2 was 2.00 (N=3). The combined means for the Case Study #3 was 1.80 (N=3).

###### Interpretation of Data:

###### Scenario #1

ELCC 2.1 Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (50% above, 50% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

ELCC 5.1 Acts with integrity and fairness.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (50% above, 50% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

ELCC 5.2 Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (50% above, 50% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

ELCC 5.3 Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 5.4 Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester rated at proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

Scenario #2

ELCC 1.1 Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 1.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 3.1 Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 3.1 across the two semesters; however for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 3.2 Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 3.2 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element

indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 3.3 Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within school.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 3.3 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

#### Case Study #3

ELCC 1.2 Collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 1.2 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (50% above, 50% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

ELCC 1.3 Promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 1.3 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 2.1 Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with expectations for all students.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored at the proficient level and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 4.1 Collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 4.4 Respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.4 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 5.1 Act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 5.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element

indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 5.5 Promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored at proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 6.1 Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored at proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

ELCC 6.2 Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across the two semesters; however, for each of the two semesters 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% (one candidate) for the Spring 2016 semester scored above proficient and 100% out of two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored above the proficient level.

Given that there was a small sample size for both administrations of this assessment (Spring 2016 N=1 and Spring 2017 N=2) it is difficult to target program decisions with the data presented. When compared across the collection cycle, the lowest scoring section of the assessment is Scenario #1 revealing the need for the EPP to support standard elements: 2.1 Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning; 5.1 Acts with integrity and fairness; 5.2 Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior; 5.3 Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity; and, 5.4 Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making more explicitly. This assessment is firmly supported by EDLD 630, a course currently offered only in the spring and the third set of data will be collected in spring 2018 with an increased number of candidates expected to take it at that time. In between the Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 administrations of the assessment, the EPP has worked to improve the scoring rubric to more fully align to ELCC demands and CAEP rubric construction recommendations. Assessment data for the constructed responses indicate the program has been highly effective in preparing students content knowledge in these six ELCC standards as evidenced by the means in each scenario and the case study were >1.25. It is noteworthy that no candidates scored below benchmark on any of the three sections of this assessment. Analysis of the responses was guided by four principles in determining whether standards were met:

- The mean of each scenario should be >1.25
- The mean of the case study should be >1.25
- No candidate should have more than one score below benchmark on any of the three sections
- The mean for each individual standard element in each specific scenario/case study should be >1.25 (Since there was such a small sampling size, this principle was not utilized in the interpretation or evaluation of data).

Program faculty will continue to monitor, analyze and evaluate the program using this assessment as more candidates are enrolled in the program. Although data is limited given the small sample sizes are for both administrations of this assessment it is evident that the overall trend is positive for addressing a wide array of standard elements from all 6 standard areas.

A newly aligned instructions and rubric that were implemented Spring 2017. This improved rubric below follows notes from the reviewer and the Spring 2016 data was drawn from the

initial rubric. Standards and structural components did not change. The EPP believes this newer version will support each candidate's understanding of how effectively apply content knowledge to negotiate sometimes prickly, legal issues within schools as well as allow for deeper understanding of the policies that impact today's schools.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. Spring 2018 data only reflected scores for two candidates, both of which scored proficient at >1,00. Gains were made in all indicators except ELCC 3.2 Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources, dropping from 1.92 to 1.50 and ELCC 5.4 Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making decreasing from 1.8 to 1.5. For Spring 2018 data there was only one student who reported zero (0) in multiple areas: 5.4 in the first section: Scenario 1, and also on elements 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.5, 6.1, and 5.2 in the Case Study section. Although this dropped the overall data across each area this data reflects weaknesses with one particular student rather than with the assessment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, the EDS faculty will align course learning objectives and instructional delivery, and ensure course content supports the standard elements. This is particularly important when adjunct faculty teach 650.

Recommendations to Support the Success of the Plan for Improvement: EDLD 698 will embed explicit instruction, course content and learning objectives to support ELCC 5.4 and EDLD 660 will explicitly support ELCC 3.2.

#### Course Links

**EDLD630 [Professional Ethics and School Law (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

### 9 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 640 Leading Instructional Change on the P-12 Campus

Assessment: Leading Instructional Change on a P-12 Campus (This assessment is the revised assessment for the Professional Development Proposal Assessment used prior to fall 2018). ELCC Standards 1, 2 and 3

Assessment #3 for the Educational Leadership, Specialist (EdS) is included in EDLD 640: Seminar in Teaching and Learning to assess candidate's ability to lead professional development specific to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) content knowledge and professional leadership skills required to prepare and facilitate high quality professional development relative to the specific campus needs. By applying current evidence-centered research strategies, effective observation tools and protocols, as well as goal-setting practices the candidate will demonstrate their ability to support data-driven instructional needs through a proposed professional development suitable for the campus faculty.

This assessment is the culmination of 18-hours of embedded field experience whereby each candidate examines the campus improvement plan and achievement data, conducts classroom observations using an instructional rounds model, and ultimately identifies an instructional need specific to the campus and aligned to the school improvement plan. The candidate will integrate course content relative to goal-setting practice [1] and equity-oriented leadership [2] into a high-quality, research-validated professional development proposal for a targeted campus audience.

