

## TEAC Annual Report 2012

### Montana State University Educational Leadership Program

The Educational Leadership program is submitting this document to meet the TEAC Annual reporting requirements for 2012. In this document we have updated our assessment system to include cohort comparisons. We now are collecting data and comparing our Med Rural, Online and Certification programs by semester that students entered the programs as a group. We have maintained the same assessment points and continue to make progress towards collecting data as the cohorts complete each of the assessments in our assessment system.

The Educational Leadership program was granted Initial Accreditation on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The Montana State University Educational Leadership program makes four claims about our candidates.

#### **Quality Principle 1: Evidence of Candidate Learning**

The ELCC Standards were developed in 2002 by the NPBEA in response to a call for a new direction in the accreditation of school leaders (NPBEA, 2002). These standards encompass the ISLLC Standards. The Educational Leadership Program at Montana State University makes the following claims aligned with TEAC Quality Principle 1: Evidence of Candidate Learning.

#### ***Claim 1: Knowledge (Rigor)***

Through rigorous coursework grounded in ELCC standards 1-6, all graduates of MSU's Educational Leadership Program demonstrate understanding of and competence in the core educational.

#### ***Claim 2: Applying Knowledge for Effective Decision-Making (Relevance)***

As documented through authentic experiences specified in ELCC standard 7, all graduates of MSU's Educational Leadership Program apply acquired knowledge of educational leadership practices to make effective, ethical decisions relevant to their individual workplace contexts.

#### ***Claim 3: Caring Relationships***

Informed by ELCC standards 4 and 5, all graduates of the MSU Educational Leadership Program are culturally competent leaders with the ability to develop internal and external stakeholder relationships, and who commit to the success of all candidates by creating a socially just and caring professional learning community

#### ***Claim 4: Cross-cutting Themes***

All graduates of the MSU Educational Leadership Program are leaders with technological knowledge and cultural competence, and with a knowledge of the importance of life-long ongoing professional development, which builds upon program knowledge.

This is our first annual report. Data in this annual report as it relates to ongoing monitoring of our claims was systematically collected beginning with students entering the program in summer 2010; however some data points exist for students entering the program during 2009.

### Addressing Weaknesses:

Results from the Audit Report received on August 10, 2010 found that,

“The program uses a comprehensive array of assessment measures; however, the Proposal lacks a rationale for individual measures and the system as a whole.

As a result of this finding, the following area of weakness was identified:

Weakness in 2.3: Not all the assessment results that the program is proposing are currently collected and a system of collecting and monitoring data needs development.

With the weakness the following stipulation was indicated:

Stipulation in 2.1: The program needs to develop a clear rationale for the assessment instruments, the rubrics for scoring, and the criteria for success for each assessment it is proposing to use to support its claims.

### Assessment System

To address the weakness and stipulation specified by the TEAC Accreditation Panel, the program has hired a data entry person to record the assessment data for the assessments aligned with the Montana State University Educational Leadership Program claims. In 2011, some of the originally proposed assessments for collecting data have been replaced with ones that more provide more precise measures of Knowledge, Relevance, Caring and Cross-Cutting Themes claims. We have not eliminated or added any assessments since our year 2011 revisions (see appendix E for the revisions made in 2011). We see two purposes for our assessment system: to evaluate candidate progress and our program claims. For each of our assessments we have established the criteria for both program and student success. This information will allow us to track student progress toward program completing and engage in a continuous program improvement cycle as we examine our assessment data on a yearly basis.

We have designed our assessment system around recommendations made by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) (<http://www.edleadershipprep.org>). The purpose of this organization is to make available valid and reliable evaluation research tools and methods for systematically collecting and analyzing data on degrees and certifications by institution, career advancement and school progress by graduates and institutions. The center is supported by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and the Utah Policy Center.

The recommendations for collecting evidence and evaluating outcomes made by the NCEELPP are aligned with requirements for programs seeking national accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). The evidence recommended to be collected and analyzed for program accreditation purposes is based on the standards and guidelines recommended by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). The NCEELPP publication, “Developing Evaluation Evidence: A Formative and Summative Evaluation Planner for Educational Leadership Preparation Programs, recommends that nine types of data be collected for program

and student evaluation purposes: Pre-conditions, Program Quality Features, Formative Assessments of Candidates Learning, Summative Assessments of Candidates Learning, Career Advancement Outcomes, Leadership Practices, Staff and School Practices, Staff and School Effectives, and student outcomes. Each of our assessments will be designated as one of the nine categories of evidence recommended by the NCEELPP in our rationale for each assessment described in the next section.

We have used EXCEL as the electronic mechanism to capture the assessment data used to evaluate our program claims. Assessment data has been entered and collected systematically for candidates who were admitted in summer 2010 and beyond to the Masters and Educational Specialist Degree programs in Educational Leadership. The data for doctoral programs is recorded for candidates admitted during the 2010 academic year. Data available for students entering the program in 2009 were recorded in the database when available. The data that we have collected to evaluate our claims has been revised since our initial inquiry brief submission (see Appendix E). A description of the updated assessment system with the rationale for the assessments is described in the following section and in Appendix E. A preliminary analysis of the assessment system data is located in **Tables 1-9 on pages 14 - 26.**

## **MA Educational Leadership**

### **Demographic Data (NCEELPP Pre-Conditions):**

We have entered data related to candidates' gender, semester entered the program, race, cohort, state of residence and previous graduate degree.

#### **Gender**

Rationale: Gender is recorded to monitor equity in outcomes and insure program is free of bias

#### **Semester entered the Program**

Rationale: Semester entered the Program is recorded to view quality of student progress and program quality over time. Establish the impact of various program modifications and innovations on student outcomes.

#### **Race**

Rationale: Race is recorded to monitor equity in outcomes and insure program is free of bias as well as measure the degree of student diversity over time.

**Cohort**

Rationale: The cohort model of program delivery has been adopted and we plan to disaggregate data by cohort to determine how they might differentially inform our claims.

**State of Residence**

Rationale: State Residency is recorded to assess the degree of regional recruiting and any impact residency may have on instruction, student progression, and/or program quality.

**Previous Graduate Degree**

Rationale: Previous Graduate Degree is recorded to assess the impact that prior graduate education has on student progression through the program and program quality. For example, is there a difference in educational quality for students who have a previous graduate degree and elect to take only the courses needed for Administrative licensure versus those with a previous degree and elect to complete a 2<sup>nd</sup> Master's degree in Educational Leadership?

**Assessments, Student Success Criteria and Program Success Criteria****Admissions Score**

Rationale: This assessment is undertaken to ensure that candidates have the prerequisite, knowledge, skills and dispositions to complete the MA program in Educational Leadership.

