
Educational Leadership [MEd] [EDLE]

Cycles included in report:
Cycle #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

Cycle: #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

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:

The Master of Educational Leadership program has been undergoing program redesign since spring 2016. Due to faculty attrition and the hiring of new EDLD faculty it was an opportune time to revisit all program assessments, course development and field experiences in light of the demands of all ELCC standard elements. It was determined that trying to address concerns on past SPA reports was untenable and an initial program submission SPA report would be reflect the redesign work that has taken place in the past year.

This report substantiates a focus on three primary areas of improvement:

1. Content Knowledge: Promoting effective content knowledge acquisition by connecting the theoretical and practical aspects of course content for candidates in relevant ways;
2. Professional/Pedagogical Dispositional Knowledge and Skills: Improving candidates' internships by embedding meaningful field experiences; and,
3. Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Connecting effective data practices to build leadership capacity to positively impact student achievement.

Content Knowledge: State standardized test data (SLLA) will continue to be used to evaluate the degree to which candidates can demonstrate understanding of ELCC standards elements. However, this has been a challenging data source for MSU due to reporting gaps based on when/if candidates took the test. Consequently, EDLD candidates will be required to take the SLLA licensure exam before the end of EDLD 696, that is, one semester before the completion of their program. Candidates can take the exam earlier of course, but the deadline to take it initially is by the end of EDLD 696. This allows another testing window if the candidate should need to repeat the exam. This increase sampling will support a deeper analysis of student understanding across and within specific exam sub-components and ELCC standards. Additionally, improvement of content knowledge acquisition and application will be approached by continued revision of constructed responses designed to support the SLLA. We have updated the content to include current scenarios, requiring a constructed response graded by a rubric. This will assist faculty in targeting how well candidates respond to dilemmas in educational practice. Also, to help candidates with connecting SLLA constructed responses based on dilemmas of practice an "Educational Platform" project will be implemented fall 2016, within EDLD 696, as way to strengthen candidates' understanding of ethics and integrity in leadership. This is not a major assessment; however, candidates' work and artifacts will be used to inform content knowledge curriculum moving forward.

Professional Knowledge and Dispositional Skills: We believe the field experience requirement is central to candidates' educational leadership development and have worked to capture the effectiveness of Professional Knowledge and Dispositional Skills. All field experiences are aligned to ELCC elements, integrated thoughtfully in course work, purposefully examined by mentor administrators, and the culmination of each candidate's 240 hours of field experiences reflectively synthesized by candidates in their final capstone course. This approach is yielding preliminary positive results, pointing toward stronger and more meaningful field experiences. This is an improvement from past practices and we believe this not only tightens the focus and accountability for candidates' field experiences, but more importantly, provides them a framework for synthesizing field experiences in order foster leadership for continuous improvement. Likewise, we are targeting ELCC standards 5 and 6 as they have the lowest marks on the SLLA (sub-component Ethics and Integrity). This has historically been a need in program assessment and course development and so we developed these standards in EDLD 620: School Culture and Dispositions, with this in mind. As we have worked to strengthen field experiences and connect them in relevant ways we have also tightened the process for assigning administrative mentors for candidates, believing these are significantly coupled together. We will continue to build on the momentum generated from work done with partner schools and mentor principals to enhance what we believe is improved field experience framework. The process of developing and using new program assessments has provided EDLD faculty with professional development and strengthened their ability to target specific ELCC standards in more explicit, meaningful ways. These tools provide EDLD faculty with insight about missing or weak elements of field experiences and course content that needed immediate attention. Changes to the program, improvements in curriculum and instruction, meaningful enhancements in mentoring processes and field experiences are presented in the EDLD handbook, which will be presented to all candidates beginning fall 2016 and used for advising.

Effects on P-12 Student Learning: We are stressing important skills and information related to evaluating instruction and gauging how to effectively support teaching and learning by using tools and protocols currently being employed in regional schools. Course content will continue to work toward candidates' expertise on their decision-making skills as they analyze and act on data; tying it to differentiated instruction, technology use in the classroom, cooperative grouping and instructional practices relative to COMPASS (the state-adopted teacher evaluation instrument). Based on past program challenges discussed earlier, we will more fully prepare and assess candidates' ability to support teacher growth and by extension, impact student achievement. Focusing on impact of leadership on student achievement, we will learn the degree to which candidates are able to demonstrate these skills by using a pre- and post- analysis of the impact of effective Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) as a vehicle for measuring leadership impact on schools. In each course, EDLD faculty will continue to promote increased ELCC element competencies through the use of data collected, by providing candidates with exemplars to model excellence, by working with our administrator mentors to improve the mentor experience for candidates, and strengthen our school partnerships to continually fine-tune field experiences in order to promote value-added dimensions for the candidates, schools and the university.

2016-2017:

Provide a brief description of how assessment results have been used for program improvement. Point to a specific example of how an assessment provided the program with data it could use for improvement and what that improvement was. If possible, also show evidence of the improvement. You may look at data from the previous two academic years to support this case. (E.g. In 2011-2012, evidence showed our students were not meeting expectations for critical thinking; in 2013-2014 we modified existing assignment in [course] and the results show an improvement of X% over previous year.)

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:

The EPP strongly encouraged candidates to take the School Leadership Licensure Exam during EDLD 696. This is done as part of one-on-one advising and made explicit through the 696 course. Also, changes to the course content in 620 have been made, as well as adjustments to the major assessment which focus on the previously low performance components related to Ethics and Integrity.

EDLD candidates who took the SLLA in 2017-2018 (N=7) demonstrates significant gains as compared to the previous year across all five SLLA categories with ranges reported between 71% (Collaborating With Key Stakeholders) to 80% (Teaching & Learning). The noticeable gains in each category reflect ongoing program improvement measures, course redesign and SPA alignment.

2018-2019:

Within the 18-19 AY, faculty were charged with increasing the use of interactive technology as a mechanism for candidate demonstration of course knowledge and skills. Course improvements using technology are evident as several courses now require students to interact using Big Blue Button in EDLD 620 and EDLD 660, as well as making engaging presentations to peers in EDLD 640 and 680.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2015-2016:

The program launched several new assessments that will provide outcome data aligning with Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards.

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:

The increase in School Leadership Licensure Assessment scores has been a highlight for the reporting year. The EDLD faculty will continue to tweak their courses to assist candidates in mastering the standards need to not only pass the assessment, but to also be extraordinary leaders in the school system.

2018-2019:

Preliminary talks of a partnership with Calcasieu Parish to establish a leadership academy would provide a specific group of candidates to feed into the EDS program. Candidates in the program are performing well on assessments; however, an increase in enrollment would make the data more reliable.

5 Program Mission

The Master of Education in Educational Leadership program prepares its graduates to lead in today's diverse schools for continuous school improvement within these four areas: Teaching and learning, school culture and community relations, data-driven decision making and professional development. Our goal is to develop candidates' ability to effectively address the nature and needs of leading today's diverse and dynamic schools by demonstration of effective, equity-oriented leadership knowledge, skill and dispositions. Excellence is leadership is evidenced as candidates are able to attain a Building Level One Principal certification and graduates of this program are also prepared to pursue doctoral studies if they choose. The mission of the McNeese State University (MSU) Educational Leadership program (EDLD) is to prepare candidates to lead forward, for continuous school improvement using current knowledge, effective skills and necessary dispositions for successfully leading today's schools.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The Master of Education in Educational Leadership supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The MED in Educational Leadership program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession as leaders in the school and community and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.

7 Assessment and Benchmark School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)

Assessment: School Leadership Licensure Exam

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) is required by the Louisiana Department of Education as part of its requirements for Educational Leader Level I certificate. In order to qualify for an Educational Leader Level I certificate, one must complete the Educational Leadership Masters of Education program and then achieve a satisfactory score on the SLLA (Exam 6011). Although candidates in the program have not been required to take the test as a condition of graduation, candidates enrolled in our Educational Leadership Masters of Education program were encouraged to take the SLLA exam to assess their content knowledge as a result of courses taken to prepare them for leadership positions in the schools of Louisiana. Beginning August 2016, candidates are required to take the exam during or before their next to last semester.

The exam is typically taken at the end of the candidate's program; however, they can take it at any time. In the State of Louisiana the SLLA exam is given during the months of October, December, January, February, April, May, July and August. It is given by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and is directly correlated to ELCC standards and each element.

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.

ELCC Standards 1-6; ELCC Standard Elements: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2

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: There will be a 50% increase in test takers prior to graduation with 50% increase in passing rates for 1st time testers.

SLLA Exam Passing score is ≥ 166 .

*Program Outcomes Links***Knowledge of Content and Educ. Practices**

EDLD candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and educational practices relevant to successfully leading diverse schools.

7.1 Data

2017-2018:

Semester	Total eligible	Attempted	Pass on 1st attempt	Failed on 1st attempt	Pass on 2nd attempt	No attempt
Fall 2017	5	4	3	1	1	1
Spring 2018	7	3	2	0	0	4
Total	12	7	6	1	1	5

2018-2019:

Semester	Total eligible	Attempted	Pass on 1st attempt	Failed on 1st attempt	Pass on 2nd attempt	No attempt
Fall 2018	5	3	3	—	—	2
Spring 2019	1	1	1	—	—	—
Total	6	4	4	—	—	2

			2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
Overall Score Information SLLA Exam#: 6011			N=9	Mean 170	N=4	Mean 177	N=7	Mean 162.3	N=7	Mean 171
				Range 157-179		Range 171-181		Range 151-172		Range 162-177
Passes on 1 st Attempt			N=8	89%	N=4	100%	N=3	43%	N=6	85.7%
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=3	Mean 12	N=7	Mean 10.57	N=7	Mean 10.5
				Range 9-11		Range 11-14		Range 8-13		Range 9-12
				55%		66%		58.7%		75%
Teaching & Learning	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4	25	N=3	Mean 15	N=3	Mean 18	N=7	Mean 13.14	N=7	Mean 16.9
				Range 12-18		Range 16-19		Range 10-16		Range 12-19
				60%		72%		52.5%		80%
Managing Organizational Systems & Safety	3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5	15	N=3	Mean 8	N=3	Mean 9	N=7	Mean 7.43	N=7	Mean 9.65
				Range 7-8		Range 8-10		Range 6-9		Range 9-11
				53%		60%		29.5%		74%
Collaborating With Key Stakeholders	4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4	21	N=3	Mean 10	N=3	Mean 13	N=7	Mean 11.71	N=7	Mean 11.4
				Range 8-12		Range 10-16		Range 9-15		Range 9-15
				47.6%		62%		55.7%		71%
Ethics & Integrity	5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2	21	N=3	Mean 12	N=3	Mean 11	N=7	Mean 9.86	N=7	Mean 10.8
				Range 11-13		Range 11-12		Range 8-13		Range 9-12
				57%		52.3%		47%		72%

			2018-2019		2019-2020		2020-2021		2021-2022	
Overall Score Information SLLA Exam#: 6011			N=4	Mean 175.75	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range 173-179		Range		Range		Range
Passes on 1 st Attempt			N=4	100%	N=		N=		N=	
ELCC Sub-component	Standard Alignment	Possible points/# of questions	2018-2019		2019-2020		2020-2021		2021-2022	
Vision & Goals	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4	14	N=3	Mean 11.67	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range		Range		Range		Range

				11-12						
				83.33%						
Teaching & Learning	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4	18-21	N=3	Mean 13.33	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range 12-15		Range		Range		Range
				74.07%						
Managing Organizational Systems & Safety	3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5	12-13	N=3	Mean 9.33	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range 8-10		Range		Range		Range
				77.78%						
Collaborating With Key Stakeholders	4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4	16-18	N=3	Mean 13.67	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range 12-15		Range		Range		Range
				75.93%						
Ethics & Integrity	5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2	15-17	N=3	Mean 11	N=	Mean	N=	Mean	N=	Mean
				Range 9-14		Range		Range		Range
				64.71%						
The Educational System		12	N=3	Mean 11.00						
				Range 9-12						
				91.67%						
Vision and Goals (Constructed Response)		12	N=3	Mean 9.00						
				Range 8-11						
				75.00%						
Teaching and Learning (Constructed Response)		18	N=3	Mean 14.00						
				Range 11-18						
				77.78%						

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
 The percent pass rate charted above provides evidence that candidates who complete the Educational Leadership Master's program possess the skills and knowledge required to become effective school leaders. There is an overall gain in candidate's scores with an average increase percentage of 2.4 points above the required 166 score. Although too soon to tell, we are hopeful that the improved data reflected by candidates in the 2015-2016 academic year were influenced by beginning program and course improvements, which began during the spring semester, 2016. The 2015-2016 candidates took their exam in late spring and early summer: April (1) and June (3) of 2016. While existing data is promising, future data will be important in our examination and evaluation of the impact of our program redesign.