The final PDP will be developed on a PowerPoint and presented synchronously in an online format. A standardized rubric aligned to the ELCC standard elements (1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1) discussed below to assess knowledge acquisition and skill development. Scores range from 1.00-4.00, with a score of 4.00 indicating highly effective competency; score of 3.00 indicating proficiency; score of 2.00 reflecting emerging competency; and a score of 1.00 indicating that the candidate is ineffective in demonstrating the competency. The rubric specifically identifies how the candidate will meet each criterion with descriptive language. Minimum competency on this rubric is an average score of 3.00 (Proficient) on each indicator.

Specific program standards (number and description) include:

The candidate will develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes (ELCC 1.2). Using observational tools, the candidate will observe classroom lessons with the principal and/or assistant principal, evaluate instruction, and participate in providing valid feedback (ELCC 3.1) to teachers about the extent to which their instruction is standards-based and

engaging to students. The candidate will develop and facilitate a professional development session on a new, research-validated instructional strategy/structure aligned with the school improvement plan. The candidate will work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3) and promote short-term goal setting as a way to demonstrate collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students (ELCC 2.1) via data collection and analysis of evidence (ELCC 2.2). The candidate will also follow up with the campus administration and offer feedback, as appropriate, to a small group of teachers as they embed their learning in practice.

The required elements of the PDP include:

- Clearly identified and articulated instructional need
- Develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes (ELCC 1.2)
- Target audience. Determine who will receive this professional development and connect rationale to needs assessment.
- Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3)
- Integration of Instructional Rounds. This can be done exactly as it is described course resources provided by the instructor or slightly modified to accommodate campus needs.
- Evaluate instruction, and participate in providing valid feedback (ELCC 3.1)
- Integration of Short-Term Objectives. This can be done exactly as it is described in the Jump Start Your School text or modified to suit campus needs.
- Data collection and analysis of evidence (ELCC 2.2)
- Clear demonstration of your understanding of Equity-Oriented Instructional Leadership ideas, structures, beliefs, practices as articulated in course text1
- Collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students (ELCC 2.1)
- Supplemental resources and materials
- Develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes (ELCC 1.2)
- High quality and engaging
- Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3)

Benchmark: Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator. Minimum level of competency is an average score of proficient.

#### Course Links

**EDLD640 [Seminar on Teaching and Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

#### Outcome Links

##### Supporting Data-Driven Needs [Program]

Education Specialist candidates will demonstrate their ability to support data-driven instructional needs through a proposed professional development suitable for the campus faculty.

## 9.1 Data

Component	Standard	Spring 2017		Spring 2018*	
		N=2		N=	
Instructional Need	ELCC 2.1	Mean	4.00	Mean	
Develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes		Range	4.00	Range	
Target Audience		%	100%	%	
Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning	ELCC 2.3	Mean	4.00	Mean	
Integration of Instructional Rounds		Range	4.00	Range	
	ELCC 3.1	%	100%	%	
		Mean	2.50	Mean	
		Range	1.00-4.00	Range	



Evaluation of teacher instruction		%	50%	%	
Short Term Objectives		Mean	2.50	Mean	
Data collection and analysis of evidence	ELCC 2.2	Range	1.00-4.00	Range	
		%	50%	%	
Equity Oriented Instructional Leadership	ELCC 2.1	Mean	2.50	Mean	
Promote collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students		Range	2.00-3.00	Range	
		%	50%	%	
Supplemental Materials & Resources	ELCC 1.2	Mean	3.50	Mean	
Organizational effectiveness and learning strategies		Range	3.00-4.00	Range	
		%	100%	%	
PD Engages	ELCC 2.3	Mean	4.00	Mean	
High-quality professional development for school staff and leaders		Range	4.00	Range	
		%	100%	%	
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	3.28	Mean	
		Range	1.00-4.00	Range	
		%	78.5	%	

\*Will use new rubric & collection is pending.

### Course Links

**EDLD640 [Seminar on Teaching and Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

#### 9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

This is a new assessment that will be implemented for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. Analysis, actions and results will be conducted by program faculty after the spring semester.

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

The data presented above was collected in Spring 2017 as a first cycle for this new assessment. There were two candidates who completed the assessment the next cycle of data is slated for Spring 2018 when EDLD 640 is offered again. The Spring 2018 data will reflect the newly revised assessment rubric that more fully supports the EPPs understanding of candidates' knowledge and understanding while more deliberately aligning to each standard element. The benchmark for proficiency on this assessment is "3" or higher. For Spring 2017, 78.5% of all 7 standard elements were at or above proficiency, with an overall mean score of 3.28 (range 1.00-4.00). Four standard elements represented by 1.2 and 2.3 reported 100% of candidates scored above proficiency. Conversely, 3.1 (mean 2.50, range 1.00-4.00), 2.2 (mean 2.50, range 1.00-4.00) and 2.1 (mean 2.50, range 2.00-3.00) each showed below benchmark at 50%. Data shows the lowest standard elements are 3.1 and 2.2. Given the small sample size it is difficult to determine patterns and trends.