Candidate Success - Candidates will earn a mean score of 15

Program Success- 90 % of students will earn an admissions score of 15 or higher

**The Educational Theory Into Practice Software (ETIPS) case studies (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 1)**

ETIPS Organizational Leadership Case Study  
 ETIPS Relational Leadership Case Study  
 ETIPS Instructional Leadership Case Study

**Rationale:** The Educational Theory Into Practice Software (ETIPS) case studies have been developed Educational Leadership faculty at the University of Virginia and recommended by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Evidence for the validity of these assessments for both program and student success has been established by the University of Virginia's research team. Research by Scott, Tucker & Dexter (2010) found that the use of ETIPS cases to assess the decision-making skills of educational administrators was able to discriminate among novice, and experts in their cognitive processing of information and matched key performance aspects for each sub-step of the decision-making process. In addition, their research demonstrated an acceptable inter-rater reliability coefficient of .77. Inter-rater reliability for the MSU Educational Leadership program faculty ratings will be determined during the 2010-2011 academic year for the three ETIPS assessments used to assess claim 1. The ETIPS case studies provide evidence of Claim 1 because it explicitly quantifies students' understanding of applying educational leadership theories, specifically organizational leadership, relational leadership and instructional leadership theories, to a specific context. The process of decision making expertise is a result of rigorous education (Schon, 1991; Argyris, 1999); therefore the measurement of this process is a sound basis for evidence of Claim 1. It is important to note that we will be using the ETIPS software to develop, and establish the local reliability and validity of the ETIPS Case Study.

**Student Success Criteria:** Students must earn a score of 80% or more on two of the three ETIPS case studies for mastery.

**Program Success Criteria:** 90% of candidates achieve mastery on at least two of the three ETIPS case studies

**Praxis Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 1)**

**Rationale:** The Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision test is intended to assess a candidate's knowledge of the functions of an administrator or supervisor, including the background of information needed to implement these functions.

This assessment covers five content areas: determining educational needs, curriculum design and instructional improvement, staff development and program evaluation, school management, and individual and group leadership skills. These content areas reflect the most current research and professional judgment and experiences of educators responsible for preparing school administrators from across the United States. Praxis Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision has undergone rigorous development to ensure that the scores provide reliable and valid evidence about candidates' educational leadership skills (ETS, 2010). Collecting candidate scores from this nationally standardized test will allow us to make norm-referenced comparisons to determine how our candidates compare to candidates enrolled and completing other educational administration programs from across the United States. Students will complete the Praxis Examination while enrolled in the capstone course taken at the end of their coursework. The Praxis will be used only as a program assessment until such time as (1) the Montana Board of Public Instruction establishes a cut score or (2) a sufficient number of MSU students take the exam to establish a local cutoff score that is demonstrated as valid. For program evaluation purposes the cut score provided below was provided on each score sheet as the U.S. mean score minus the standard error at a 95% confidence level.

Candidate Success- Candidates must achieve an score of 158

Program Success- 90% of candidates achieve a score of 158

### **EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation Project Grade (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 1)**

Rationale: Effective supervision of instruction is a key understanding in the practice of educational leadership. In the supervision simulation project, students demonstrate their ability to accurately assess individual instructional strengths and weaknesses as well as determine an appropriate professional development plan. Supervision Simulations were a recommended assessment for principal preparation (NCEELPP, 2010). For these reasons, it has been included as a means of providing evidence to Claim 1. Local validity and reliability of the scoring rubric needs to be established during SY 2011-12.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates must earn a mastery score of 85% correct or better  
 Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates will achieve mastery (85% correct)

### **Portfolio Reflection Score (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 1)**

Assessment: Portfolio Reflection Score

**Rationale:** Provides both, a measure of individual's leadership and administrative knowledge by requiring candidates to reflect on and synthesize their coursework and from that synthesis discuss their learning. The Portfolio Reflection Rubric seeks to capture and measure the degree of students' learning from the reflection. A rubric has been developed to assess this portion of the portfolio (see attached). Inter-rater reliability for faculty ratings will be established during the 2011-2012 school year.

**Student Success Criteria:** Candidates must earn a rating of "2" (Competent Understanding) proficiency for mastery

**Program Success Criteria:** 90% of candidates achieve a rating of Proficient Understanding (3)

### **Cumulative GPA (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 1)**

**Rationale:** The cumulative GPA is a more holistic reflection of student performance across all of their coursework. This assessment will be used for a program assessment only

**Program Success Criteria:** All students will earn a cumulative average GPA of 3.5 or higher

### **School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (NCEELPP Leadership Practice, Career Advancement, Staff and School Practices) (Claims 1 and 4)**

**Rationale:** The SLPPS is recommended by the University Council of Administration (UCEA) for assessment of educational leadership preparation programs to assess the quality and effectiveness of leadership and the school improvement work of graduates who become educational leaders. The SLPPS will be administered to all candidates upon graduating from the program (exit survey) and also administered to candidates one year after graduating from the program (follow-up survey). Through factor analysis with The SLPPS assesses 15 leadership areas: Active-Learning instructional practices, Knowledgeable - competent faculty, Supportive Organizational Structure, Challenging-coherent-reflective program content, Leading learning program focus and content, Positive student relationships, Internship quality attributes, Learned to lead vision and ethics, Learned to lead learning for candidates and teachers, Learned to lead organizational learning, Learned management and operations, Learned to lead parent and community involvement, Positive beliefs about the principalship and Negative Beliefs about the principalship. The internal reliability of the 15 subscales ranges from .712 to .90. Furthermore in 2008, the SLLPS was completed by educational leadership candidates from 9 states and enrolled in 25 different institutions. Thus, national

norms are available that will allow us norm-referenced comparisons about program effectiveness and allow us to determine how our candidates rate our program in comparison to candidates enrolled and completing other educational administration programs nationally. The SLLPS will be used only a program assessment indicator.

Program Success: Candidates will meet or exceed the national mean SLPPS items scores

**Site Supervisor’s Evaluation adapted from the North Carolina School Executive: Principal Evaluation Form (NCEELPP Formative and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 2)**

Rationale: This assessment will serve as a guide for aspiring principals as they reflect upon and improve their effectiveness as school leaders. The North Carolina School Executive: Principal Evaluation Form assesses the following skill areas:

- Strategic Leadership
- Instructional Leadership
- Cultural Leadership
- Human Resource Leadership
- Managerial Leadership
- External Development Leadership
- Micropolitical Leadership

Student Success Criteria: Students will earn a score of Proficient

Program Success Criteria: 90% of students earn will a score of proficient

**Logged Field Experience Hours (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 2)**

Rationale: Researchers have demonstrated a connection between the amount of pre-service field experiences provided to principals and skill. The Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC) standards require a prolonged and in-depth field experience to facilitate skill development among students. The number of logged field experience hours quantifies each students field experience participation, thus establishing evidence for Claim 2

Student Success Criteria: Candidates log a minimum of 226 hours

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates log at least 226 hours



### **Portfolio Artifacts Score (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 2)**

Rationale: Provides both, a measure of individual's leadership and administrative skills by requiring candidates to reflect on artifacts representing projects completed during their field experience activities. For example, candidates may have created a student handbook and included this as a portfolio artifact. A rubric has been developed to assess this portion of the portfolio (see attached). Inter-rater reliability among faculty will be established during the 2011-2012 school year.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates must earn a rating of "2" (Competent Understanding) proficiency for mastery

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates achieve a rating of Proficient Understanding (3)

### **Field Experience Grade (Claim 2)**

Rationale: Researchers have demonstrated a connection between the amount of pre-service field experiences provided to principals and skill. The Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC) standards require a prolonged and indepth field experience to facilitate skill development among students. The number of logged hours provides evidence of participation in field experience, but not the quality of the experience. The Field Experience Grade incorporates the student's reflected understanding of the experiences that he or she participated in as well as the university supervisor's assessment of the quality of the experiences. Therefore, the field experience grade provides a data point describing the quality of leadership skills as well as the quality of the student's skill in reflection on those experiences. In these ways the Field Experience Grade provides evidence of Claim 2.