Also, a breakdown of the data by ELCC each standard element would be helpful in assisting our understanding of program effectiveness. However, this is problematic because candidates who take the exam after they leave McNeese State University are not required to report the scores back to institution, resulting in a reporting gap. In order to get their principal certification candidates are only required to take the test, allowing us only to determine they have done so, but not able to examine results on individual standards/elements.

2016-2017:
 Most of the data reported on this assessment reflect performance of candidates who were enrolled in the EDLD 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 below 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.

During the 2014-2015 year, nine candidates took the exam, 89% (eight) passed it on the first attempt with mean score of 170 score and range between 157-179. Only three reported the scores to MSU. For the 2015-2016 year, four candidates took the exam, 100% passed it on the first attempt with a mean score of 177 and range between 171-181. Only three reported scores to MSU this year as well. For the 2016-2017 year, seven candidates took the exam and 43% of candidates passed the exam on their first attempt with a mean of 162.3 and range between 151-172.

As stated earlier, the discrepancy between the number of testers to the number reported to MSU is due to the fact that candidates, while encouraged, previously were not required to take the exam as a condition for graduation prior to fall 2016. However, candidates who took the exam in 2016-2017 represent those required to take the exam during or before their next-to-last semester. While the data indicates a low achievement rate for 2016-2017 first attempt test takers, the EPP is hopeful future trends in data will reveal more substantial insight to inform program improvement.

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. For 2014-2015, the mean for correct responses out of 18 questions for this sub-component was 10 (55%) with a range of 9-11. Comparatively, mean correct responses for 2015-2016 improved to 12 (66%) with a range increase of 11-14, while the 2016-2017 mean decreased 10.57 (58.7%) with a range increase of 8-13.

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. The mean for correct responses out of 25 questions for this sub-component was 15 (60%) with a range of 12-18. Comparatively, mean correct responses for 2015-2016 increased to 18 (72%) and increased in range scores of 16-19, while the 2016-2017 mean decreased 13.14 (52.5%) with a range increase of 10-16.

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. The mean for correct responses out of 15 questions for this sub-component was 8 (53%) with a range of 7-8. Comparatively, mean correct responses increased for 2015-2016 with 9 (60%) and with a range increase of 8-10, while the 2016-2017 mean decreased 7.43 (29.5%) with a range increase of 9-15.

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. The mean for correct responses out of 21 questions for this sub-component was 10 (47%) with a range of 8-12. Comparatively, mean correct responses for 2015-2016 increased to 13 (62%) as did the range score of 10-16, while the 2016-2017 mean decreased 11.71 (55.7%) with a range difference of 9-15.

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. The mean for correct responses out of 21 questions for this sub-component was 12 (57%) with a range of 11-13. Comparatively, mean of correct responses decreased for 2015-2016 with an 11 (52%) as did range, reporting lower at 11-12, while the 2016-2017 mean decreased 9.86 (47%) with a range increase of 8-13.

Gains were reported for overall mean (170 to 177, +7 increase) for 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 collection cycles as well as overall range (low score on range 157-171, +14 increase and high score on range 179-181, +2 increase) for the same data cycles. In addition, in 2015-2016, 100% (N=4) of candidates passed the exam on the first try while in 2014-2015, 89% (N=8) passed it on their first attempt. Comparatively, decreases are reflected in overall mean scores (177 to 162.3, -14.7 decrease) for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 reported data (low score on range 171 to 151, -20 decrease and high score on range 181-172, +9 increase).

Gains from 2014-2015 are also reported in each sub-component on the SLLA exam except for Ethics and Integrity, which showed a decrease in mean (from 57% to 52% correct) and a slight decrease in range (from 11-13 to 11-12) of correct responses. For 2016-2017, no gains were reported in each subcomponent, rather decreases were reflected in each subcomponent: Vision & Goals (from 66% to 58.7% correct), Teaching & Learning (from 72% to 52.5% correct), Managing Organizational Systems & Safety from (60% to 29.5% correct), Collaborating with Key Stakeholders (from 62% to 55.7% correct), and Ethics & Integrity (52.3% to 47% correct).

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, program faculty are 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 not met. The number of first-time test takers stayed the same with N=7. Data from passing rates for 1st time testers was not previously reported, but 2017-2018 baseline data reports 12 were eligible, seven attempted, six passed on 1st attempt, one passed on 2nd attempt, and five did not take the exam. EDLD candidates who took the SLLA in 2017-2018 (N=7) demonstrate significant gains as compared to the previous year across all 5 SLLA categories with ranges reported between 71% (Collaborating With Key Stakeholders) to 80% (Teaching & Learning). *Bam!* The noticeable gains in each category reflect ongoing program improvement measures, course redesign and SPA alignment.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In 2018-2019, EDLD faculty will continue to work to increase the number of passing rates for 1st time test takers and continue to show an increase in SLLA test takers.

Recommendations to Support Successful Plan for Improvement: Given informational guidelines provided in the EDLD Handbook and in the syllabus for 696, 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, 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.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was not met.

First-time test takers decreased from 85% (6 of 7 candidates) to 66% (4 of 6 candidates); however, the number of “no attempts” decreased by 60% as only 2 did not take the test in 2018-2019, while 5 did not take it in 2017-2018.

EDLD candidates who took the SLLA in 2018-2019 (n=4) showed a mean score of 175.75 (r=173-179) with 100% passing on the 1st-attempt. Average percent passing ranged from 64.7% (Ethics and Integrity) to 91.67% (The Educational System). Visions & Goals reported 83.3% and all other indicators fell between 74.0% and 77.78%. Three indicators are reported that are not yet aligned to the program (The Educational System, Visions & Goals [constructed response], and Teaching and Learning [constructed response]).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The EDLD faculty will continue to promote SLLA participations and align program courses and assessments with new standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Align courses, fieldwork, assessments, and the EDLD Handbook with current standards
- EDLD faculty will provide support and resources for SLLA preparations in the EDLD Handbook and have candidates report the status of their SLLA exam by study day during the semester they are enrolled in EDLD 696.

8 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 620 Equity-Oriented Leadership

Assessment: Equity-Oriented Organizational Management and School Community Action Plan (EO-OMSC-AP)

Content Knowledge and Professional Learning Skills

This assessment is included within EDLD 620: School Culture and Dispositions to assess candidates' ability to promote equity-oriented leadership specific to Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) content knowledge and professional leadership skills required to generate a positive school culture and enhance community relations. By employing strategies to collect, analyze and interpret data relative to diverse teacher and student representations candidates will demonstrate their ability to advocate for school policies and programs that foster equitable learning opportunities and student success as well as present findings in a professional, respectful manner.

The required elements for this EO-OMSC-AP include:

- Integrated Teacher Survey Data (ELCC 4.1) (taken from work done in EDLD 603)
- Integrated evidence and related scholarship (ELCC 6.1)
- Proposed Action Plan (ELCC 6.2)
 - Use communication techniques that are respectful to school community (ELCC 6.1)
 - Present diverse stakeholders through collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty and community information (ELCC 4.1)
 - Integrate scholarship reflecting connections to broader political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts (ELCC 6.1)
 - Present awareness reflective of the effects that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students and learning (ELCC 6.1)
 - Advocacy for equitable school policies and programs (ELCC 6.2)

ELCC Standards: 4 and 6

This assessment given in EDLD 620 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).

A comprehensive rubric below will be used to assess the EO-OMSC-AP and the following scoring structure will be used to determine candidates' performance:

140-130 = Highly Effective (93%)

129-120 = Proficient (86%)

119-105 = Emerging (75%)

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.

Courses**EDLD620 School Culture and Dispositions (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)***Program Outcomes Links***Equity in Mgmt and Community Relations**

Candidates will demonstrate leadership competencies and skills in equity-oriented organizational management and community relations.

8.1 Data

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[MED_EDLD_Equity Oriented Management and School Community Action Plan_17-18](#) [PDF 124 KB SEP 16, 2018]

[MED_EDLD_Equity Oriented Management and School Community Actoin Plan_18-19](#) [PDF 119 KB SEP 15, 2019]

Courses

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

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

This assessment will collect the first data set at the end of the fall 2016 semester. There are 24 candidates currently enrolled in the course, providing a strong baseline for the standard elements assessed. Mean, range and percentages ≥ 3 will be analyzed relative to each ELCC element below:

ELCC Standard Element 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.

ELCC Standard Element 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for the school, students, families, and caregivers.

ELCC Standard Element 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

As a new assessment for the EPP the initial set of data was collected Fall 2016 in EDLD 620 with 18 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 3.77. 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 3.56 (range = 1.00-2.00) 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 3.61 (range = 1.00-4.00). The strongest standard elements were indicated by 4.00 scores for ELCC 4.1: Communication techniques to improve the school's educational environment and ELCC 6.2: Understands how school context is influenced by district, state and national trends affecting student learning in a school environment.

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 18 of 18, 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, 88.8% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 17 of 18, 88.8% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above. One candidate (.05%) scored below benchmark with a "2.00".

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, 83.3% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 16 of 18, 88.8% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above. Two candidates (.11%) scored below benchmark with a "2.00".

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 6.1 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 17 of 18, 94.4% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3, or above. One candidate (.05%) scored below benchmark with a "1."

ELCC 6.1 Respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school

No pattern or trend can be detected in scores earned for ELCC 6.1 across collection cycles yet; however for this initial cycle, 83.3% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 17 of 18, 94.4% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above. One candidate (.05%) scored below benchmark with a "1.00".

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 18 of 18, 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 17 of 18, 94.4% of candidates for the F'16 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3, or above. One candidate (.05%) scored below benchmark with a "1."

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 6.2 across collection cycles yet; however for this initial cycle, 83.3% of candidates rated above proficiency on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 16 of 18, 88.8% of candidates for the Fall 2016 semester, scored above the proficient level, 3.00, or above. Two candidates (.11%) scored below benchmark with a "2.00".

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. Reviewer's comment: "While the assessment activities show alignment to the concepts outlined in each of the ELCC standard elements, more work is needed on the scoring rubric to ensure that the evaluative criteria used within the levels of the rubric align to a majority of indicators given for each ELCC standard element."