Interpretation of Data:

This assessment will collect the first data set at the end of the spring semester in 2017. There is a cohort of approximately 20 candidates who are slated to enroll in EDLD 640 during that time, providing a significant baseline for the standard elements assessed. Mean, range and percentages  $\geq 3$  will be analyzed relative to each ELCC element below:

ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates can develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 1.3 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates.

ELCC Standard Element 2.3: Candidates can work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 2.3 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates.

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

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 3.1 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 50% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 50% (one candidate) for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 50% out of two candidates rated below proficiency.

ELCC Standard Element 2.1: Candidates can promote collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 3.1 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 50% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 50% (one candidate) for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 50% out of two candidates rated below proficiency.

ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates have knowledge of organizational effectiveness and learning strategies

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 1.3 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates.

ELCC Standard Element 2.3: Candidates have knowledge of high-quality professional development for school staff and leaders

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for 2.3 across more than one semester is available yet; however for the reported semester 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% for the Spring 2017 semester rated above proficient and 100% out of two candidates.

In response to reviewer comments a newly aligned instructions and rubric will implemented S pring 2018. The data presented in this report reflect the EPPs initial submission in fall 2016. The next collection cycle for this assessment will be Spring 2018 as EDLD 640 is only taught in the spring at this point. However, the EPP, following the reviewer's notes, has made significant improvements in the rubric for this assessment and believes this newer version offers more substantial evaluative criteria that are more tightly aligned to the demands of the ELCC standard elements. Data in Spring 2018 will be collected using this newest version shown below. We believe this assessment authentically supports each candidate's understanding of how promote continual and sustained improvement via leading and facilitating professional development as an instructional leader.

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: Data will be collected for this assessment in the fall 2018 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will score at benchmark or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Support the Success of Plan Improvement: Using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

### Course Links

**EDLD640 [Seminar on Teaching and Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

## 10 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 697 Comprehensive Project Assessment

Assessment: Capstone Project: Creating a School Plan

ELCC Standards: 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

EDLD 697 Comprehensive Project is completed in the last semester of the program. Each candidate will identify an issue they have discovered while completing their field observation hours and/or through course projects completed throughout the MEd EDLD program on their particular P-12 campus that can be verified through analysis of data. The project topic must directly align with ELCC standards and student achievement. A list of ELCC standard elements is given to candidates to help spark their thinking about topic ideas for their comprehension project. Once the topic has been identified, the candidate will work through their project guided by the ELCC standards included within the Comprehensive Project Rubric. The candidates submit weekly written assignments for feedback from the instructor. The weekly assignments are tied to each ELCC standard element found on the rubric. The final submission of the Comprehensive Project is submitted at the end of the semester.

Specific program standards (number and description) included:

10 competencies to be covered within the Capstone Project

- Procedures,
  - develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes (ELCC 1.2)
  - create school-based strategic and tactical goals (ELCC 1.2)
- Analysis of data,
  - interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement (ELCC 2.2)
  - analyze school processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school (ELCC 3.1)
- Connection to campus resources,
  - identify leadership capabilities of staff (ELCC 3.4)
- Responsiveness to stakeholders,
  - use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information (ELCC 4.1)
- Collaboration,
  - identify and use diverse community resources to improve school programs (ELCC 4.2)
- Connection to professional development,
  - design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction (ELCC 2.3)
- Ethical and legal applications,
  - formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas (ELCC 5.4)
  - review and critique school policies, programs, and practices to ensure that student needs inform all aspects of schooling, including social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty with in the school (ELCC 5.5)
- Implications,
  - incorporate cultural competence, personality types in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices (ELCC 2.1)
- Impact on P-12 setting,
  - promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff

(ELCC 2.1)

- Next steps, model distributed leadership skills (ELCC 3.4)

Benchmark: Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator. Minimum level of competency is an average score of proficient.

### Course Links

**EDLD697 [Educational Leadership Practicum II (Lab. 9, Cr. 3)]**

### Outcome Links

#### Distributed Leadership [Program]

Educational Specialist candidates will model distributed leadership skills.

### 10.1 Data

2016-2017:

Data table is attached.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

EDS\_EDLD\_Capstone Project\_Creating a School Plan\_17-18

### Course Links

**EDLD697 [Educational Leadership Practicum II (Lab. 9, Cr. 3)]**

### 10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

This is a new assessment that will be implemented for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. Analysis, actions and results will be conducted by program faculty after the spring semester.

2016-2017:

The Comprehensive Project was implemented in Fall 2016 with one candidate. Data collected from this semester indicated that the candidate's final mean score on the Comprehensive Project was above the proficient level of a score of 3.00 as identified by overall mean scores of 4.00. Of the one candidate that attempted this major assessment during this reporting period, he did pass on his first attempt.