Student Success Criteria: Student must achieve a grade of "B" for mastery

Program Success Criteria: 90% will achieve a grade of "B"

### **Portfolio Platform (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Summative Assessment of Candidate Learning) (Claim 3)**

Rationale: This assessment is designed to capture student dispositions through reflections about their philosophy of leadership that are related to common program values. Specifically, it focuses on their dispositions toward engaging practices indicative of transformational leadership. The rubric seeks to measure the degree to which the student understands transformational leadership and is willing to employ transformational leadership practices. The use of transformational leadership in schools as well as the development of professional learning communities connects

organizational culture to an ethic of care as defined by Sergiovanni, 2005. Therefore such a measure provides evidence of Claim 3. A rubric has been developed to assess this portion of the portfolio (see attached).

Student Success Criteria: Candidates must earn a rating of “2” (Competent Understanding) proficiency for mastery

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates achieve a rating of Proficient Understanding (3)

### **Job Placement (NCEELPP Career Advancement Outcome) (Claim 3)**

Rationale: The MSU Educational Leadership program seeks to prepare educational leaders for roles as school and school systems administrators; therefore, placement in an administration position is an indicator of Claim 3. Job placement will be used as an indicator of program success. We will also compare MSU placement rates to the national placement rates gathered by the SLPPS. This assessment will only be used to assess program success.

Student Success: 50% of graduates will be placed in administrative positions within one year of graduation.

### **Job retention (NCEELPP Career Advancement Outcome)(Claim 3)**

Rationale: Job retention will also be assessed using the SLPPS as a follow-up survey. We will determine the percent of candidates who have retained their administrative positions within one year of obtaining an administrative position. Retention in an administrative position for a year or more is an indicator of program quality and speaks directly to the preparedness of candidates educated in this program. Additionally we will compare our retention rates to those from data supplied by the SLPPS.

Assessment: Job placement: 90% of graduates will retain their administrative positions after one year of placement.

### **Professional Development Plan Score using the McREL (Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory) Balanced Leadership Profile (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidate Learning (Claim 4)**

Rationale: The purpose of this assessment is to identify candidates' strengths and weaknesses in educational leadership decision-making. McREL has developed this instrument to assess candidates' development and growth of professional

goals and educational leadership decision-making skills. We have developed a rubric to locally assess the life-long learning goals assessed by the Balanced Leadership Profile (see attached). Using an externally developed valid, profile allows students to determine their strengths and weaknesses, provides a sound and consistent basis for students to develop a professional development plan. Creating a rubric that assesses such a professional development plan is a sound measure of a student's ability in planning lifelong learning activities. The score of this rubric appears to be a sound method of evidence for Claim 4. The assessment has established reliability and validity. Using the results of the assessment, candidates will establish short and long-term goals. We have a locally developed a rubric assess the life-long learning goals developed by the candidate based on the results of the Balanced Leadership Profile.

**Grade in EDLD 534: Data Driven Decision-Making (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature) (Claim 4) , Grade in EDLD 555: School Finance (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature) (Claim 4), and Grade in EDLD 520: Schools and Diverse Communities**

Rationale: The rationale for EDLD 534 (Data Driven Decision-Making) and EDLD 555 (School finance) is that these courses will assess candidate technological knowledge and cultural competence, and with a grasp of the importance of life-long ongoing professional development, which builds upon program knowledge. Specifically the grades from both Data Driven Decision Making and School Finance will be based on student competencies to use data analysis software to complete their assignments. Candidates will be also be required to complete assignments in the Schools and Community course that will show evidence of their knowledge of cultural competencies.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates must earn a B for mastery

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates reach mastery

## **Ed.D/Ed.S Educational Leadership**

### **Admissions Score**

Rationale: This assessment is undertaken to ensure that candidates have the prerequisite, knowledge, skills and dispositions to complete the MA program in Educational Leadership.

Candidate Success - Candidates will earn a mean score of 30 or higher

Program Success- 90 % of students will earn an admissions score of 30 or higher

### **ETIPS Central Office Case Study (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidates Learning) (Claim 1)**

Rationale: The Educational Theory Into Practice Software (ETIPS) case studies have been developed Educational Leadership faculty at the University of Virginia and recommended by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Evidence for the validity of these assessments for both program and student success has been established by the University of Virginia's research team. Research by Scott, Tucker & Dexter (2010) found that the use of ETIPS cases to assess the decision-making skills of educational administrators was able to discriminate among novice, and experts in their cognitive processing of information and matched key performance aspects for each sub-step of the decision-making process. In addition, their research demonstrated an acceptable interrater reliability coefficient of .77. Inter-rater reliability for the MSU Educational Leadership program faculty ratings will be determined during the 2010-2011 academic year for the three ETIPS assessments used to assess claim 1. The ETIPS case studies provide evidence of Claim 1 because it explicitly quantifies students' understanding of applying educational leadership theories, specifically organizational leadership, relational leadership and instructional leadership theories, to a specific context. The process of decision making expertise is a result of rigorous education (Schon, 1991; Argyris, 1999); therefore the measurement of this process is a sound basis for evidence of Claim 1. It is important to note that we will be using the ETIPS software to develop, and establish the local reliability and validity of the ETIPS Case Study.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates must accurately respond to 80% of the questions to achieve mastery

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates achieve mastery on at least two of the three ETIPS case studies

**Candidates Pass Comprehensive Exam by the end of 4 Academic semesters (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidates Learning) (Claim 1)**

Rationale: Candidates need to make adequate progress toward the completion of their comprehensive exam or they are in danger of not completing the dissertation. The graduate school requires candidates to complete the comprehensive exam within five years of completing their coursework.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt

Program Success Criteria: 90% candidates transition from end of coursework to comprehensive exam in 24 months maximum.

**Candidates Pass Dissertation Defense by the end of 10 academic years. (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature and Formative Assessment of Candidates Learning) (Claim 1)**

Rationale: Montana State University School of Graduate Education requirements state that candidates have a total of 10 years to complete their doctoral coursework and their dissertation requirements.