A newly aligned rubric will be implemented Fall 2017. The data presented in this report reflects the EPPs 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:

Analysis of Data: Data will be collected using the revised rubric in the fall of 2018.

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

Recommendations to Successfully Implement the Plan for Improvement: EDLD faculty will continue to use instructional methods and with the newly revised assessment, measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was met. One set of data is available for F18 where all candidates (n=3) scored at or above a 3.00 on each indicator. The mean for each indicator was 3.88 and the range for each indicator was 3.00-4.00.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The assessment will be aligned to current standards and candidates will score at or above benchmark on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Faculty will align the assessment to the current standards and make adjustments to the assessment as needed.

Courses

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

9 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 630 Constructed Response/Case Study

Assessment: Constructed Response/Case Study

Two vignettes and one case study measure candidate knowledge and skills in specific situations. The scenarios describe situations a school leader might commonly encounter and asks the candidate to respond to focused questions. Candidate responses require specific details considering the information provided and/or proposed courses of action to address the problems relevant to the respective situations. 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.

ELCC Standards 1-6; ELCC Standard Elements: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2

This assessment measure candidates' content knowledge and understanding of all ELCC standards and how the candidate actually 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.

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

- 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.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was:

- The mean of each vignette should be ≥ 1.25
- No candidate should have more than one score of zero on any of the assessments.
- The mean for each individual standard element in each specific scenario/case study should be ≥ 1.25 .

Courses

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

Program Outcomes Links

Knowledge of Content and Educ. Practices

EDLD candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and educational practices relevant to successfully leading diverse schools.

9.1 Data Constructed Response/Case Study

2015-2016:

Vignette Scenario	#	ELCC standard element	Score=2 Highly Effective		Score=1 Proficient		Score=0 Ineffective		Mean	Range	% >1.00
			N	%	N	%	N	%			
Scenario 1	15	2.1	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	1.6	1.00-2.00	100%
	15	5.1	7	46%	8	54%	0	0%	1.47	1.00-2.00	100%
	15	5.2	8	54%	7	46%	0	0%	1.53	1.00-2.00	100%
	15	5.3	7	46%	8	54%	0	0%	1.47	1.00-2.00	100%
	15	5.4	7	46%	8	54%	0	0%	1.47	1.00-2.00	100%
	75	Grand Mean	38	50%	37	50%	0	0%	1.50	1.00-2.00	100%
Scenario 2	15	1.1	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	1.6	1.00-2.00	100%
	15	3.1	10	67%	5	33%	0	0%	1.67	1.00-2.00	100%

15	3.2	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	1.6	1.00-2.00	100%
15	3.3	7	46%	8	54%	0	0%	1.62	1.00-2.00	100%
60	Grand Mean	35	58%	25	42%	0	0%	1.61	1.00-2.00	100%

Scenario #1		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
		N=15		N=10		N=2	
ELCC Component	2.1	Mean	1.60	Mean	1.75	Mean	2.00
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.1	Mean	1.47	Mean	1.75	Mean	2.00
Acts with integrity and fairness		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.2	Mean	1.53	Mean	1.58	Mean	2.00
Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.3	Mean	1.47	Mean	1.92	Mean	2.00
Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	5.4	Mean	1.47	Mean	1.83	Mean	1.50
Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
Overall Scenario #1 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.60	Mean	1.76	Mean	1.80
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
Scenario #2		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
ELCC Component	1.1	Mean	1.60	Mean	1.59	Mean	2.00
Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	3.1	Mean	1.67	Mean	1.83	Mean	2.00
Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	3.2	Mean	1.60	Mean	1.92	Mean	1.50
Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
ELCC Component	3.3	Mean	1.62	Mean	1.92	Mean	2.00
Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
Overall Scenario #2 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.61	Mean	1.81	Mean	1.87
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
Case Study #3		Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
ELCC Component	1.2	Mean	1.60	Mean	1.74	Mean	2.00
Collect and use data		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%

ELCC Component		Mean	1.53	Mean	2.00	Mean	1.50
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement	1.3	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.53	Mean	1.92	Mean	2.00
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning	2.1	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.60	Mean	1.67	Mean	2.00
Collaborate with faculty and community members	4.1	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.53	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Respond to community interests and needs	4.4	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.47	Mean	1.83	Mean	2.00
Acts with integrity and fairness	5.1	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	0%
		Mean	1.60	Mean	2.00	Mean	2.00
Promote social justice within the school	5.5	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.53	Mean	1.92	Mean	2.00
Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers	6.1	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.43	Mean	1.75	Mean	2.00
Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions	6.2	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%
		Mean	1.55	Mean	1.87	Mean	1.94
Overall Case Study #3 Rubric Scores		Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00	Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%	%	100%	%	100%

Scenario #1		Spring 2019		Spring 2020		Spring 2021	
		N=3		N=		N=	
ELCC Component		Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning	2.1	Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
		Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Acts with integrity and fairness	5.1	Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
		Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior	5.2	Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
		Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity	5.3	Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
		Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	

Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making	5.4	Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
Overall Scenario #1 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.80	Mean		Mean	
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
Scenario #2		Spring 2019		Spring 2020		Spring 2021	
ELCC Component	1.1	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	3.1	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	3.2	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	3.3	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
Overall Scenario #2 Rubric Scores		Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
Case Study #3		Spring 2019		Spring 2020		Spring 2021	
ELCC Component	1.2	Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Collect and use data		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	1.3	Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	2.1	Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	4.1	Mean	1.67	Mean		Mean	
Collaborate with faculty and community members		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	4.4	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Respond to community interests and needs		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	5.1	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Acts with integrity and fairness		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	5.5	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Promote social justice within the school		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component	6.1	Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	
Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers		Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
ELCC Component		Mean	2.00	Mean		Mean	

Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions	6.2	Range	2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	
Overall Case Study #3 Rubric Scores		Mean	1.98	Mean		Mean	
		Range	1.00-2.00	Range		Range	
		%	100%	%		%	

Combined Overall Means for Spring 2017, Spring 2018 and Spring 2019 (N=15)		
Scenario #1 Rubric Scores	Mean	1.78
	Range	1.00-2.00
	%	100%
Scenario #2 Rubric Scores	Mean	1.89
	Range	1.00-2.00
	%	100%
Case Study #3 Rubric Scores	Mean	1.93
	Range	1.00-2.00
	%	100%

Courses

EDLD630 Professional Ethics and School Law (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

The grand mean of Vignette 1 (scenario 1) was 1.50. The individual element means ranged from 1.47 to 1.60. Standard element 2.1 had a mean of 1.60. Standard element 5.1 had a mean of 1.47. Standard element 5.2 had a mean of 1.53 and Standard element 5.4 had a mean of 1.47.

The grand mean of Vignette 2 (scenario 2) was 1.61. The individual element means ranged from 1.60 to 1.67. Standard element 1.1 had a mean of 1.60. Standard element 3.1 had a mean of 1.67. Standard element 3.2 had a mean of 1.60 and standard element 3.3 had a mean of 1.62.

2016-2017:

Spring 2016 was the first administration of this assessment. The total number of candidates who took the assessment in Spring 2016 was 15 and in Spring 2017 it was 10. There was a 100% passing rate on each standard element of the assessment for both Spring 2016 and Spring 2017. While Spring 2016 had an overall mean for Scenario #1 at 1.50 with individual element means ranging from 1.00-2.00, the overall mean in Spring 2017 increased to 1.76 (+.26). Mean increases in ratings occurred in all standard elements (all ranges = 1.00-2.00) in Scenario #1: 2.1 increased from 1.60 to 1.75 (+.15); 5.1 increased 1.47 to 1.75 (+.28); 5.2 increased 1.53 to 1.58 (+.05); 5/3 increased from 1.47-1.92 (+.45); 5.4 increased from 1.47 to 1.83 (+.36).

In Scenario #2 the overall mean for Spring 2016 was 1.61 and Spring 2017 it was 1.81 (+.20) with a range at or above benchmark (1.00-2.00). Standard element 1.1 dropped by .01 in Spring 2017, with a slight decrease from 1.60 in Spring 2016 to 1.59. All other standard elements in Scenario #2 showed gains in standard element means: and 3.1 increased from 1.67 to 1.83 (+.16); and both 3.2 and 3.3 increased from 1.60 to 1.92 (+.32) (all ranges were 1.00-2.00).

The overall mean for Spring 2016 of the Case Study #3 was 1.55 (range = 1.00-2.00) and for Spring 2017 it increased by .32 with a mean of 1.87. With a range of 1.00-2.00 and 100% passing rate, all 9 standard elements reflected in the Case Study #3 section of the assessment increased from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017. Results were: 1.2 increased from 1.60 to 1.74 (+.14); 1.3 increased from 1.53 to 2.00 (+.47); 2.1 increase from 1.53 to 1.92 (+.39); 4.1 increased from 1.60 to 1.67 (+.07); 4.4 increased from 1.53 to 2.00 (+.47); 5.1 increased from 1.47 to 1.83 (+.36); 5.5 increased from 1.60 to 2.00 (+.40); 6.1 increased from 1.53 to 1.92 (+.39); and 6.2 increased from 1.43 to 1.75 (+.32).

Combined means across both collection cycles for each scenario reports Scenario #1 was 163 (N=25) and Scenario #2 was 171 (N=25). The combined means for the Case Study #3 was 171 (N=25). 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 1.50 on standard elements 2.1, 5.1, 5.2 (range = 1.00-2.00). 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 1.5 (range = 1.00-2.00). The overall mean for Case Study #3 was 1.94 with a range of 1.00-2.00.

Interpretation of Data:

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 target program decisions with the data presented.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% 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 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (46% above proficient, 54% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% 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 5.2 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (54% above proficient, 46% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (60% above, 40% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1, or above.

ELCC 5.3 Safeguard values of democracy, equity, and diversity.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 5.3 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (46% above proficient, 54% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (90% above, 10% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (46% above proficient, 54% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (50% above, 50% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (67% above proficient, 33% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (90% above, 10% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (46% above proficient, 54% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (90% above, 10% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (54% above proficient, 46% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (100% above proficient).

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (54% above proficient, 46% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (90% above, 10% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (70% above, 20% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above. One candidate scored below benchmark (10%).

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (54% above proficient, 46% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (100% above proficient).

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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (46% above proficient, 54% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (80% above, 20% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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 5.5 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (60% above proficient, 40% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (100% above proficient).

ELCC 6.1 Advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 6.1 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (54% above proficient, 46% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (90% above, 10% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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 6.2 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% 15 candidates for the Spring 2016 semester (55% above proficient, 45% at proficient) and 100% out of 10 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester (70% above, 30% proficient) scored at the proficient level, 1.00, or above.

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 greater than 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 six 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 met. Spring 2018 data only reflected scores for two candidates, both of which scored proficient at ≥ 1 . 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 1.80 to 1.50.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In the upcoming year, EDLD 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 EDLD courses.

Recommendation to Support Success of Continuous Improvement Plan: EDLD 696 will embed explicit instruction, course content and learning objectives to support ELCC 5.4 and EDLD 660 will explicitly support ELCC 3.2.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was met. Candidates scored at benchmark (1.00 or higher) on each indicator. Gains in ELCC 5.4 and 3.2 in terms of mean averages with 5.4 increasing from 1.50 to 1.67 and 3.2 improving from 1.50 to 2.00.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

EDLD faculty will continue to promote learning and opportunity for candidates to collect and use data for school improvement (ELCC 1.2 and ELCC 1.3)

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD 630 and EDLD 650 are recommended to be taken concurrently. EDLD will embed explicit instruction and course content requirements that support ELCC 1.2 and ELCC 1.3 where candidates will collect and analyze data for supporting PLC activities.