Interpretation of Data:

The scores from the one candidate in Fall 2016 indicated he was Highly Effective, score of 4.00, in all of the following ELCC Elements:

Element 1.2 develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; create school-based strategic and tactical goals:

Element 2.1 incorporate cultural competence, personality types in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices:

Element 2.1 promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff:

Element 2.2 interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement:

Element 2.3 design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction:

Element 3.1 analyze school processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school:

Element 3.4 model distributed leadership skills:

Element 4.1 use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information:

Element 4.2 recognize diversity in personalities, curriculum, staff, and culture; identify and use diverse community resources to improve school programs:

Element 5.4 formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas:

Element 5.5 review and critique school policies, programs, and practices to ensure that student needs inform all aspects of schooling, including social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty with in the school.

**Revised Assessment:**

A newly aligned instructions and rubric which will be implemented Fall 2017 and the first iteration of data collected. The EPP does believe that this newer version will support each candidate's understanding of what is expected within the Capstone Project as well as allow for deeper understanding of the many components that should support a decision make on a P-12 campus. Also, all ELCC standards are now included within this assessment.

**Comprehensive Project (revised assessment):****Alignment of Assessment to Standards****ELCC Content Knowledge:**

Collect and use relevant evidence to base decisions (ELCC 1.2)

Multiple sources of evidence are collected, analyzed, and interpreted (ELCC 1.2)

Create school-based strategic and tactical goals (ELCC 1.2)

Promote continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3)

Sustain a school culture conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)

Evaluate school management and operational systems to identify a topic in order to improve school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (ELCC 3.1)

Identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school (ELCC 3.1)

Involve school staff in decision making; identify leadership capabilities of staff (ELCC 3.4)

Identify diverse community resources to support implementation of school plan (ELCC 4.2)

Establish safeguards for democracy, equity, and diversity (ELCC 5.3)

Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the schools (ELCC 5.4)

Identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school (ELCC 6.3)

**ELCC Professional Leadership Skills:**

Candidates in this course should have already completed 210 of their required 240 hours of field experiences as site-based tasks were embedded in and connect to specific goals of each required EDLD course. Candidates taking this course will complete the final 30 hours of field experience.

The Capstone Final Project of the EDLD program includes choosing a task from one of the EDLD courses and expanding on it to include all of the following components:

1. Identifying a topic: Evaluate school management and operational systems to identify a topic in order to improve school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (ELCC 3.1)
2. Analysis of data: Collect and use relevant evidence to base decisions (ELCC 1.2)
3. Multiple sources of evidence are collected, analyzed, and interpreted (ELCC 1.2)
4. Identifying school goals: Create school-based strategic and tactical goals (ELCC 1.2)
5. Making decisions: Identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school (ELCC 3.1)
6. School capacity for distributed leadership: Involve school staff in decision making; identify leadership capabilities of staff (ELCC 3.4)
7. Mobilize community resources: Identify diverse community resources to support implementation of school plan (ELCC 4.2)
8. Ethical and legal applications: Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the schools (ELCC 5.4)
9. School culture: Sustain a school culture conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)
10. Professional development: Promote continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3); Establish safeguards for democracy, equity, and diversity (ELCC 5.3)
11. Emerging trends and initiatives: Identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school (ELCC 6.3)

**2017-2018**

**Analysis of Data:** The benchmark for the assessment was met. Findings from the first two versions of the assessment were collected over five semesters (Version #1 Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017; Version #2 Summer 2017, Fall 2017). The data indicates our candidates have a strong grasp of the ELCC standard elements assessed by the Capstone Project assignment as identified by overall assessment mean scores falling between 3.50-3.71 over the five semester with the benchmark being set at a score of 3.00.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: For 2018-2019, candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Support Success of the Plan for Improvement: Using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

### Course Links

#### **EDLD697 [Educational Leadership Practicum II (Lab. 9, Cr. 3)]**

### **11 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 650 Professional Learning Community Assessment**

Assessment: Leading a Professional Learning Community

ELCC Standards: 1, 2

Candidates are to lead a professional learning community in the tasks of analyzing school assessment data, both qualitative and quantitative, that result in a needs assessment (ELCC 1.2). This should be done at your grade level or within your content area. Once you collaboratively determine the area needing improvement you will then determine instructional strategies, curriculum materials and technology utilization that will lead to an increase in student achievement (ELCC 1.3). Your next task will be to lead the professional learning community (ELCC 2.3) in the implementation of the aforementioned instructional strategies, curriculum materials usage and technology utilization. Your final task will be to follow up, present and lead (ELCC 2.3) other appropriate groups in the school setting to promote capacity building of new strategies. The end result of your efforts should lead to the support of comprehensive building level professional development practices (ELCC 2.3) that enhances teacher growth and efficacy, leading to continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3). You are to apply technology tools throughout the process, particularly when monitoring instructional practices (ELCC 2.4).