Student Success Criteria: Candidates pass dissertation defense on first attempt.

Program Success Criteria: 90% of candidates complete dissertation within five years from passing comprehensive exams

**Establishing Inter-rater Reliability**

An inter-rater reliability of .81 has been calculated for the MA program Admissions rubric score. The inter-rater reliability for the Ed.D admissions rubric for the 2010 cohort was .92. However, inter-rater reliability still needs to be established for the four ETIPS case studies, portfolio reflection, portfolio artifacts, portfolio platform, Balanced Leadership Goals, EDLD 508 simulation case study and rubric for the North Carolina Evaluation form. Establishing inter-rater reliability for each assessment will begin by having the Educational Leadership faculty score examples of student work for each assessment, compare ratings and reach consensus about applying the rubric score points consistently. Then a sample of each of the assessments listed above will be scored by two Educational Leadership faculty. Those scores will then be used to calculate the inter-rater reliability for each assessment.

**Analysis of Assessment Data**

Data for the assessments collected for both the M.A. and Ed.D programs was analyzed by claim and is reported in the following tables.

Table 1

Claim 1

Cohort	Admissions Score		ETIPS Organizational Leadership Case Study		ETIPS Relational Leadership Case Study		ETIPS Instructional Leadership Case Study		EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation		Portfolio Reflection		Cumulative GPA	
	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success
<b>Rural</b>	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Online</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Billings</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Table 3.

Doctoral Assessment Results for Claim 1

<b>Admissions Scores</b>		<b>Cumulative GPA</b>	
Candidate Success	Program Success	Candidate Success	Program Success
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes





M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)	% Candidates at or above average score of 15	% of Students Reaching Mastery	% of Students Reaching Mastery	% of Students Reaching Mastery	% of Students Reaching Mastery	% of Students Reaching Mastery	Praxis	% of Students with a Cumulative GPA of 3.5 or higher	
<b>Rural</b>						100%			NA
<b>2009</b>	100%	100%	80%	80%	NA	100%		100%	NA
<b>2010</b>	95%	50%	59%	90%	100%	100%		96%	NA
<b>2011</b>	93%	88%	70%	NA	100%	NA		92%	NA
<b>2012</b>	88	80%	NA	54%	NA	70%		NA	NA
<b>Online</b>									
<b>2009</b>	85%	NA	0%	60%	NA	100%		92%	NA
<b>2011</b>	100%	40%	80%	NA	100%	NA		100%	NA
<b>2012</b>	100%	83%	100%	NA	100%	NA			NA
<b>Billings</b>									
<b>2010</b>	100	90%	89%	NA	100%	NA		NA	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>									
<b>2009</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	100%		66%	NA	NA	NA		100%	NA
<b>2012</b>	100%	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA

<sup>a</sup>mean

<sup>b</sup>standard deviation

NA = Not Assessed Yet

<sup>1a</sup> Candidate Success - Candidates will earn a mean score of 15

<sup>1b</sup> Program Success- 90 % of students will earn an admissions score of 15 or higher

<sup>2a</sup> Candidate Success - Students must earn a score of 80% or more on two of the three ETIPS case studies. or more on two of the three ETIPS case studies for mastery.

<sup>2b</sup> Program Success- 90 % of candidates achieve proficient understanding

<sup>3a</sup> Candidate Assessment - Candidates must achieve a mastery score of 85%

<sup>3b</sup> Program Assessment - 90% of Candidates will reach mastery

<sup>4a</sup> Candidate Success - Candidates must achieve an average score of 2

<sup>5a</sup> Candidate Success- Candidates must achieve a score of 158

<sup>5b</sup> Program Success- 90% of candidates achieve a score of 158

<sup>4b</sup> Program Success- 90 % of candidates achieve a mean score of 3 (Proficient understanding)

<sup>6</sup> Program Success-All students will earn a cumulative average GPA of 3.5 or higher

Table 5

Claim 2:Applying Knowledge for Effective Decision-Making (Relevance)							
M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)	North Carolina Principal Evaluation Form <sub>8</sub>	Logged Hours <sub>9a,9b</sub>		Portfolio Artifacts <sub>10a, 10b</sub>		EDLD 574 Field Experience Grade <sub>11a,11b</sub>	SLPPS Follow-up Survey <sub>12</sub>
		M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>	M	SD	M	SD
<b>Rural</b>							
2009	NA	215	53	3	0	4	0
2010	NA	242	3.7	3.0	0	NA	NA
2011	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA
2012	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA
<b>Online</b>							
2009	NA	243	10	24	.97	NA	NA
2011	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA
2012	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA
<b>Billings</b>							
2010	NA	247	10	NA		NA	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>							
2009	NA	NA		NA		4.0	0
2011	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA
2012	NA	NA		NA		NA	NA

<b>M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)</b>		<b>% with 226 logged hours</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>	<b>% Earning a B or above</b>	
<b>Rural</b>					
<b>2009</b>	NA	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2010</b>	NA	100%	100%	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Online</b>					
<b>2009</b>	NA	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Billings</b>					
<b>2010</b>	NA	100%	85%	NA	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>					
<b>2009</b>	NA	NA	NA	100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

<sup>a</sup>mean

<sup>b</sup>standard deviation

NA = Not Assessed Yet

<sup>8a</sup>Candidate Success- average score of 2

<sup>8b</sup>Program Success - 90% of candidates earn a score of 2

<sup>9a</sup> Candidate Success - candidates log at least 226 hours

<sup>9b</sup> Program Success - 90% of candidates log at least 226 hours

<sup>10a</sup> Candidate Success - an average score of 2 (Competent Understanding)

<sup>10b</sup>Program Success- 90 % of candidates achieve a mean score of 3 (Proficient understanding)

<sup>11a</sup> Candidate Success - Candidates must achieve a B for mastery

<sup>11b</sup> Program Success - 90% of candidates will earn a B or above

Table 6

<b>Claim 3: Caring Relationships</b>					
<b>M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)</b>	<b>Portfolio Platform<sub>13a,13b</sub></b>		<b>Follow - up SLLPPS<sub>14</sub></b>	<b>Job Placement<sub>15</sub></b>	<b>Job Retention<sub>16</sub></b>
	<b>M<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SD<sup>b</sup></b>			
<b>Rural</b>					
<b>2009</b>	3.0	0	NA	NA	NA
<b>2010</b>	3.0	0	NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA
<b>Online</b>					
<b>2009</b>	2.7	.20	NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	3.0	0	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA
<b>Billings</b>					
<b>2010</b>	3.0	0	NA	NA	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>					
<b>2009</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA		NA	NA	NA

<b>M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>			
<b>Rural</b>				
<b>2009</b>	100%	NA	NA	NA
<b>2010</b>	100%	NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Online</b>				
<b>2009</b>	100%	NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Billings</b>				
<b>2010</b>	23%	NA	NA	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>				
<b>2009</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA

<sup>a</sup>mean

<sup>b</sup>standard deviation

<sup>13a</sup> Candidate Success - an average score of 2 (Competent Understanding)

<sup>13b</sup> Program Success- 90 % of candidates achieve a mean score of 3 (Proficient Understanding)

Table 7

Claim 4 : Cross-cutting Themes						
M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)	McREL Balanced Leadership Profile/Goals <sup>17a,17b</sup>	EDLD 534 Data Driven Decision Making Grade <sup>18a,18b</sup>	EDLD 555 Montana School Finance Grade <sup>19a,19b</sup>	EDLD 520 Schools & Diverse Communities Grade <sup>20a,20b</sup>	SLLPPS Follow-UP Survey <sup>21</sup>	
	M <sup>a</sup> SD <sup>b</sup>	M SD	M SD	M SD		
<b>Rural</b>						
<b>2009</b>	3.0 .1	3.76 .97	4.0 0	4.0 0		NA
<b>2010</b>	3.0 0	3.91 .30	3.87 .34	3.79 .92		NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	3.64 1.20	4.0 0	3.91 .30		NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
<b>Online</b>						
<b>2009</b>	3.0 0	4.0 0	3.6 .20	3.9 .28		NA
<b>2011</b>	3.0 0	4.0 0	4.0 0	4.0 0		NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
<b>Billings</b>						
<b>2010</b>	3.0 0	4.0 0	4.0 0	4.0 0		NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>						
<b>2009</b>	NA	4.0 0	4.0 0	3.89 .33		NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	4.0 0	3.67 .6		NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA

<b>M.A. Educational Leadership Cohorts (2009-2012)</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>	<b>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>	
<b>Rural</b>					
<b>2009</b>	100%	92%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2010</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Online</b>					
<b>2009</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Billings</b>					
<b>2010</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>Certification (Principal/Supt)</b>					
<b>2009</b>	NA	100%	100%	100%	NA
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	100%	100%	NA
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

<sup>a</sup>mean

<sup>b</sup>standard deviation

NA = Not Assessed Yet

<sup>17a</sup> Candidate Success - an average score of 2 (Competent Understanding)

<sup>17b</sup> Program Success- 90 % of candidates achieve a mean score of 3 (Proficient understanding)

<sup>18a</sup> Candidate success - Candidates must achieve a grade of B for mastery

<sup>18b</sup> Program success- 90% of candidates must achieve a B

<sup>19a</sup> Candidate success - Candidates must achieve a grade of B for mastery

<sup>19b</sup> Program success- 90% of candidates must achieve a B

<sup>20a</sup> Candidate success - Candidates must achieve a grade of B for mastery

<sup>20b</sup> Program success- 90% of candidates must achieve a B



Educational Leadership Ed.D Program Assessments

Table 8

Claim 1 - Knowledge (Rigor)								
Cohort	Admissions Rubric Score <sup>1a,1b</sup>		4 Academic semesters to the Comprehensive Exam	Comprehensive Exam Pass Rate	10 Academic Years Semesters completed Comprehensive Exam and Dissertation	ETIPS Central Office Year	Cumulative GPA <sup>6a,6b</sup>	
	M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>					M	SD
2008	13.25	8.75	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.95	.023
2010			NA	NA	NA	NA	3.95	.023
2012	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA		
	<b>% of students achieving an admissions score of 15 or above</b>						<b>% of students earning an average GPA of 3.5 or higher</b>	
	100%						100%	

NA = Not assessed Yet

<sup>a</sup> Mean

<sup>b</sup> Standard Deviation

<sup>1a</sup> Candidate Success - Mean rater score of 30 or above

<sup>2b</sup> Program Success - 90% of students achieve a mean score of 30 or above

<sup>6a</sup> Candidate Success: 100% of students will earn an average GPA of 3.5 or higher

<sup>6b</sup> Program Success Criteria: All students will earn a cumulative average GPA of 3.5 or higher

Table 9

<b>Claim 2:Applying Knowledge for Effective Decision-Making (Relevance)</b>		<b>Claim 3: Caring Relationships</b>		<b>Claim 4 : Cross-cutting Themes</b>	
<b>Dissertation</b>	<b>SLLPPS Exit Survey</b>	<b>SLLPPS Exit Survey</b>	<b>SLLPPS Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>Dissertation</b>	<b>Grade In EDLD 643 Social Justice</b>
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

NA = Not Assessed Yet



**Teacher Education Accreditation Council**

**Table of Program Options**

Option Name	Level	Number of completers in previous academic year (Sp/Su 2012)	Number of students enrolled in current academic year (Fall 2012)
Rural	Graduate	7	27
Online	Graduate	2	33
Billings	Graduate	7	11
Principal Certification	Graduate	1	13
		17	84

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
 EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EDLD 574 FIELD EXPERIENCE  
 SITE SUPERVISOR EVALUATION FORM  
 2012

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Site Supervisor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

MSU Ed. Leadership Supervisor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

As part of the MSU Field Experience process, you are requested to complete the following Field Experience Evaluation Survey Form. The survey will become part of the student’s record. Your input is very important, so please take a few minutes to complete the survey with the student identified. Thank you very much for your participation.

Instructions: Please read each numbered evaluation component below. Select the rating level, noted below, that best describes how you perceive this individual’s performance by checking one of the four options. **For each rating of “1”, please give an explanation for that score in the comment section.** When you have rated all of the components, please place this survey into an envelope and return to the MSU Field Experience Supervisor.

- 3 The student administrator is *highly effective* in demonstrating this behavior.
- 2 The student administrator *usually* demonstrates this behavior.
- 1 The student administrator *needs improvement* on this behavior.
- NA **Not applicable**/no basis for judgment.

1.	Reviews student achievement data with staff when developing vision and goals for school/program.	1	2	3	NA
2.	Includes all appropriate stakeholders when developing goals for the school/program.	1	2	3	NA
3.	Sets high expectations for students and staff.	1	2	3	NA
4.	Communicates the school/program goals effectively to the community.	1	2	3	NA
5.	Fosters diversity in the school as a part of the vision and goals.	1	2	3	NA
6.	Is aware of current best practices to promote a positive learning culture.	1	2	3	NA
7.	Monitors the instructional program.	1	2	3	NA
8.	Leads efforts to develop programs that promote a positive learning culture.	1	2	3	NA
9.	Recognizes staff and student accomplishments that support				

	the learning culture.	1	2	3	NA
10.	Conducts the transformative change process in a manner consistent with promoting a positive school learning culture.	1	2	3	NA
11.	Resolves problems efficiently in such a way that precludes similar problems from occurring in the future.	1	2	3	NA
12.	Manages resources, distributes budgets and staff in a fair manner.	1	2	3	NA
13.	Complies with laws, policies, regulations, and collective bargaining agreements.	1	2	3	NA
14.	Creates a safe and secure climate using best practices in this area.	1	2	3	NA
15.	Values instructional time by limiting interruptions and distractions.	1	2	3	NA
16.	Treats everyone in a professional and respectful manner.	1	2	3	NA

A rating of one (1) must be explained. Please add comments to explain any rating of one (1) on any response.