Courses

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

10 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 650 Lead a Professional Learning Community

Assessment: Leading a Professional Learning Community

This is an activity requiring the candidate to create and lead a Professional Learning Community (PLC) within the school setting. The candidate will lead PLC 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. The candidate will ultimately provide relevant feedback to appropriate groups within the school setting so that new strategies, curriculum materials and technology utilization become embedded throughout the schools' instructional setting. The creation and collaborative leadership required within this activity will measure the candidates' knowledge and understanding of the ELCC standards and how the candidate' utilizes leadership skills to incorporate the ELCC standards into school leadership functions.

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)

Data was collected in spring 2017 using the initially submitted rubric and the EPP has since made significant improvements and will collect future data with the revised rubric and assessment tool presented here.

Spring 2017:

- ELCC 1.3 Promote continual and sustainable school improvement
- ELCC 2.3 Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff
- ELCC 2.4 Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning

Spring 2018:

- ELCC 1.2 Create school-based strategic and tactical goals
- ELCC 1.2 Collecting and using relevant evidence on which to base a decision that impacts student learning
- ELCC 1.3 Promote continual and sustainable school improvement
- ELCC 2.3 Work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning
- ELCC 2.4 Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning

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.

Courses

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

10.1 Data

Previous Rubric:

Component	Standard	Spring 2017	
		N=14	
ELCC Component (CK)	1.3	Mean	2.00
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component (CK)	2.3	Mean	2.00
Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component (CK)	2.4	Mean	1.94
Promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning		Range	1.00-2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component (PLS)	1.3	Mean	2.00
Promote continual and sustainable school improvement		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component (PLS)	2.3	Mean	2.00
Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff		Range	2.00
		%	100%
ELCC Component (PLS)	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	1.99
		Range	1.00-2.00
		%	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%

New rubric:

Component	Standard	Spring 2019	

		N=3	
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	2.00
Monitor instructional practices within the school and provide assistance to teachers		Range	2.00
		%	100%
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	2.00
		Range	2.00
		%	100%

Courses

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

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

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 2.00, which is above proficiency

Interpretation of Data:

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, which is included on two rubric items. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that 100% of the 14 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 14 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 on one iteration of ELCC 2.4, 92.8% of the 14 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored a 2.00, which is above proficiency, while only one candidate (7.14%) scored at the proficient level. On the second indicator for ELCC 2.4, 100% of candidates scored a 2.00, above the proficiency rating.

Revisions Based on Reviewer's Comments:

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. Reviewer's comment: "While the assessment activities show alignment to the concepts outlined in each of the ELCC standard elements, more work is needed on the scoring rubric to ensure that the evaluative criteria used within the levels of the rubric align to a majority of indicators given for each ELCC standard element."

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.

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).

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 2.0, (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 and 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. Data suggests improvements be made within the course to explicitly scaffold, support and preview candidate's progress and plans related to monitoring practices within the school as well as documenting the evidence appropriately.

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

Recommendations to Successfully Implement the Plan for Improvement: EDLD faculty will continue to implement instructional strategies and using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidate Spring 20 scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was met as 100% of the candidates scored a 1.00 or above on each element. In the 18-19 AY, all three candidates scored a 2.00 on every ELCC component.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The assessment will be aligned to current standards and candidates will score at or above benchmark on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD faculty will update the assignment so that it is aligned to current standards. Revisions will be made to the assessment as necessary.

Courses

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

11 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 690 Mentor and Self-Reflection Surveys

Assessment: Mentor Survey and Candidate Self-Report Survey

The purpose of the Mentor Survey is to gain the mentor's perspective of candidate's expertise in performing Professional Leadership Skills in the field. Mentors are to rate candidate's expertise according to specified descriptors for each ELCC element. This survey allows the program to gain real-world data on each Professional Leadership Skill assignment as well as information on whether the assignments are applicable and rigorous enough to support our candidates once they become Educational Leaders.

The purpose of the Self-Reflection Survey is three fold. First, candidates are to reflect on their abilities to practice each ELCC element (Professional Leadership Skills) in the field and then rate themselves on each element using specific descriptors. Second, candidates align each ELCC element covered within the program to specific evidence from their EDLD portfolio projects. Third, candidates are able to write comments within the instrument for each ELCC element which allows them to give program feedback and input into the strength of the Professional Leadership Skill assignments.

Scores are reported according to the following ratings:

4= Exceeds expectations

3= Meets expectations (expected for mastery)

2=Unacceptable

1= No evidence

ELCC Standards 1-6; ELCC Standard Elements: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2.

Assessment #7 is comprised of two mirroring instruments that are collected within separate courses during the Educational Leadership Master's program. Both instruments include all Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards and elements, and are collected in the last semester of the program. The first instrument, Mentor Survey, is collected at the end of EDLD 690: Instructional Leadership: Standards, Theories, and Practices when the majority of all required Professional Leadership Skill field hours have been completed. The second instrument, Self-Reflection Survey, is collected during the last course of the program, EDLD 697: Educational Leadership Practicum II.

The purpose of the Mentor Survey is to gain the mentor's perspective of candidate's expertise in performing Professional Leadership Skills in the field. Mentors are to rate candidate's expertise according to specified descriptors for each ELCC element. This survey allows the EPP to gain real-world data on each Professional Leadership Skill assignment as well as information on whether the assignments are applicable and rigorous enough to support the candidates once they become Educational Leaders.

The purpose of the Self-Reflection Survey is three-fold. First, candidates are to reflect on their abilities to practice each ELCC element (Professional Leadership Skills) in the field and then rate themselves on each element using specific descriptors. Second, candidates align each ELCC element covered within the program to specific evidence from their EDLD portfolio projects. Third, candidates are able to write comments within the instrument for each ELCC element which allows them to give program feedback and input into the strength of the Professional Leadership Skill assignments.

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:

- 100% of candidates will return both instruments.
- The benchmark for both instruments will be 3.00.
- Overall mean will be 3.00 for both instruments.

Courses

EDLD690 Instructional Leadership: Standards, Theories, and Practices (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)

*Program Outcomes Links***Professional Skills and Dispositions**

Candidates will demonstrate professional skills and dispositions in a school level/clinical practice setting.

11.1 Data

Previous Data:

Mentor Survey Results:

Standard	Spring 2016 N=5			Summer 2016 N=4		
	Mean	Range	% passing	Mean	Range	% passing
1.1	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
1.2	4.00	4.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
1.3	3.80	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
1.4	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
2.1	3.80	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
2.2	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
2.3	4.00	4.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
2.4	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
3.1	3.20	1.00-4.00	80%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
3.2	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
3.3	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
3.4	2.60	1.00-4.00	80%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
3.5	3.80	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
4.1	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
4.2	2.80	1.00-4.00	80%	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
4.3	2.80	1.00-4.00	80%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
4.4	3.40	1.00-4.00	80%	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
5.1	3.20	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
5.2	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
5.3	3.00	1.00-4.00	80%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
5.4	3.40	3.00-4.00	100%	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
5.5	2.80	1.00-4.00	80%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
6.2	3.60	3.00-4.00	100%	4.00	3.00-4.00	100%
6.2	3.20	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
6.3	3.20	3.00-4.00	100%	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
Overall Mean	3.376			3.73		

Self-Reflection Survey Results:

Summer 2016			
Standard	Mean	Range	% passing
1.1	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
1.2	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
1.3	3.25	2.00-4.00	75%
1.4	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
2.1	4.00	4.00	100%
2.2	3.00	2.00-4.00	50%
2.3	3.25	2.00-4.00	75%
2.4	3.00	2.00-4.00	75%
3.1	2.75	1.00-4.00	75%
3.2	3.25	1.00-4.00	75%
3.3	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%

3.4	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
3.5	3.50	2.00-4.00	75%
4.1	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
4.2	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
4.3	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
4.4	3.25	3.00-4.00	100%
5.1	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
5.2	3.50	2.00-4.00	75%
5.3	3.00	2.00-4.00	50%
5.4	2.75	2.00-4.00	50%
5.5	3.00	2.00-4.00	50%
6.1	3.25	2.00-4.00	75%
6.2	3.50	2.00-4.00	75%
6.3	4.00	4.00	100%
Overall Mean	3.36		

2017-2018:

EDLD 690 Mentor Survey					EDLD 697 Self-Reflection Survey				
Benchmark = 3.00					Benchmark = 3.00				
		Spring 2016	Summer 2016	Spring 2017			Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
ELCC element	#	5	4	13	ELCC element	#	4	1	8
1.1	Mean	3.40	3.75	3.08	1.1	Mean	3.25	3.00	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		Range	3.00-4.00	3.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%	85%		%	100%	100%	100%
1.2	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.38	1.2	Mean	3.50	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		range	3.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Mean	3.80	3.75	3.38	1.3	Mean	3.25	4.00	3.75
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	92%		%	75%	100%	100%
1.4	Mean	3.40	3.50	3.00	1.4	Mean	3.50	4.00	3.63
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	92%		%	100%	100%	100%
2.1	Mean	3.80	4.00	3.77	2.1	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.75
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		Range	4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%	100%
2.2	Mean	3.60	3.75	3.69	2.2	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%		%	50%	100%	100%
2.3	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.77	2.3	Mean	3.25	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%		%	75%	100%	100%
2.4	Mean	3.60	3.75	3.54	2.4	Mean	3.00	1.00	3.63
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00		Range	2.00-4.00	1.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	92%		%	75%	0%	100%
3.1	Mean	3.20	3.50	3.85	3.1	Mean	2.75	4.00	3.75
	Range	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00		Range	1.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	80%	100%	100%		%	75%	100%	88%
3.2	Mean	3.40	3.50	3.08	3.2	Mean	3.25	3.00	3.88
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00	1.00-4.00		Range	1.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00

ELCC element	#	1	1	ELCC element	#	1	1
1.1	Mean	3.00	4.00	1.1	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
1.2	Mean	3.00	4.00	1.2	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
1.3	Mean	3.00	4.00	1.3	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
1.4	Mean	3.00	4.00	1.4	Mean	3.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	3.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
2.1	Mean	3.00	4.00	2.1	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
2.2	Mean	3.00	4.00	2.2	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
2.3	Mean	3.00	4.00	2.3	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
2.4	Mean	3.00	4.00	2.4	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
3.1	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.1	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
3.2	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.2	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
3.3	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.3	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
3.4	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.4	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
3.5	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.5	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
4.1	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.1	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
4.2	Mean	4.00	4.00	4.2	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
4.3	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.3	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
4.4	Mean	4.00	4.00	4.4	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00

	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
5.1	Mean	4.00	4.00	5.1	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
5.2	Mean	4.00	4.00	5.2	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
5.3	Mean	4.00	4.00	5.3	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
5.4	Mean	3.00	4.00	5.4	Mean	4.00	3.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	3.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
5.5	Mean	3.00	4.00	5.5	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00	4.00		Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%		%	100%	100%
Overall mean		3.20	4.00	Overall mean		3.96	3.96

Courses

EDLD690 Instructional Leadership: Standards, Theories, and Practices (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

According to Mentor Survey data, Spring 2016 completers (100%) averaged at meets expectations (3) or exceeds expectations (4) for all of standard elements (total of 25). All candidates (100%) also scored a exceeds expectations (4) for elements ELCC 1.2 and ELCC 2.3, showing that our program is able to solidly support candidate ability to develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes (ELCC 1.2) as well as work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning through the use of differentiated instruction strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction (ELCC 2.3).