Specific program standards (number and description) included:

ELCC Standard Elements: 1.3, 2.3, 2.4 (old rubric) 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.4 (new rubric)

ELCC Content Knowledge:

Role of professional learning in continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3)

High-quality professional development for school staff and leaders (ELCC 2.3) Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology (ELCC 2.4)

ELCC Professional Leadership Skills:

The candidate will analyze teacher learning within campus PLCs to include practices, content, and impact. A needs assessment for improving professional learning will be determined by using qualitative data and quantitative data. Success of PLC implementation will be determined and candidates will design and carry out PLC initiatives for improving the effectiveness of campus PLC's using current theories and practices of efficacy and professional learning.

The candidate will improve professional learning through identifying strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3) by working collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3) by designing the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction (ELCC 2.3). Candidates must use technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data results for accountability reporting (ELCC 2.4). The candidate will follow up by coaching and providing feedback to appropriate groups as they embed the new strategy into their instructional program.

Benchmark: Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 1.00) or higher on each indicator.

Minimum level of competency is an average score of proficient.

### Course Links

#### **EDLD650 [School Improvement: Utilizing Data to Lead Change (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

### Outcome Links

#### **Collaboration [Program]**

Education Specialist candidates will lead a professional learning community in the vital collaborative activities of

analyzing school assessment data that eventually lead to the implementation of innovative instructional strategies, new curriculum materials and new technology utilization that result in a positive effect on student achievement.

### 11.1 Data

Previous Rubric:

Component	Standard	Spring 2017	
		N=2	
ELCC Component	1.3	Mean	2.00
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	2.3	Mean	2.00
Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	2.4	Mean	2.00
Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning		Range	2.00
		%	100%
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	2.00
		Range	2.00
		%	100%

New rubric:

Component	Standard	Spring 2018	
		N=2	
ELCC Component	1.2	Mean	2.00
Create school-based strategic and tactical goals		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	1.3	Mean	2.00
Identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	2.2	Mean	2.00
Interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	2.3	Mean	2.00
Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component	2.4	Mean	1.50
Monitor instructional practices within the school and provide assistance to teachers		Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	1.90
		Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%



## Course Links

### EDLD650 [School Improvement: Utilizing Data to Lead Change (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

#### 11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

This is a new assessment that will be implemented for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. Analysis, actions and results will be conducted by program faculty after the spring semester.

2016-2017:

As a new assessment for the EPP the initial set of data was collected in Spring 2017 in EDLD 650 with 14 candidates. Candidates must score at or above the benchmark score for this assessment, which is a "Proficient" rating of "1.00" on each component. Data indicate that final scores for candidates on this assessment are at or above the benchmark as identified by an overall mean score of 1.99 with scores ranging 1.00-2.00. The range for scores on this assessment is 0-2.00 and candidates were required to have at least an average mean of proficient in order to pass. The weakest standard element mean for this assessment is 1.94 (range = 1.00-2.00) on ELCC 2.4: Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning. All other standard elements received a score of 2, which is above proficiency.

Interpretation of Data (Initial):

ELCC 1.3 Promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 1.3 in the initial semester of data collection. The data show 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark (1.00) or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% of the two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored a 2.00, above the proficient level of 1.00.

ELCC 2.3 Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.3 in the initial semester of data collection. The data show 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark (1.00) or better on this standard, which is included on two rubric items. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% of the two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored a 2.00, above the proficient level of 1.00.

ELCC 2.4 Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.4 in the initial semester of data collection. The data show 100% of the candidates scored at benchmark (1.00) or better on this standard, which is included on two rubric items. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% of the two candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored a 2.00, above the proficient level of 1.00.

Revisions Based on Reviewer's Comments:

The following is the newly aligned instructions and rubric that were first implemented Spring 2017. The data presented in this report reflect the EPPs initial submission in fall 2016. The next collection cycle for this assessment will be Spring 2018 as EDLD 650 is only taught in the spring at this point. However, the EPP, following the reviewer's notes, has made significant improvements in the rubric for this assessment and believes this newer version offers more substantial evaluative criteria that are more tightly aligned to the demands of the ELCC standard elements. Data in Spring 2018 will be collected using this newest version. We believe this assessment authentically supports each candidate's understanding of how promote continual and sustained improvement via leading a PLC, which includes using campus data, developing a collaborative plan of action, effectively matching materials and pedagogy, and utilizing effective monitoring and follow up practices to impact student success.



**ELCC Content Knowledge:**

Role of professional learning in continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3)  
High-quality professional development for school staff and leaders (ELCC 2.3) Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology (ELCC 2.4)

**ELCC Professional Leadership Skills:**

The candidate will analyze teacher learning within campus PLCs to include practices, content, and impact. A needs assessment for improving professional learning will be determined by using qualitative data and quantitative data. Success of PLC implementation will be determined and candidates will design and carry out PLC initiatives for improving the effectiveness of campus PLC's using current theories and practices of efficacy and professional learning. The candidate will improve professional learning through the creation of school-based strategic and tactical goals (ELCC 1.2) and using relevant evidence for which to base decisions that impact student learning (ELCC 1.2) by identifying strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3) by working collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3) by designing the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction (ELCC 2.3). Candidates must use technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data results for accountability reporting (ELCC 2.4). The candidate will follow up by coaching and providing feedback to appropriate groups as they embed the new strategy into their instructional program.