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

Site Supervisor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

My signature above means that I have reviewed this Evaluation Form but that I do not necessarily agree with component ratings and/or summative evaluation rating or comments in this form.

Student Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**This Evaluation Form is to be mailed to:**

**Gerald Pease, Montana State University – Educational Leadership, P.O. Box 172880, Room 116 Reid Hall, Bozeman, Montana, 59717**

Rubric for Portfolio Platform

Domain	No Understanding Demonstrated (0)	Basic Understanding (1)	Competent Understanding (2)	Proficient Understanding (3)	Score
<b>Establishing High Standards</b>	Discussion of learning standards was not addressed and/or a conveyed teacher perspective	Discussion of establishing high learning standards was vague, generalized, and/or conveyed a generic approach	Discussion of establishing high learning standards reflected best-practices and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of establishing high learning standards demonstrated instructional leadership and was well integrated with other values	
<b>Engaging Stakeholders</b>	Discussion of stakeholder engagement was not addressed and/or inadequately conveyed an understanding of community stakeholders	Discussion of stakeholder engagement was vague, generalized, and/or a conveyed a generic approach to stakeholder engagement	Discussion of stakeholder engagement reflected best-practices and provided concrete, realistic leadership examples	Discussion of stakeholder engagement demonstrated participatory leadership and was well integrated with other values	
<b>Data-Based Decision Making</b>	Discussion of data-based decision making was not addressed and/or a conveyed predetermined response	Discussion of data-based decision making was vague, generalized, and/or a conveyed generic approach to problem solving	Discussion of data-based decision making reflected best-practices, open-mindedness and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of data-based decision making demonstrated an inquiry-based approach and was well integrated with other values	

<b>Advocating for All Students</b>	Discussion of student advocacy was not addressed and/or a limited understanding of diversity	Discussion of student advocacy was vague, generalized, and/or conveyed a simplistic approach of diversity	Discussion of student advocacy reflected best-practices, cultural competency and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of student advocacy demonstrated a commitment to social justice principles and was well integrated with other values	
<b>Accepting Responsibility</b>	Discussion of personal responsibility was not addressed and/or conveyed an ego-centric perspective	Discussion of personal responsibility was vague, generalized, and/or a conveyed dualistic perspective	Discussion of personal responsibility reflected best-practices, ethical considerations and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of personal responsibility demonstrated ethical leadership and was well integrated with other values	
<b>Seeking Continuous Improvement</b>	Discussion of continuous school improvement was not addressed and/or conveyed a teacher perspective	Discussion of continuous school improvement was vague, generalized, and/or conveyed a cause and effect perspective	Discussion of continuous school improvement reflected best-practices, systems thinking, and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of continuous school improvement demonstrated transformational leadership and was well integrated with other values	
<b>Creating a Safe and Trusting Environment</b>	Discussion of establishing and maintaining a safe and trusting environment was not addressed and/or conveyed a limited perspective of school culture	Discussion of a positive school culture was vague, generalized, and/or conveyed a simplistic view of school culture	Discussion of a positive school culture reflected best-practices, an understanding of relational trust and provided concrete leadership examples	Discussion of a positive school culture demonstrated an understanding of collective efficacy and was well integrated with other values	

**Rubric For Portfolio Goals Statement**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>No Understanding Demonstrated (0)</b>	<b>Basic Understanding (1)</b>	<b>Competent Understanding (2)</b>	<b>Proficient Understanding (3)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Use of Self-Assessment</b>	No evidence provided to demonstrate the use of a self assessment	A self assessment instrument was used but the analysis was not reflective or was inaccurate	Self assessment instrument results were analyzed for self evaluation. Provides examples to demonstrate some results. Implicitly tied analysis to standards.	Synthesizes concepts, standards and self-assessment feedback as tools for critique used in self-evaluation. Provides concrete examples that define current level using this synthesis	
<b>Use of Professional Network</b>	Use of a professional network or learning community was not discussed	Demonstrated use of a professional network but use was limited or not realistic	Appropriately incorporates the use of a professional network to facilitate professional development	Explicitly and appropriately considers the use of professional network of relationships. Provides specific examples	
<b>Articulation of Plan</b>	Plans for professional development beyond graduate were not addressed	Professional development plan was outlined but the plan's objectives were limited, generalized or not aligned with the self- assessment.	Professional development plan was aligned with the self-assessment and fully explained with clear objectives and rationale	Clearly and explicitly articulates a workable plan for continuing professional development that is aligned with self-evaluation	
<b>Commitment to Live-long Learning</b>	No evidence of commitment to live long learning was demonstrated	Commitment to live long learning is not well articulated or generalized	Commitment to livelong learning is explicitly discussed and appropriate and individualized	Clearly and explicitly articulates a commitment to livelong learning and ongoing reflective practice	
				<b>Total Score</b>	



Rubric for Portfolio Artifacts

Domain	No Understanding Demonstrated (0)	Basic Understanding (1)	Competent Understanding (2)	Proficient Understanding (3)	Score
Standard 1- Articulating a Vision	Artifact reflects little to no understanding of goal-setting or vision development	Artifact reflects the use of key concepts and best practices in school improvement but at a superficial level or best practice is not accurately applied	Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts and best practices in school improvement and change management	Artifact explicitly reflects the use of specific key concepts and best practices in school improvement planning and leading change	
Standard 2- Instructional Leadership	Artifact reflects little to no understanding of instructional supervision or instructional leadership	Artifact reflects the use of key concepts and best practices in creating an appropriate instructional environment but at a superficial level or best practice is not accurately applied	Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts and best practices in creating an appropriate instructional environment	Artifact explicitly reflects the use of specific key concepts and best practices in developing a professional learning community	
Standard 3- Program Management	Artifact reflects little to no understanding of managing school programs	Artifact reflects the use of key concepts and best practices in managing school programs but at a superficial level or best practice is not accurately applied	Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts and best practices in establishing or facilitating effective management processes	Artifact explicitly reflects the use of specific key concepts and best practices in creating or sustaining effective management systems	
Standard 4- Engagement of Parents and Community	Artifact reflects little to no understanding of engaging diverse constituents of the school	Artifact reflects the use of key concepts and best practices in parent and community engagement but at a superficial level or best practice is not	Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts and best practices in engaging the community and/or all parents	Artifact explicitly reflects the use of specific key concepts and best practices in culturally competent leadership and/or facilitating positive parent	