It is important to note that the range of elements 3.1, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, and 5.5 included one student with a score of no evidence (1) for each of these elements.

Interpretation of Data:

Because the Mentor Survey is a new instrument included within our program during the Spring 2016 semester and was completed on candidates who began the program before its redesign, it is understandable that not all candidates had evidence within their portfolio to support each element. Our faculty actually thought that the scores from the mentors would be lower than reported due to the program redesign and candidates previous work within the confines of the old program. Because the scores on this instrument were not as low as we thought and simply gave an overview and not specific ideas to help support a stronger program and therefore stronger candidates, another survey was included during the summer 2016 semester to gather candidateSpring 20 perspectives of Professional Leadership Skills as well.

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

Mentor Survey

The Mentor Survey was implemented in Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017. Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the mentors for these cohorts of candidates rated the overall Professional Leadership Skills of these candidates as at or above the benchmark set of proficient, score of 3, as indicated by the overall mean scores of the surveys at 3.38, 3.73, 3.36, respectively.

Across the same time frame, all three cohorts had 100% of candidates, total of 22, who scored at or above benchmark in the following elements:

Element 1.2 The candidate developed and used evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes.

Element 2.1 The candidate has knowledge of school programs and activities to ensure personalized learning opportunities and facilitated the use of appropriate content-based learning materials and learning strategies.

Element 2.2 The candidate gained experience with interpreting information and communicating progress toward student achievement.

Element 2.3 The candidate worked collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning through the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction.

Element 3.3 The candidate has knowledge of and understands the implementation of discipline management plans.

Element 6.1 The candidate served as a respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school.

Across the same time frame, the following elements of the rubric had a mean score of less than benchmark, score of 3.00.

Element 3.4 The candidate involved school staff in the decision-making process by designing a survey for teachers to identify the types of direct assistance the teacher's desire from supervisors and from fellow teachers to support student learning (Spring 2016 - one candidate).

Element 4.2 The candidate identified and used diverse community resources to improve school programs (Spring 2016 - one candidate).

Element 4.3 The candidate utilized collaboration strategies for building effective relationships with families and caregivers (Spring 2016 - one candidate).

Element 5.2 The candidate formulated a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices (Spring 2017- two candidates).

Element 5.5 The candidate reviewed and critiqued 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 within the school (Spring 2016 - one candidate).

Self-Reflection Survey

The Self-Reflection Survey was implemented in Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017. Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the cohorts of candidates rated their overall Professional Leadership Skills as at or above the benchmark set of proficient, score of 3.00, as indicated by the overall mean scores of the surveys at 3.36, 3.4, 3.7, respectively.

Across the same time frame, all three cohorts had 100% of candidates, total of 22 that scored themselves at or above benchmark in the following elements:

Element 1.1 The candidate created or participated in the creation of a written school vision that articulates learning characterized by a respect for students and their families and community partnerships.

Element 1.2 The candidate developed and used evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes.

Element 1.4 The candidate constructed an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of school plans and programs.

Element 2.1 The candidate has knowledge of school programs and activities to ensure personalized learning opportunities and facilitated the use of appropriate content-based learning materials and learning strategies.

Element 3.4 The candidate involved school staff in the decision-making process by designing a survey for teachers to identify the types of direct assistance the teacher's desire from supervisors and from fellow teachers to support student learning.

Element 4.1 The candidate communicated information about the school within the community.

Element 4.2 The candidate identified and used diverse community resources to improve school programs.

Element 5.1 The candidate created an educational platform that reflects infrastructure that helps to monitor and ensure equitable practices.

Across the same time frame, the following elements of the rubric had a mean score of less than benchmark, score of 3.00:

Element 2.4 The candidate monitored instructional practices within the school and provided assistance to teachers and used technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data results for accountability reporting (Fall 2016 - one candidate).

Element 3.1 The candidate has knowledge of school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school such as operational policies and procedures (Summer 2016- one candidate).

Element 5.4 The candidate formulated sound school strategies to address current issues and dilemmas in education (Summer 2016- two candidates; Fall 2016- one candidate).

Element 5.5 The candidate reviewed and critiqued 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 within the school. (Fall 2016 - one candidate).

Element 6.3 The candidate identified and anticipated emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school (Fall 2016- one candidate).

Interpretation of Data:

Element 1.1 The candidate created or participated in the creation of a written school vision that articulates learning characterized by a respect for students and their families and community partnerships.

Scores given by mentors for Element 1.1 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort had a 100% passage rate with 85% for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient (Proficient = 3.00).

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 1.1 across the three semesters indicated a high pattern for passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 1.2 The candidate developed and used evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes.

Scores given by mentors for Element 1.2 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 1.2 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 1.3 The candidate identified strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promotes continuous and sustainable school improvement

Scores given by mentors for Element 1.3 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohorts, total of nine candidates, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12, for the final semester cohort of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 1.3 across the three semesters did not indicate a pattern for passage rates. For the Summer 2016 semester 75% of candidates, three of the four, scored at proficient or higher, while for the final two semesters, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, 100% of the candidates, total of nine, scored proficient or higher on this particular element. According to this data the rate of passage increased as the semesters in use progressed.

Element 1.4 The candidate constructed an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of school plans and programs.

Scores given by mentors for Element 1.4 across the three semesters indicated a percentage for high passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine candidates, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 1two candidates, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 1.4 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage of passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 2.1 The candidate has knowledge of school programs and activities to ensure personalized learning opportunities and facilitated the use of appropriate content-based learning materials and learning strategies.

Scores given by mentors for Element 2.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 2.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 2.2 The candidate gained experience with interpreting information and communicating progress toward student achievement.

Scores given by mentors for Element 2.2 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 2.2 across the three semesters found that for the first semester data was collected, Summer 2016, 50%, total of two of the four candidates, rated themselves less than proficient with this skill; however, for the last two submissions of data collected, 100% of candidates, total of nine, rated themselves as Highly Effective in this same skill. According to this data, the rate of passage increased as the semesters in use progressed.

Element 2.3 The candidate worked collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning through the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction

Scores given by mentors for Element 2.3 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 2.3 across the three semesters found that for the first semester data was collected, Summer 2016, 75%, total of three of four candidates, rated themselves less than proficient with this skill; however, for the last two submissions of data collected, 100% of candidates, total of nine, rated themselves as Highly Effective in this same skill. According to this data the rate of passage increased as the semesters in use progressed.

Element 2.4 The candidate monitored instructional practices within the school and provided assistance to teachers and used technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data results for accountability reporting.

Scores given by mentors for Element 2.4 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine candidates, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12 of 13 candidates, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient.

Scores given by candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 2.4 across the three semesters found that for the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, 75% (three out of four candidates) and 0% (0 out of one candidate), scored themselves less than proficient; however, for the last iteration of data from Spring 2017 with a cohort of eight candidates, 100% of them scored proficient or better. The Fall 2016 cohort, N=1, rated themselves as not having completed an assignment that fulfilled this particular element.

Element 3.1 The candidate has knowledge of school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school such as operational policies and procedures.

Scores given by mentors for Element 3.1 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first semesters, Spring 2016, the cohort, total of five candidates, had a 80% passage rate with the last two semesters, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, total of 17 candidates, having 100% passing rate with candidates scoring at or above proficient. According to this data, the rate of passage increased as the semesters in use progressed.

Scores given by candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.1 across the three semesters found that for the first and last semesters, Summer 2016 and Spring 2017, 75% (three out of four candidates) and 88% (seven out of eight candidates), scored themselves less than proficient; however, for the second iteration of data from Fall 2016 with a cohort of one candidate, 100% scored proficient or better. One candidate (25%) within the Summer 2016 cohort rated this element as a 1.00, i.e. not completed task aligned to this particular element.

Element 3.2 The candidate led, or was involved with, the school leadership team in conducting and analyzing the school's budget and financial status to determine alignment with student needs and the candidate projected long-term resource needs of a school

Scores given by mentors for Element 3.2 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Fall 2016, with a total of nine candidates, 100% scored at or above benchmark. For the Spring 2017 semester, 85%, or 11 of 13 candidates, scored at the proficient level or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.2 across the three semesters found that for the first semester data was collected, Summer 2016, 75%, total of three of four candidates, rated themselves less than proficient with this skill; however, for the last two submissions of data collected, 100% of candidates, total of nine, rated themselves as Highly Effective in this same skill. One candidate (25%) within the Summer 2016 cohort rated this element as a 1.00, i.e. not completed task aligned to this particular element.

Element 3.3 The candidate has knowledge of and understands the implementation of discipline management plans.

Scores given by mentors for Element 3.3 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.3 across the three semesters found that for the first and second semester data was collected, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, total of five candidates, 100% rated themselves at or above proficient with this skill; however, for the last submission of data collected for Spring 2017, only 88%, or 12 of 13, rated themselves as proficient or better.

Element 3.4 The candidate involved school staff in the decision-making process by designing a survey for teachers to identify the types of direct assistance the teacherSpring 20 desire from supervisors and from fellow teachers to support student learning. Scores given by mentors for Element 3.4 across the three semesters did not indicate a pattern for passage rates. For both the Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters, mentors identified this element (one mentor Spring 2016 and one mentor Spring 2017) as their candidate did not complete a task that fulfilled this particular element as determined by a score of 1. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.4 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 3.5 The candidate participated in, or interviewed an administrator about, developing a school master schedule and analyzed and connected school policies that protect time and schedules to maximize teacher instructional time and student learning. Scores given by mentors for Element 3.5 across the three semesters showed that for the first two semesters Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, total of nine candidates, 100% scored at the proficient level or higher. During the last iteration of data, Spring 2017, 85% of the 13 candidates scored at proficient or higher with one candidate scoring at the 1.00, no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.5 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 75%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 75% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher.

Element 4.1 The candidate communicated information about the school within the community. Scores given by mentors for Element 4.1 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine candidates, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12 of 13, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 3.4 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 4.2 The candidate identified and used diverse community resources to improve school programs. Scores given by mentors for Element 4.2 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 80%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 85% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Summer 2016 and Spring 2017 show that one candidate for each of these semesters was scored at 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 4.2 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 4.3 The candidate utilized collaboration strategies for building effective relationships with families and caregivers. Scores given by mentors for Element 4.3 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 80%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 92% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Summer 2016 show that one candidate was scored at 1.00, no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 4.3 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 and Fall 2016 had 100% of candidates score at or above proficiency; however, for Spring 2017 75% of candidates scored at or above proficiency with one candidate scoring a 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element.

Element 4.4 The candidate developed effective relationships with a variety of community partners. Scores given by mentors for Element 4.4 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 80%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 85% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 show that one candidate from each semester was scored at 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 4.4 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 and Fall 2016 had 100% of candidates score at or above proficiency; however, for Spring 2017 75% of candidates scored at or above proficiency.

Element 5.1 The candidate created an educational platform that reflects infrastructure that helps to monitor and ensure equitable practices. Scores given by mentors for Element 5.1 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 and Fall 2016 had 100% of candidates scoring at or above proficient; however, for Spring 2017, 85% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher with one candidate scoring a 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 5.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 5.2 The candidate formulated a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices. Scores given by mentors for Element 5.2 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine, had a 100% passage rate with 85%, total of 11, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 5.2 across the three semesters indicated a higher passage rate for the last two semesters with 100% of candidates during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, total of nine, scoring at Highly Effective, score of 4.00. For the four candidates in the Summer 2016 cohort, only 75% rated themselves as proficient or higher on this particular element.