**New Assessment Instructions for the Candidate for Leading a PLC:**

You are to lead a professional learning community in the tasks of analyzing school assessment data, both qualitative and quantitative, that results in a needs assessment (ELCC 1.2). This should be done at your grade level or within your content area. Once you collaboratively determine the area needing improvement you will then determine instructional strategies, curriculum materials and technology utilization that will lead to an increase in student achievement (ELCC 1.3). Your next task will be to lead the professional learning community (ELCC 2.3) in the implementation of the aforementioned instructional strategies, curriculum materials usage and technology utilization. Your final task will be to follow up, present and lead (ELCC 2.3) other appropriate groups in the school setting to promote capacity building of new strategies. The end result of your efforts should lead to the support of comprehensive building level professional development practices (ELCC 2.3) that enhances teacher growth and efficacy, leading to continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3). You are to apply technology tools throughout the process, particularly when monitoring instructional practices (ELCC 2.4).

A step-by-step process is as follows:

- 1) Select three to five teachers within your content area or grade level to comprise the group who will be your working PLC. Get guidance and approval from your mentor administrator.
- 2) Collaboratively conduct a needs assessment drawing on qualitative and quantitative data (ELCC 1.2). Qualitative data may be things such as observations and interviews of students and teachers. Quantitative data would include things such as campus data, attendance reports, student achievement scores, analysis of student work, etc. (ELCC 1.2, 1.3).
- 3) Based on your PLCs needs assessment, work together to develop and/or design particular instructional strategies that can ameliorate the stated need (ELCC 1.2). Lead the PLC in the development of instructional strategies, curriculum materials, manipulatives, and other resources along with effective technology (ELCC 2.3). It is not expected that you facilitate the instruction when it is employed on a classroom; however, you could. The needs assessment and guidance from your mentor administrator will help you determine the best-fit person for facilitating the strategy in a classroom. It is your responsibility to use research-supported methods and literature to justify your PLC intervention. Develop a timeline and calendar for carrying out the instructional intervention, for observing and collecting data on the work carried out and follow up to assess the results. (ELCC 2.4).

4) Report and share results with appropriate groups and give coaching and feedback to the groups regarding positive aspects of the strategies that were employed. Remember to use face-to-face and technology to report your findings and to coach other groups regarding the new strategies. Be sure to detail the new strategies and not generalize so that teachers and students can benefit from your efforts (ELCC 2.4).

5) You are to write a final report that includes four sections/parts. The first section should explain in detail steps 1 and 2. Section 2 should discuss all elements in step 3. Include any charts, tables or images pertinent to your PLC in section 3. The fourth section will detail elements in step 4. Be sure to support your new strategies with at least three research/literature citations within your paper. Include reference section at end of paper.

Your report will include the following four sections:

I and II: Selection of PLC, Needs Assessment

III: Development and Application of PLC Developed Instructional/Assessment Strategy, Curriculum Materials and Technology Resources

- Collection method, analysis and interpretation of data
- Charts, tables, images of data results
- Follow up and debrief

IV: Feedback and Coaching Support for Appropriate Forward Moving Forward

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. Both (100%) candidates scored at or above proficiency, which a score of "1.00" is the benchmark for this assessment with an overall average of 1.90 and a range of 1.00-2.00.

Within specific components, candidates (100%) were successful with ELCC 1.2: Create school-based strategic and tactical goals, with a mean of 2.00, (range = 2.00).

Likewise, strong performance was demonstrated on ELCC 1.3: Identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement, with 100% of candidates scoring above proficiency with a 2.00. This indicates that candidates are able to aptly name and promote practices that support school improvement, which is to be expected in that EDLD 640 is taken concurrently with EDLD 650 and it promotes instructional leadership and professional development as key course elements.

ELCC 2.4: Monitor instructional practices within the school and provide assistance to teachers, was the lowest performing component with data indicating that 100% of candidates passed at proficiency or higher, with a mean of 1.50 and range of 1.00-2.00.

ELCC 2.2 Interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement.

ELCC 2.3: Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning both scored 100% of candidates ranked above proficiency with a mean score of 2.00. Data suggests improvements be made within the course to explicitly scaffold, support and preview candidates' progress and plans related to monitoring practices within the school as well as documenting the evidence appropriately.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: For 2018-2019, candidates will score at benchmark (score of 1.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Support the Success of Plan for Improvement: Using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

### Course Links

**EDLD650 [School Improvement: Utilizing Data to Lead Change (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

## 12 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 698 Action Research Project Assessment

Assessment: Action Research Project Assessment

ELCC Standards: 4 and 6

This assessment given in EDLD 520 is designed to measure candidates' knowledge and understanding of how to examine the ways in which equity-oriented leadership can promote and a

school culture and dispositions that foster school improvement for and student success. Candidates will develop an action plan for with 8 components, each aligned to ELCC standard elements, which ask them to identify and propose action based on equity-oriented principles. The final presentation is a PowerPoint with embedded voiceover presentation that addresses each required element outlined in the rubric.