		accurately applied		engagement	
<b>Standard 5- Ethical Leadership</b>	<b>Artifact reflects little to no understanding of ethical leadership practice</b>	<b>Artifact reflects the use of key concepts and best practices arriving at fair, ethical, and socially just decisions but at a superficial level or concepts of fair and ethical practice are not accurately applied</b>	<b>Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts in making decisions that are fair, socially just and/or demonstrate ethical school leadership practices</b>	<b>Artifact explicitly reflects the use of specific key concepts and best practices in determining a fair, ethical and socially just decisions which promote equity and effectiveness</b>	
<b>Standard 6- Context of Education</b>	<b>Artifact reflects little to no understanding of the overarching contexts of school systems</b>	<b>Artifact reflects the use of key concepts in how schools are impacted by the district, community or state but at a superficial level or best practice is not accurately applied</b>	<b>Artifact reflects the sound and thorough use of key concepts in how district, community, and/or state-level values, policies and practices impact the school</b>	<b>Artifact explicitly reflects an understanding of specific concepts in how larger systems (such as district, community and state) and schools are reciprocally impacted</b>	
<b>Overall connection between theory and practice</b>	<b>Artifacts provide little to no evidence of the use of best practice models</b>	<b>Artifacts reflect the use of key concepts and best practices in a generalized form or best practice is not consistently applied accurately</b>	<b>Artifacts consistently reflect the sound and thorough use of key concepts and best practices</b>	<b>Artifacts explicitly reflect specific best practices and researched-based models</b>	
<b>Evidence of participative or inclusionary practice</b>	<b>Artifacts provide little to no evidence that others were involved in the effort</b>	<b>Artifacts reflect some involvement of others but such involvement was superficial</b>	<b>Artifacts reflect the inclusion of stakeholders</b>	<b>Artifacts explicitly reflect a team effort or the purposeful inclusion of stakeholders</b>	
				<b>Total Score</b>	

**Rubric for Portfolio Reflection**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>No Understanding Demonstrated (0)</b>	<b>Basic Understanding (1)</b>	<b>Competent Understanding (2)</b>	<b>Proficient Understanding (3)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Vision</b>	Reflection of the role of vision in leadership does not reflect the application of best practices	Reflection on the role of vision in leadership connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources	Reflection on the role of vision in leadership accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences	Reflection on the role of vision in leadership integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences	
<b>Instructional Leadership</b>	Reflection of instructional leadership does not reflect the application of best practices	Reflection on instructional leadership connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources	Reflection on instructional leadership accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences	Reflection on instructional leadership integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences	
<b>School Management</b>	Reflection of school management does not reflect the application of best practices	Reflection on school management connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources	Reflection on school management accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences	Reflection on school management integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences	

<b>Family and Community Engagement</b>	<b>Reflection of family and community engagement does not reflect the application of best practices</b>	<b>Reflection on family and community engagement connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources</b>	<b>Reflection on family and community engagement accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences</b>	<b>Reflection on family and community engagement integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences</b>	
<b>Ethical Leadership</b>	<b>Reflection of ethical leadership does not reflect the application of best practices</b>	<b>Reflection on ethical leadership connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources</b>	<b>Reflection on ethical leadership accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences</b>	<b>Reflection on ethical leadership integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences</b>	
<b>Context of Education</b>	<b>Reflection on the larger context of education does not reflect the application of best practices</b>	<b>Reflection on the larger context of education connects best practice and experiences without citing seminal or researched-based sources</b>	<b>Reflection on the larger context of education accurately synthesizes specific best practices, using citations, with specific experiences</b>	<b>Reflection on the larger context of education integrates best practices as criteria for evaluating experiences</b>	

Scoring Rubric: ETIPS Leadership Cases

**Step One: Identify the Issue**

**Q1:** Consider what is going on at the school. Generate 3-5 explanations that you think could account for this. Check the one that you believe is at the heart of the issue.

<b>Criteria 1a: All statements, explanatory fluency</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant lists facts or empirical evidence from the case.	Participant provides <b>one</b> explanation that fits the given facts and evidence from the case.	Participant provides <b>two</b> explanations that fit the given facts and evidence from the case.	Participant provides <b>three</b> explanations that fit the given facts and evidence from the case.
<b>Criteria 1b: One bulleted statement's explanatory accuracy</b>			
Participant lists facts or empirical evidence from the case.	Participant describes one explanation that fits the facts and evidence from the case, but it is <b>not a relevant</b> issue.	Participant describes one explanation that is a <b>relevant</b> issue.	Participant describes one explanation that <b>uses given facts and evidence</b> as a <b>rationale</b> from the case, and it is a <b>relevant</b> issue.
<b>Criteria 1c: One bulleted statement's explanatory detail</b>			
Participant identifies an irrelevant issue <b>or</b> a relevant issue, but <b>without any rationale</b> .	Participant describes a relevant issue with a <b>rationale</b> that draws upon <b>one</b> factual detail.	Participant describes a relevant issue using a <b>rationale</b> that draws upon <b>two</b> factual details.	Participant describes a relevant issue using a <b>rationale</b> that draws upon <b>three or more</b> factual details.

**Q 2:** Identify eight key data sources that led you to conclude what the heart of the issue is.

<b>Criteria: Number of Matches with 8 Relevant Items ___ X .375 (up to max. of 3 pts)</b>
---

## School Website Map

About the School	Students	Staff	Curriculum and Assessment	Technology Infrastructure	School Community Connections	Professional Development
Mission Statement	Demographics	Demographics	Standards	School Wide Facilities	Family Involvement	PD Plan
School Improvement Plan	Performance	Mentoring	Instructional Sequence	Classroom Based Facilities	Business Involvement	Resources
Facilities	Schedule	Leadership	Computer Curriculum	Community Facilities	Higher Education Involvement	Leadership
	Student Leadership	Faculty Schedule	Classroom Pedagogy and Assessment	Technology Support Staff	Community Resources	Learning Community
		Faculty Meetings		Policies and Rules		Professional Development Process Goals
		Faculty Contract		Technology Committee		
				Technology Survey Results		
				Technology Plan and Budget		

## School Intranet Map

Student Data	Staff Data	Policies	Financial Records
Discipline	Supervision & Evaluation	Instruction	Budget
Attendance	Teacher Improvement Goals	Personnel	
Grades & Achievement	Staff assignments		
	Leadership Team Profile		

**Q 3:** In addressing this issue, identify the desired goals you hope to achieve.

<b>Criteria: Goal alignment with issue</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant lists a goal that is only meant to improve facts and evidence from the case.	Participant lists a vague goal possibly by reiterating the “purpose” of the case.	Participant lists a goal that addresses an issue he or she believes is affecting the facts and evidence in the case (i.e., explanation given in step one), but is <b>not</b> related to one of the actual relevant issues of the school.	Participant lists a goal that <b>addresses</b> one of the actual relevant issues the school is facing (i.e., explanation).