Element 5.3 The candidate developed, implemented, and evaluated school policies and procedures that support democratic values, equity, and diversity issues. Scores given by mentors for Element 5.3 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 80%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 92% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 show that one candidate from each semester was scored at 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 5.3 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 50%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 75% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Spring 2017 indicate that one candidate felt they did not have any evidence of a task that fulfilled this element as identified by a score of 1.00.

Element 5.4 The candidate formulated sound school strategies to address current issues and dilemmas in education. Scores given by mentors for Element 5.4 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 5.4 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 50%, Fall 2016 had 0%, and Spring 2017 had 100% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Fall 2016 indicate that one candidate felt they did not have any evidence of a task that fulfilled this element as identified with a score of 1.00.

Element 5.5 The candidate reviewed and critiqued 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 within the school. Scores given by mentors for Element 5.5 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016, having 80% of their cohort, or four of five candidates, and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of four candidates, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12 of 13, for the final semester of Spring 2017 scoring proficient or higher having only one candidate scoring less than proficient in the final semester of data. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 5.5 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 50%, Fall 2016 had 0%, and Spring 2017 had 100% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Candidates who scored themselves less than proficient, identified that they completed a task pertaining to the element but were not adequate at mastering this particular element as identified with a score of 2.00.

Element 6.1 The candidate served as a respectful spokesperson for students and families with the school. Scores given by mentors for Element 6.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for high passage rates. For all three semesters, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Spring 2017, the cohort, total of 22, had a 100% passage rate scoring proficient or higher. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 6.1 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 75%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 88% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher.

Element 6.2 The candidate met with a small group of representative students and advocated for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and student success. Scores given by mentors for Element 6.2 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient. Scores for Spring 2017 show that one candidate was rated at 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element. Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 6.2 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 75%, Fall 2016 had 100%, and Spring 2017 had 75% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Spring 2017 show that one candidate was rated at 1.00, or no task completed to fulfill this element.

Element 6.3 The candidate identified and anticipated emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school

Scores given by mentors for Element 6.3 across the three semesters indicated a high percentage for passage rates. For the first two semesters, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016, the cohort, total of nine, had a 100% passage rate with 92%, total of 12, for the final semester of Spring 2017 having only one candidate scoring less than proficient.

Scores given by the candidates within their self-reflection survey for Element 6.3 were inconsistent as Summer 2016 had 100%, Fall 2016 had 0%, and Spring 2017 had 88% of their candidates scoring at proficient or higher. Scores for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 showed that one candidate from each semester felt they did not have any evidence of a task that fulfilled this element as identified with a score of 1.00.

As our Master of Education in Educational Leadership program has evolved so has our dissemination of these two documents to the candidates and their mentors. Candidates are now provided this information within the EDLD Handbook located on our website as well as in the first course of the program so that there is an open communication about what is expected of them in the field. We have found that allowing them to self-reflect and the mentors to rate them in the last two semesters is beneficial and more accurate only if they can score /rate using the instruments as they progress throughout the five-semester program.

Although the instruments are now given at the beginning of the program, they are collected as stated previously in the last semester before graduation. They are a requirement of the embedded courses as they help the EPP to determine how our field experiences are directly effecting our candidate preparation for the P-12 campus.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. Although the instruments are now given at the beginning of the program, they are collected as stated previously in the last semester before graduation. They are a requirement of the embedded courses as they help the EPP to determine how our field experiences are directly effecting our candidate preparation for the P-12 campus.

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

Recommendation to Successfully Implement Plan for Improvement: EDLD faculty will ensure both Mentor and Self-Reflection Surveys are completed and returned.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was met.

Data collected represent 2 candidates, one from F18 and one from S19. Both candidates received mentor scores on the overall Professional Leadership Skills at or above the benchmark (score of 3), as indicated by the overall mean scores 3.2 (F18) and 4 (S19).

The Self-Reflection Survey was implemented in Summer 2016 (U'16), Fall 2016 (F'16), Spring 2017 (S'17). Data collected from the Self-Reflection Survey show both candidates rated themselves at or about benchmark, with one 3 given on ELCC 1.4 for the F18 candidate and on ELCC 5.4 for the S19 candidate. Overall mean averages were 3.96 for both semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Candidates are expected to continue to score at benchmark (3.00 or higher) on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD Faculty will updated the assessment to align with current standards.
- EDLD Faculty will distribute the survey within a course in order to obtain a 100% return rate for both Mentor and Self-Reflection Surveys

Courses

EDLD690 Instructional Leadership: Standards, Theories, and Practices (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)

12 Assessment and Benchmark Leading Instructional Change on a P-12 Campus

Assessment: Leading Instructional Changes on P-12 Campus

This assessment is included within EDLD 690: Instructional Leadership: Standards, Theories, and Practices to provide evidence of a candidates understanding of the specific Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) content knowledge and professional leadership skills required to coach teachers towards better instructional strategies as well as the implementation of more rigorous curriculum.

The required information for this presentation will come from the culmination of all experiences from within EDLD 690 including the following: the candidate will complete a COMPASS observation evaluation on a new or struggling teacher along with collecting pre-test data on the students in the class. Then the candidate will create an Action Plan from the observational instrument tied to differentiated instruction, technology use in the classroom, cooperative grouping, etc. The candidate will then implement the Action Plan through modeling and co-teaching methods. Snapshots and follow-up debriefings will occur throughout the course. A final COMPASS evaluation will be completed and data analyzed to determine student and teacher growth throughout the semester.

ELCC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6.

EDLD 690 is taken during the final two semesters before completion of the program. Candidates are assigned a cooperating teacher based on administration preference, evaluation scores, and willingness to work with a candidate within our program. The candidate completes two full evaluations and two snapshots as well as hours in the field mentoring and co-teaching with the cooperating teacher and their students. Candidates must create an action plan based on the teacher's needs as identified by their initial evaluation scores. The action plan must include a co-teaching, differentiation, cooperative grouping, and technology component. The final presentation is a culmination of all of these tasks in the field as well as a connection to reading text and research as required within the course.

Specific program standards (number and description) included:

ELCC Standard Elements: 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 5.2.

Alignment of Assessment to Standards

ELCC Content Knowledge:

Continual and sustained improvement models and processes (ELCC 1.3)

Instructional leadership practices (ELCC 2.3)

Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation (ELCC 2.3)

Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology (ELCC 2.4)

Evaluation of teachers (ELCC 3.1)

The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement (ELCC 5.2)

ELCC Professional Leadership Skills:

The candidate will observe and evaluate teacher instruction to provide valid feedback (ELCC 3.1) through monitoring instructional practices within the school and providing assistance to teachers (ELCC 2.4). The candidate will identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promotes continuous and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3) through designing the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction (ELCC 2.3) while working collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning (ELCC 2.3).

The candidate will complete a COMPASS observation evaluation on a new or struggling teacher along with collecting pre-test data on the students in the class. Then the candidate will create an Action Plan from the observational instrument tied to differentiated instruction, technology use in the classroom, cooperative grouping, etc. The candidate will then implement the Action Plan through modeling and co-teaching methods. Snapshots and follow-up debriefings will occur throughout the course. A final COMPASS evaluation will be completed and data analyzed to determine student and teacher growth throughout the semester.

The candidate will complete two (2) book studies that discuss school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices (ELCC 5.2) and the candidate will also reflect and analyze leadership decisions in terms of established ethical practices (ELCC 5.2).

These resources cover the culture and climate of a school as well as instructional strategies required to meet the needs of all learners.

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

Program Outcomes Links

Instructional Leadership

Candidates will demonstrate effective application of leadership skills in instructional leadership.

12.1 Data

Spring 2016:

ELCC Standards Grade Distribution	Ineffective	Emerging Proficient	Proficient	Highly Effective
1.3, Continual and sustained improvement models and processes	N=0	N=1	N=13	N=6
	0%	20%	60%	20%
2.3, Instructional leadership practices	N=0	N=1	N=3	N=1
	0%	20%	60%	20%
2.3, Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluations	N=0	N=1	N=3	N=1
	0%	20%	60%	20%
2.4, Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology	N=0	N=1	N=2	N=2
	0%	20%	40%	40%
3.1, Evaluation of teachers	N=0	N=1	N=2	N=2
	0%	20%	40%	40%
5.2, The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement	N=0	N=1	N=2	N=2
	0%	20%	40%	40%

ELCC Standards Mean and Range	Total # of candidates		
	Mean	Range	% pass
1.3	3.00	2.00-4.00	80%
2.3a	3.00	2.00-4.00	80%
2.3b	3.00	2.00-4.00	80%
2.4	3.20	2.00-4.00	80%
3.1	3.20	2.00-4.00	80%
5.2	3.20	2.00-4.00	80%

Component	Standard	Spring 2016		Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
		N=5		N=1	N=13	N=6
Continual and sustained improvement models and processes	ELCC 1.3	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.46	3.50
		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		%	80%	100%	85%	100%
Measures of teacher performance	ELCC 2.2	Mean	3.00	4.00		4.00
		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00		4.00
		%	80%	100%		100%
Instructional leadership practices	ELCC 2.3	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.85	3.17
		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		%	80%	100%	100%	100%
Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluations	ELCC 2.3	Mean	3.20	3.00	2.85	3.83
		Range	2.00-4.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		%	80%	100%	69%	100%
Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology	ELCC 2.4	Mean	3.20	4.00	3.23	3.50
		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
		%	80%	100%	100%	83%
Evaluation of teachers	ELCC 3.1	Mean	3.20	4.00	3.46	
		Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	
		%	80%	100%	92%	
		Mean	3.20	4.00	3.23	3.67

The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement	ELCC 5.2	Range	2.00-4.00	4.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		%	80%	100%	77%	100%
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean	3.10	3.83	3.35	
		Range	2.00-4.00	3.83	2.33-3.67	
		%	100%	100%	100%	

Component	Standard	Spring 2018		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019
		N=0	N=0	N=0	N=1	N=
Continual and sustained improvement models and processes	ELCC 1.3	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Measures of teacher performance	ELCC 2.2	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Instructional leadership practices	ELCC 2.3	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluations	ELCC 2.3	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology	ELCC 2.4	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Evaluation of teachers	ELCC 3.1	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement	ELCC 5.2	Mean				
		Range				
		%				
Overall Rubric Scores		Mean				
		Range				
		%				

No data available from the 18-19 AY.

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Element 1.3 Continual and sustained improvement models and processes:

The mean score of 3.00 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates as a whole can analyze data they collected from the teacher evaluations and student achievement scores to develop an Action Plan that includes better instructional and behavior management techniques, technology for learning, as well as more rigorous curriculum. 80% of the candidates scored a 3.00 or higher (Proficient or Highly Effective) in this category.

Element 2.3 Instructional leadership practices; Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation:

The mean score of 3.00 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates as a whole understand and can articulate the impact on curriculum and instruction snapshots (frequent, short observations using a specific set of protocol) have as well as how their leadership both in the classroom and on the campus can impact student achievement. 80% of the candidates scored a 3.00 or higher (Proficient or Highly Effective) in this category.

Element 2.4 Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology:

The mean score of 3.20 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates as a whole understand and can explain how the Action Plan's two objectives were implemented in the classroom and what support was needed by the candidate in order to support teacher instruction and student learning. Candidates were required within each objective to include at least one instructional technology to ensure student engagement with the content. 80% of the candidates scored a 3.00 or higher (Proficient or Highly Effective) in this category.