Candidates must earn an average score of proficient or better in order to pass the course. Data is analyzed to determine candidate mean scores for each component of the rubric, i.e. ELCC standards, as well as overall knowledge of the content of the course.

ELCC Content Knowledge:

Collaboration and communication techniques to improve the school’s educational environment (ELCC 4.1)

The effect that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students, and learning (ELCC 6.1)

The larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (ELCC 6.2)

ELCC Professional Leadership Skills:

The candidate will employ collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information (ELCC 4.1) to develop an Equity-Oriented Organizational Management and School Community Action Plan (EO-OMSC-AP). Analysis of student data developed from the candidate’s design and collection of a series of interviews at a public school campus with diverse student representations will provide information about the following:

- Multicultural identities
- Social groups
- Social-economic demographics
- Grade levels
- Content areas and
- Academic tiers and learning levels that focuses on students’ perceptions of instructional strategies used by their teachers.
- Likewise, candidates will incorporate data collected and analyzed from teachers in EDLD 603, as well as researching both school and community

Within the EO-OMSC-AP the candidate will advocate for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and student success (ELCC 6.2) and share their EO-OMSC-AP responding as a respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school (ELCC 6.1).

Benchmark: For the Content Knowledge and Professional Learning Skills portion an average proficiency score of 3.00 or higher is required.

**Course Links**

**EDLD698 [Elements of Educational Research Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

**Outcome Links**

**Ethical Behavior [Program]**

Education Specialist candidates have the knowledge of basic principles of ethical behavior established by legal and professional organizations and the effect of ethical behavior on one’s own leadership.

**12.1 Data**

Component	Standard	Fall 2016		Fall 2017*	
		N=3		N=2	
ELCC Component	4.1	Mean	4.00		
Communication techniques to improve the school’s educational environment		Range	4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	6.2	Mean	4.00		
Understands how school context is influenced by district, state and national		Range	4.00		

trends affecting student learning in a school environment		%	100%		
ELCC Component	4.1	Mean	4.00		
Collaboration strategies used to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty and community information.		Range	4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	4.1	Mean	4.00		
Develops narrative communicating interpretation of teacher survey data; connects to school, student, and faculty and community factors		Range	4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	6.2	Mean	3.67		
Connects to the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context		Range	3.00-4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	6.1	Mean	3.67		
Understands the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students and learning		Range	3.00-4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	6.2	Mean	4.00		
Advocate for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and student success		Range	4.00		
		%	100%		
ELCC Component	6.1	Mean	4.00		
Respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school		Range	4.00		
		%	100%		
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	3.91		
		Range	3.00-4.00		
		%	100%		

\*There was no data available to report for this academic year.

**Course Links**

**EDLD698 [Elements of Educational Research Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

**12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

This is a new assessment that will be implemented for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. Analysis, actions and results will be conducted by program faculty after the spring semester.

2016-2017:

As a new assessment for the EPP the initial set of data was collected Fall 2016 in EDLD 620 with three candidates. Candidates must score at or above the benchmark score for this assessment, which is a “Proficient” rating of “3.00” on each component. Data indicate that final scores for candidates on this assessment are at or above the benchmark as identified by

an overall mean score of 3.91 with scores ranging 3.00-4.00. The range for scores on this assessment is 1.00-4.00 and candidates were required to have at least an average mean of proficient in order to pass. The weakest standard element mean for this assessment is 3.67 (range = 3.00-4.00) on ELCC 6.1: Understands the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students and learning. Along the same thread, ELCC 6.2: Connects to the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context, is comparably low with a mean of 3.67 (range = 3.00-4.00). All other standard elements received a score of 4.00.

#### Interpretation of Data:

**ELCC 4.1 Communication techniques to improve the school's educational environment**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 4.1 Collaboration strategies used to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty and community information.**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 4.1 Develops narrative communicating interpretation of teacher survey data; connects to school, student, and faculty and community factors**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 6.1 Understands the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students and learning**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 6.2 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 6.1 Respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 6.2 Understands how school context is influenced by district, state and national trends affecting student learning in a school environment**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 6.2 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

**ELCC 6.2 Connects to the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context**  
No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 6.2 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 66.6% of candidates rated above proficiency on this

standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that one of three, 33.3% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored at the proficient level of "3.00".

ELCC 6.2 Advocate for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and student success

No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 4.1 across collection cycles yet; however, for this initial cycle, 100% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that three of three, 100% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

Based on the reviewer's comments from the initial EDLD SPA submission, changes have been made to the rubric pertaining to better alignment to the standards and clearer descriptors for each element.

A newly aligned rubric will be implemented Fall 2017. The data presented in this report reflects the EPP's initial assessment instrument submitted in fall 2016 shown above. The next collection cycle for this assessment will be Fall 2017 as EDLD 620 is a fall course and is being offered at the writing of this report. However, the EPP, following the reviewer's notes, has made significant improvements in the rubric for this assessment and believes this newer version offers more substantial evaluative criteria that are more tightly aligned to the demands of the ELCC standard elements. Data in Fall 2017 will be collected using this newest version. We believe this assessment authentically supports each candidate's understanding of how promote equity-oriented school culture and dispositions.

2017-2018:

There was no data reported for this academic year.

#### Course Links

**EDLD698 [Elements of Educational Research Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

### 13 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 620 Equity Oriented Organizational Management Project

Assessment: Equity-Oriented of Organizational Management and School Community Action Plan

Benchmark: Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator. Minimum level of competency is an average score of proficient.

#### Course Links

**EDLD620 [School Culture and Dispositions (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

#### Outcome Links

##### Educational Leadership Principles [Program]

Educational Specialist candidates will apply educational leadership principles to understand and promote a positive school culture.

### 13.1 Data

2016-2017:

Data table is attached.

2017-2018:

Data table is attached; a new rubric is pending.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

EDS\_EDLD\_Equity Oriented Organizational Management Project\_17-18

#### Course Links

**EDLD620 [School Culture and Dispositions (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

### 13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This is a new assessment that will be implemented for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. Analysis, actions and results will be conducted by program faculty after the spring semester.

2017-2018

Analysis of Data: Yes, the benchmark was met. New data is to be collected using the presented Fall 2018 rubric.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: For the 2018-2019, candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Support the Success of the Plan for Improvement: Using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

### Course Links

**EDLD620 [School Culture and Dispositions (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**

## 14 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Numbers

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

### 14.1 Data Enrollment and Completers

Educational Specialist Program - Enrollment and Completers:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	17	0	3	3
2014-2015	19	0	9	9
2015-2016	6	1	0	1
2016-2017	7	0	1	1
2017-2018	10	2	1	3

#### 14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met.

The rate of enrollment increased by 3% (N=3) and baseline data for completers began in 2016-2017 where a 66% increase of completers was reported (N=3).

The enrollment rate for 2017-2018 increased from seven to 10 which is 3%. Completer rate increased from zero to two candidates for fall 2017 and stayed the same for spring 2018 (N=1). Likewise, the total completer rate for 2017-2018 changed from one to three, an increase of 66%.

Because program faculty are a small group and teach multiple courses in the program we will meet at least once a semester during 2018-2019 to communicate about emerging student needs. Faculty will collectively develop a tiered-intervention plan to support struggling students in order to support on-time completers. Likewise, faculty will meet to consider and work on preliminary development of a Leadership Academy partnership with CPSB, as a potential venue for recruitment with possible seed funding can be considered via Endowed Professorships.

Behavioral and Measurable Recommendations to Support the Above Goal: Working in tandem with effective mentor administrator placement and supportive, accurate advising,

90% of EDLD candidates complete their EdS program within the given five-semester timeline. Likewise, an intervention plan and rough draft Leadership Academy proposal will be developed by faculty.

## 15 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

Alignment:

- ELCC Standards
- EDLD updates
- Admin partners and field experiences
- SLLA data and candidate support
- ELCC-aligned major assessments and course improvements

Benchmark: All program faculty will meet at least twice an academic year to discuss curriculum changes/implementations, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

### 15.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

EDS\_EDLD\_Curriculum Development\_17-18

#### 15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met, however, standards are not updated to include the newest version of standards yet. The handbook has been updated to align with accreditation award. EDLD courses have not updated program standards to new standards that were launched in Spring 2018. The deadline for that work is much later and the faculty focused on gaining full program accreditation with existing standards based on the program redesign efforts. The program was awarded national accreditation in summer 2018.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal for 2018-2019 will be to strengthen opportunity for students to demonstrate competencies using technology.

Recommendations to Support the Plan for Improvement: Within at least one new course each semester, faculty will increase the use of interactive technology integration as a mechanism for candidate demonstration of course knowledge and skills.

## Program outcomes

Content, Principles, & Practices

*Education Specialist candidates demonstrate knowledge of content and leadership principles and practices as relevant to school leadership.*

Situations and Scenarios

*Education Specialist candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills in specific situations and scenarios that a school leader might commonly encounter. Candidate responses should reflect knowledge of ELCC standards. The constructed response scenarios measure the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the ELCC standards and how the candidate actually incorporates the ELCC standards into carrying out school leadership functions.*

Supporting Data-Driven Needs

*Education Specialist candidates will demonstrate their ability to support data-driven instructional needs through a proposed professional development suitable for the campus faculty.*

Distributed Leadership



*Educational Specialist candidates will model distributed leadership skills.*

#### Collaboration

*Education Specialist candidates will lead a professional learning community in the vital collaborative activities of analyzing school assessment data that eventually lead to the implementation of innovative instructional strategies, new curriculum materials and new technology utilization that result in a positive effect on student achievement.*

#### Ethical Behavior

*Education Specialist candidates have the knowledge of basic principles of ethical behavior established by legal and professional organizations and the effect of ethical behavior on one's own leadership.*

#### Educational Leadership Principles

*Educational Specialist candidates will apply educational leadership principles to understand and promote a positive school culture.*

End of report