Element 3.1 Evaluation of teachers:

The mean score of 3.20 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates as a whole understand and can explain the evaluation scores of their cooperating P-12 teachers will evidence from their notes and course resources proving why the score earned on each component of the evaluation was correct. 80% of the candidates scored a 3.00 or higher (Proficient or Highly Effective) in this category.

Element 5.2 The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement:

The mean score of 3.20 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates as a whole understand and can describe how various resources utilized throughout the course directly affect school culture and student achievement. 80% of the candidates scored a 3.00 or higher (Proficient or Highly Effective) in this category.

Changes being implemented in future sections of EDLD 690 to ensure success for all EDLD candidates includes evaluation videos and rubric examples from our state department of education website. The website includes videoed lessons along with the evaluation scores and justifications which will aid candidates in gaining experience with observing, note taking, scoring, and finally self-assessing their ratings for evaluation components with what the state department of education considers appropriate for that particular lesson.

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results

Data collected from three previous semesters, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017, indicate that the cohort of candidate's final scores on their technology-enriched presentations are at or above the proficient level, a score of 3 or higher, as identified by overall mean scores of 3.1, 3.83, 3.35, respectively. As Proficiency was identified as a 3.00 or higher as the benchmark for achievement, the data indicated that across the same three semesters indicates only one element of the rubric where candidates scored less than benchmark was ELCC 2.3, Instructional Leadership Practices.

Further examination of the rubric scores when comparing Spring 2016 candidates, total of 5, and Spring 2017 candidates, total of 13, showed that for each element on the rubric, only one had range scores above proficient, ELCC 2.4, Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology; likewise, only one element on the rubric had range scores of Ineffective, ELCC 5.2, The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement.

Of the 19 candidates that attempted this major assessment over the three semesters, 17 of them passed on the first attempt.

Interpretation of Data:

ELCC 1.3 Continual and sustained improvement models and processes.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 1.3 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 80% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and 10 of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

ELCC 2.3 Instructional leadership practices.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.3 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 80% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and 12 of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

ELCC 2.3 Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluations.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.3 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 69% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and 8 of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above. The low data results for Spring 2017 showed that five of the 13 candidates only scored at the Emerging Proficient level, 2.00.

ELCC 2.4 Infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of instructional technology.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 2.4 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 80% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and 13 of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

ELCC 3.1 Evaluation of teachers.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 3.1 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 80% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and 11 of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

ELCC 5.2 The relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement.

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for ELCC 5.2 across the three semesters; however, for each of the three semesters 77% or more of the candidates scored proficient or better on this standard. Further examination of individual candidate's scores for this element indicated that four of five candidates for the Spring 2016 semester and nine of 13 candidates for the Spring 2017 semester scored at the proficient level, 3.00, or above.

The low data results for Spring 2017 showed that four of the 13 candidates only scored at the Emerging Proficient level, 2.00.

Beginning Fall 2017, a revised scoring guide will be the first iteration of data. This newer version is based on SPA reviewer's comments and we believe it will support each candidate's understanding of what is expected within this presentation as well as allow for deeper understanding of the content and processes of evaluation and mentoring in the field.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. Of the 19 candidates that attempted this major assessment over the three semesters, 17 of them passed on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The 2018-2019 goal is that candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Successfully Implement the Plan for Improvement: Using the newly revised assessment, measures of candidate's scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

There was no data available from the 18-19 AY.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Data will be collected in the upcoming year and candidates will be expected to score at benchmark (3.00 or higher) on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD faculty will align the assessment with updated standards.

13 Assessment and Benchmark EDLD 697 Final Comprehensive Project

Assessment: Capstone Project: Creating a School Plan.

Each candidate will identify a problem they have discovered while completing their field observation hours on their particular campus. This issue must be one that pertains to student achievement, school culture, personnel and staffing, etc. and is linked to at least one of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) topics covered throughout the program (see list under Project Requirements below). Once the issue has been identified, the candidate will then determine at least two ELCC standards that directly relate to the identified problem to ensure alignment of content and learning. Then the candidate will collect and analyze the school data to better understand the problem and implications for the elementary or secondary students if the problem is not rectified. Candidates will also provide recommendations to administrators regarding changes that may address the problem.

The use of a standardized rubric of the ten competencies listed below to assess knowledge attainment and application is used. Scores range from 2.00-4.00, with a score of 2.00 indicating the competency was minimal (ineffective); a score of 3.00 indicating the competency was addressed (proficient); and a score of 4.00 indicating that understanding of the competency exceeded expectations (highly effective). The rubric specifically identifies with descriptive words how the candidate will meet each of the identified categories.

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.

Courses

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

13.1 Data

Summer 2016 Grade Distribution N=4						
ELCC Standard	Emerging Proficient		Proficient		Highly Effective	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1.2	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
2.2	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%
3.1	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%
3.4	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
4.1	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
4.2	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%
2.3	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
5.4	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
5.5	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%
2.1a	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%
2.1b	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%
3.4	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%

Summer 2016 Mean and Range N=4			
ELCC Standard	Mean	Range	% passing
1.2	4.00	4.00	100%
2.2	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
3.1	3.75	3.00-4.00	100%
3.4	4.00	4.00	100%
4.1	4.00	4.00	100%
4.2	3.00	3.00	100%

2.3	4.00	4.00	100%
5.4	4.00	4.00	100%
5.5	4.00	4.00	100%
2.1a	3.50	1.00-2.00	75%
2.1b	3.50	3.00-4.00	100%
3.4	3.00	2.00-4.00	50%

Comprehensive Project (Version 1):

ELCC Standard		Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
	#	4	1	8
1.2 develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; create school-based strategic and tactical goals	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.50
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%
2.2 interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement	Mean	3.75	4.00	3.38
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	75%
3.1 analyze school processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school	Mean	3.75	4.00	3.63
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	92%
3.4 identify leadership capabilities of staff	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.63
	Range	4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	88%
4.1 use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.50
	Range	4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	75%
4.2 identify and use diverse community resources to improve school programs	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.63
	Range	3.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	88%
2.3 design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction	Mean	4.00	2.00	3.75
	Range	4.00	2.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	88%
5.4 formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas	Mean	4.00	3.00	3.50
	Range	4.00	3.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	88%
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 within the school	Mean	4.00	4.00	3.50
	Range	4.00	4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	88%
2.1 incorporate cultural competence, personality types in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices	Mean	3.50	3.00	3.50
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%
2.1 promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff	Mean	3.50	4.00	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%	100%
3.4 model distributed leadership skills	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.88
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00
	%	50%	100%	100%
Overall mean		3.71	3.58	3.61

Capstone Project (Version 2):

ELCC Standard		Summer 2017	Fall 2017
	#	6	4
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)	Mean	3.83	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%
Analysis of data ¹ : Collecting and using relevant evidence on which to base a decision that impacts student learning (ELCC 1.2) (Evidence off campus)	Mean	3.17	3.50
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	67	100%
Analysis of data ² : Collecting and using relevant evidence on which to base a decision that impacts student learning (ELCC 1.2) (Evidence on campus)	Mean	3.00	4.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	4.00
	%	67%	100%
Identifying school goals: Create school-based strategic and tactical goals (ELCC 1.2)	Mean	3.00	3.75
	Range	2.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	5%	100%
Making decisions: Identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school (ELCC 3.1)	Mean	3.50	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%
School capacity for distributed leadership: Involve school staff in decision making; identify leadership capabilities of staff (ELCC 3.4) (on campus assets)	Mean	4.00	4.00
	Range	4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%
Mobilize community resources: Identify diverse community resources to support implementation of school plan (ELCC 4.2) (off campus assets)	Mean	3.50	3.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	83%	75%
Ethical and legal applications: Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school (ELCC 5.4)	Mean	4.00	3.75
	Range	4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	100%	100%
School culture: Sustain a school culture conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)	Mean	3.83	3.75
	Range	3.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
	%	83%	100%
Professional development ¹ : Promote continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3)	Mean	3.50	4.00
	Range	3.00-4.00	4.00
	%	100%	100%
Professional development ² : Establish safeguards for democracy, equity, and diversity of the plan (ELCC 5.3)	Mean	3.50	3.25
	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00
	%	100%	75%
Emerging Trends and Initiatives: Identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school	Mean	3.17	4.00
	Range	2.00-4.00	4.00
	%	%	%
Overall mean			

Capstone Project (Version 2):

ELCC Standard		Summer 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
	#	0	1	1
Identifying a topic: Evaluation of school plan/program (ELCC 1.4)	Mean		3.00	4.00
	Range		3.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Analysis of data: Collecting and using relevant evidence on which to base a decision that impacts student learning (ELCC 1.2) (Evidence on campus)	Mean		2.00	4.00
	Range		2.00	4.00
	%		0%	100%

Creating a shared vision: Collaboratively develops, articulates, and implements a shared vision of learning. (ELCC 1.1)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Making a decision: Identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school. (ELCC 3.1)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
School capacity for distributed leadership: Involve school staff in decision making; identify leadership capabilities of staff (ELCC 3.4) (Off campus assets)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Mobilize community resources: Identify diverse community resources to support implementation of school plan (ELCC 4.2) (Off campus assets)	Mean		3.00	4.00
	Range		3.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Ethical and legal applications: Evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school (ELCC 5.4)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
School culture: Sustain a school culture conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Professional development: Promote continual and sustainable school improvement (ELCC 1.3)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Professional Development: Establish safeguards for democracy, equity, and diversity of the plan (ELCC 5.3)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Emerging trends and initiatives: Identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school (ELCC 6.3)	Mean		4.00	4.00
	Range		4.00	4.00
	%		100%	100%
Overall mean			3.63	4.00

Courses

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

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

This new assessment was implemented in Summer of 2016 and completed by four candidates. The overall mean score of all four candidates on this assessment was 3.71 on a 4.0 scale. The data indicates that four candidates (100%) earned a passing score on this assessment as each candidate's average score was above at or above Proficient. Of the four students with ten standards evaluated, two students scored emerging proficient on a total of three standards. Candidate four scored an emerging proficient on Standard 2.1, incorporate cultural competence, personality types in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices. Both Candidates one and four scored an emerging proficient on Standard 3.4, model distributed leadership skills.

Element 1.2 develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; create school-based strategic and tactical goals; collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals:

The mean score of 4.00 (4.00 score), Highly Effective, on this element proves that all candidates (100%) are able to identify and clearly articulate what procedures were developed, the use of evidence-centered research, and strategic planning processes were used to determine the site issue they were going to include within this comprehensive project.

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

The mean score for candidates on this element was 3.50 (4.00 score). Once candidate (25%) scored emerging proficient while the other three candidates (75%) scored Highly Effective. Three (75%) of the candidates are able thoroughly discusses specific and general implications on cultural competencies that can be affected by the success (or lack thereof) of the project. (i.e. programs, curriculum, instructional practices, various stakeholders). The fourth candidate (25%) did not address the specific or general implications on cultural competencies that can be affected by the success (or lack thereof) of the project. (i.e. programs, curriculum, instructional practices, various stakeholders). In order to ensure success for future candidates, an online discussion board will be included within the course so candidates can brainstorm and discuss stakeholders that are directly affected by the success (or lack thereof) of their project.

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

The mean score of 3.50 (4.00) scale was earned by candidates on this component. Two candidates (50%) scored Highly Effective meaning they were able to identify and demonstrate highly effective leadership behaviors, skills, dispositions and decision-making in order to promoting trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff. Two candidates (50%) scored Effective meaning ineffective leadership behaviors, skills, dispositions and decision-making were identified, and/or may not have thoroughly address all of the following promoting trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff.

Element 2.2 interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement Instructional leadership practices; Leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation:

The mean score of 3.75 (4.00 score) was earned on this component. Three candidates (75%) were able to give strong explanation of multiple sources of data that were collected and evaluated; that the data have been analyzed and interpreted; and candidate clearly communicates progress (or lack thereof) toward achievement. One candidate (25%) scored proficient on this component meaning minimal sources of relevant data have been evaluated and data analyzed and/or interpretation of data does not clearly communicate progress (or lack thereof) toward achievement.

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

The mean score of 4.00 (4.00 score), Highly Effective, on this element proves that this group of candidates (100%) overall were able to articulate relative to the stated problem, there is highly effective application to professional development that is designed to use differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction.

Element 3.1 strategic and tactical challenges for the school:

The mean score of 3.75 (4.00 score on this component). Three candidates (75%) scored at the Highly Effective level meaning they were able to analyze and describe school processes and operations and the challenges for the school/students and is clearly justified by data evidence. One candidate (25%) scored at the Proficient level meaning they were able to analyze and describe school process and operations and the challenges for the school/students but data is inconclusive or evidence is weak.

Element 3.4 identify leadership capabilities of staff; model distributed leadership skills:

The mean score of 3.00 (4.00 score) was earned on this component. Two candidates (50%) scored at the Highly Effective level meaning they thoroughly discussed how administration will model distributed leadership skills and gave a highly effective plan for addressing the next steps necessary for continued success is addressed clearly, with clear timeline considerations and complete resources needed. Two candidates (50%) scored at the Emerging Proficient level meaning they had an incomplete discussion of how administration will model distributed leadership skills and an ineffective plan for addressing the next steps necessary for continued success is presented. A weak sketch or no timeline is prepared and resources needed are not effectively addressed. To ensure the success of all candidates in the future, the directions will be changed to specify a timeline and specific number of steps to be planned for (i.e. what will your next five steps be in preparing and implementing your project plan within the next three-to-six months).

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

The mean score of 4.00 (4.00 score), Highly Effective, on this element proves that this group of candidates (100%) overall gave clear evidence of: collaborative 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:

The mean score of 3.00 (4.00 score), Proficient, on this element proves that this group of candidates (100%) overall gave clear evidence of: collaborative development of plan and identified participation from diverse community resources (stakeholders).

Element 5.4 formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas:

The mean score of 4.00 (4.00 score), Highly Effective, on this element proves that this group of candidates (100%) overall relative to their stated problem gave strong identification of ethical and legal practices aptly used to support success.

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:

The mean score of 4.00 (4.00 score), Highly Effective, on this element proves that this group of candidates (100%) overall clearly described the positive impact of the project on all of the following: social justice, school culture, and student achievement.

2016-2017:

Analysis and Actions/Decisions based on Results:

The Comprehensive/Capstone Project was implemented in Summer 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017). Data collected from these three semesters indicated that the cohort of candidateSpring 20 final scores on the Comprehensive Project was above the proficient level of a score of 3.00 as identified by overall mean scores of 3.71, 3.58, and 3.61, respectively. Across the same time frame, only one element of the rubric had a mean score of less than proficient, 3.00, which occurred during the Fall 20 16 semester where the cohort, N=1, scored a 2 on the ELCC Element 2.3, Design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction.

Further examination of the rubric scores when comparing Summer 2016, N=4, Fall 2016, N=1, and Spring 2017, N=8, showed that each of the following ELCC standard elements were mastered by all three cohorts of candidates: ELCC 1.2, 2.1, and 3.1. Examination of the data also determined ELCC standard elements of the rubric in which a cohort had a range that fell below the benchmark of 3were as follows: Summer 2016 for 2.1; Fall 2016 for 2.3; Spring 2017 for 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5.4, and 5.5.

Of the 13 candidates that attempted this major assessment over the three reported semesters, 12 of them passed on the first attempt.

Interpretation of Data:

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

Scores earned for Element 1.2 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or better on this particular element.

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

Although for the first semester, Summer 2016, only 75% of the candidates met benchmark, N=3, for Element 2.1, for the remaining two semesters, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, all candidates, N= 9, exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 scoring Highly Effective, 4.00, on this element.

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

Scores earned for Element 2.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or better on this particular element.

Element 2.2 interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement:

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for Element 2.2 across the three semesters; however, for the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, all candidates, N=5, scored proficient or higher on this element. Of the candidates in the Spring 2017 cohort, six of the eight, or 75%, scored proficient or higher.

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

No pattern or trend was detected in scores earned for Element 2.3 across the three semesters; however, for the Summer 2016 semester, 100% of candidates as well as 88%, N=7, of Spring 2017 candidates scored a proficient or higher for this element. The Fall 2016 cohort, N=1, scored a 2.00 or emerging proficient on this particular element. This is the only element that candidate did not meet benchmark on.

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

Scores earned for Element 3.1 across the three semesters indicated a pattern for passage rates. For each of the three semesters, 100% of the candidates, total of 13, scored proficient or better on this particular element. Element 3.4 model distributed leadership skills: Although for the first semester, Summer 2016, only 50% of the candidates met benchmark, N=2, for Element 3.4, for the remaining two semesters, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, all candidates, N= 9, exceeded the benchmark of 3.00 scoring Highly Effective, 4.00, on this element.

Element 4.1 use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information: For the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, 100% of candidates, N=5, scored Highly Effective, 4.00, on Element 4.1. For the Spring 2017 semester, six out of eight candidates, or 75%, scored proficient or above indicating that two of the candidates scored less than proficient on this element.

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

For the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, 100% of candidates, N=5, scored proficient or higher on Element 4.2. For the Spring 2017 semester, seven out of eight candidates, or 88%, scored proficient or above indicating that one candidate scored less than proficient on tis element.

Element 5.4 formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas:

For the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, 100% of candidates, N=5, scored proficient or higher on Element 5.4. For the Spring 2017 semester, seven out of eight candidates, or 88%, scored proficient or above indicating that one candidate scored less than proficient on tis element.

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 within the school: For the first two semesters, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, 100% of candidates, N=5, scored proficient or higher on Element 5.5. For the Spring 2017 semester, seven out of eight candidates, or 88%, scored proficient or above indicating that one candidate scored less than proficient on this element.

Based on the reviewer's comments from the last EDLD SPA submission, changes have been made to the rubric pertaining to better alignment to the standards and clearer descriptors for each element. Reviewer's comment- "More work is needed on the scoring rubric to ensure that the evaluative criteria used within the levels of the rubric align to a majority of indicators given for each ELCC standard element."

The following is the 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 effective decision-making on a P-12 campus. Also all ELCC standards are now included within this comprehensive assessment.

Capstone 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)

Capstone Project (revised assessment):

Analysis of Data: The Comprehensive Project was rewritten and renamed the Capstone Project for Summer 2017 as per reviewer Spring 20 request.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark 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: The goal for 2018-2019 is that candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendations to Successfully Implement Plan for Improvement: EDLD faculty will work to ensure that by using proper instructional materials and the newly revised assessment, measures of candidate's scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was not met. There were only 2 candidates' scores reported for the F18-S19 period. The overall mean is gradually increasing as demonstrated by a F17, 3.5 to a 3.63 in F18 and again in S19 to a 4. While both candidates passed the assessment, one student's score fell below the benchmark of 3 with a score of 2 on *Analysis of Data (1.2)* with respect to using evidence on the campus.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Candidates will be expected to score at benchmark of 3.00 or high on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD faculty will align the assessment with current standards with expectations that candidate will score at 3.00 or above.

Courses

EDLD697 Educational Leadership Practicum II (Lab. 9, 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

Master of Education: Educational Leadership 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	49	—	—	23
2014-2015	43	—	—	26
2015-2016	36	—	—	10
2016-2017	36	5	7	12
2017-2018	30	5	4	9
2018-2019	11	5	1	6

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. The enrollment rate for 2017-2018 decreased from 36 to 30 which is 16%. Completer rate stayed the same for fall 2017 with five candidates and dropped from seven to four, a 43% decrease in spring 2018. Likewise, the total completer rate for 2017-2018 changed from twelve to nine, a decrease of 25%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Because program faculty are a small group and teach multiple courses in the program we will meet at least once a semester 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.

Recommendation to Support the Success of the Plan for Improvement: Working in tandem with effective mentor administrator placement and supportive, accurate advising, 90% of EDLD candidates complete their MED program within the given five-semester timeline. Likewise, an intervention plan and rough draft Leadership Academy proposal will be developed by faculty.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

The benchmark was not met for an increase in enrollment. The enrollment rate for 2018-2019 decreased from 30 to 11, which is 63%. Completer rate stayed the same for fall 2018 with five candidates and dropped from seven to one, an 85% decrease in spring 2019. Likewise, the total completer rate for 2018-2019 changed from nine to six, a decrease of 33%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

EDLD faculty will work to promote the program and recruit high quality candidates.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD faculty will partner with CPSB leadership to develop a proposal to establish a leadership academy leading to the recruitment of high quality candidates in the area by the end of Fall 2019.

15 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development

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.

2018-2019:

Data table is attached.

Artifacts

[EDLD_Curriculum_Development_18-19](#) [PDF 115 KB SEP 15, 2019]

[MED_EDLD_Curriculum_Development_17-18](#) [PDF 64 KB SEP 16, 2018]

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of data: The benchmark was met. EDLD 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: In 2018-2019, the program will strengthen opportunities for students to demonstrate competencies using technology.

Recommendation to Support the Success of 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.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

EDLD faculty have met with district leaders to develop plans for upcoming collaborations. EDLD faculty have also worked to improve the use of technology in the program by the candidates.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

EDLD faculty will ensure that all course assessments, fieldwork, and the EDLD Handbook are aligned to the current standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- By the end of the Spring 2020 semester, all program coursework, fieldwork, assessments, and the EDLD handbook will be completely and accurately aligned to current standards.

16 Assessment and Benchmark Resource Management

Assessment: Resource Management

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.

16.1 Data

Component		Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
		N=19	N=7	N=5
ELCC Component 3.2	Mean	3.42	3.00	3.40
Efficiently use human and fiscal resources to manage school operations	Range	2.00-4.00	2.00-3.67	2.50-4.00
	%	89%	58%	80%
ELCC Component 3.5	Mean	3.84	3.71	4.00
Ensure that teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning	Range	3.00-4.00	2.00-4.00	4.00
	%	100%	85%	100%

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data:

Overall pass rates for 3.2 were 89% and decreased to 58%. Also, 3.5 decreased from 100% (n=19) to 85% (n=7) for the 2016-2017 data cycle.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

In 2018-2019, candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00) or higher on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successfully Implementing Plan for Improvement: EDLD faculty will continue to instruct candidates to ensure that measures of candidates' scores will be at or above benchmark on each indicator.

2018-2019:

Data Analysis:

Candidates in summer 2018 reported scores that ranged from 2.50-4.00 on ELCC 3.2 and 4.00 on ELCC 3.5. 80% scored at or above benchmark (3.00) on element 3.2 and 100% at or above benchmark on element 3.50.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Candidates will score at benchmark (score of 3.00 or higher) on each indicator.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- EDLD faculty will align the assessment with current standards.
- EDLD faculty will include resources into coursework to assist candidates in improving on the expectations of these components.

End of report