## Step Two: Guiding Principles

**Q 1:** How will the school goals and mission serve you as criteria for your decision?

<b>Criteria: Applying mission and goals to action</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant gives <b>vague</b> answer and does <b>not</b> reference the school goals or mission statement.	Participant <b>paraphrases</b> (literally) or quotes the school's goals or mission statement.	Participant cites and <b>interprets</b> use of the school's goals or mission statement. (Only implies how it will guide action)	Participant applies the school's goals or mission statement as <b>criteria</b> for solution of the problem.

**Q 2:** What principles of professional (declarative) knowledge will serve as your criteria for making a decision? Indicate your top three:

List of checked dispositions; no criteria for scoring.

<input type="checkbox"/>	learning goals in a pluralistic society
<input type="checkbox"/>	the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
<input type="checkbox"/>	systems theory
<input type="checkbox"/>	theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development
<input type="checkbox"/>	operational procedures at the school and district level
<input type="checkbox"/>	principles and issues relating to school safety and security
<input type="checkbox"/>	human resources management and development
<input type="checkbox"/>	principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management
<input type="checkbox"/>	principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space
<input type="checkbox"/>	legal issues impacting school operations
<input type="checkbox"/>	current technologies that support management functions

**Q 3:** Dispositions are what an administrator believes in, values, and is committed to. What dispositions will serve as your criteria for making a decision? Indicate your top three:

List of checked dispositions; no criteria for scoring.

- information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
- effective communication
- effective consensus-building and negotiation skills
- the educability of all
- a school vision of high standards of learning
- continuous school improvement
- the inclusion of all members of the school community
- ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults
- a willingness to continuously examine one's own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
- doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance
- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching
- taking risks to improve schools
- trusting people and their judgments
- accepting responsibility
- high-quality standards, expectations, and performances
- involving stakeholders in management processes
- a safe environment

**Q 4:** Select one of the dispositions from your list above and explain how it will serve you as a criterion for making a decision.

<b>Criteria: Applying dispositions to action</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant makes no connection between the disposition and the school in the case.	Participant gives vague answer, loosely connecting a disposition to something about the school in the case.	Participant cites a disposition and relates it to the participant-identified main issue in the school in the case.	Participant explains how the disposition will serve as a criterion for taking action in making a decision about the participant-identified issue in the school in the case.



## Step Three: Identify Alternative Solutions

**Q 1:** First, in the table below, list the two distinctly different alternatives you can identify for addressing the problem/issue, keeping in mind how you can be creative and consider new ideas. Second, for each alternative, check which of the criteria you identified in Step 2 align with this alternative. Third, consider school characteristics (such as programs, practices, tools, routines, structures, procedures, personnel, policies, systems) and for each alternative, indicate how they might serve as enablers or constraints.

### Alternative #1

<b>Criteria: Alternative addresses identified issue</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant identifies an alternative <b>without</b> explanation of how <b>or</b> why this choice will address the participant-identified main issue in the school <b>or</b> doesn't address own identified issue at all. ( <b>No</b> logic chain.)	Participant identifies an alternative and poorly explains how <b>or</b> why the choice will address participant-identified main issue in the school. ( <b>Incomplete</b> logic chain.)	Participant identifies an alternative and adequately explains how <b>or</b> why the choice will address participant-identified main issue. (A <b>complete</b> logic chain.)	Participant identifies an alternative and <b>clearly</b> explains how <b>and</b> why the choice will address the participant-identified main issue. (A <b>complete</b> logic chain.)
<b>Criteria: 2 Enablers and Constraints taken into consideration</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant <b>does not</b> account for enablers and constraints <b>about the school</b> in answer.	Participant makes <b>vague</b> references to enabler(s) and /or constraint(s) at the school. ( <b>Recall</b> of the context in alternative above.)	Participant takes enabler(s) and /or constraint(s) at the school <b>into consideration</b> in the formulation of alternative. ( <b>Application</b> of the context in alternative above.)	Participant <b>maximizes</b> enabler(s) and /or acknowledges constraint(s) at the school in the formulation of alternative. ( <b>Evaluation</b> of the context in alternative above.)

**Repeat for second alternative**

## Step Four: Best Alternative and Plan of Action

Only the selected alternative is scored.

**Q 2:** How will you articulate the direction you have set in order to create shared meanings and your performance expectations for moving in this direction? What data will you collect/monitor in order to help your leadership team track the school's progress and performance for this direction?

<b>Criteria: Setting Direction</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant does <b>not</b> discuss strategies for developing clear goals for the school, communicating them, <b>or</b> monitoring organizational performance.	Participant discusses <b>one or two</b> strategies for developing clear goals for the school, communicating them, <b>or</b> monitoring organizational performance.	Participant discusses <b>multiple</b> (3) strategies for developing a shared vision and goals for the school, communicating them, <b>or</b> monitoring organizational performance.	Participant discusses a <b>rich mix</b> (4 or more) of strategies for developing a shared vision and goals for the school, communicating them, <b>or</b> monitoring organizational performance.

**Q 3:** How will you develop people's capacity to move in this direction? What support and opportunities to learn are needed?

<b>Criteria: Developing the People</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant does <b>not</b> discuss strategies for supporting faculty reflection, learning and growth to foster improvement at the school level.	Participant discusses <b>one or two</b> strategies for supporting faculty reflection, learning, <b>or</b> growth to foster improvement at the school level.	Participant discusses <b>multiple</b> (3) strategies for supporting faculty reflection, learning, <b>or</b> growth to foster improvement at the school level.	Participant discusses a <b>rich mix</b> (4 or more) of strategies for supporting faculty reflection, learning, <b>or</b> growth to foster improvement at the school level.

**Q 4:** What will make the organization work to help you achieve movement in this direction? What are the entire range of conditions and incentives necessary in the school in order to fully support rather than inhibit stakeholders moving in the direction you've set?

<b>Criteria: Developing the Organization</b>			
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant does <b>not</b> discuss strategies for strengthening the school culture, modifying organizational structures, building collaborative processes, or managing the school environment.	Participant discusses <b>one or two</b> strategies for strengthening the school culture, modifying organizational structures, building collaborative processes, <b>or</b> managing the school environment.	Participant discusses <b>multiple</b> (3) strategies for strengthening the school culture, modifying organizational structures, building collaborative processes, <b>or</b> managing the school environment.	Participant discusses a <b>rich mix</b> (4 or more) of strategies for strengthening the school culture, modifying organizational structures, building collaborative processes, <b>or</b> managing the school environment.

## Cross-cutting Element of Coherence Crosscutting

0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Participant does <b>not</b> communicate a connection among these 4 elements: participant-identified issue, goal, alternatives, and plan of action. [Note: consider 3 parts of the plan of action together as 1 of the 4 elements.]	Participant communicates a <b>vague or disjointed</b> coherence because only 1 connection between any 2 of these 4 elements: participant-identified issue, goal, selected alternative, and the (three parts together making up the) plan of action.	Participant implies coherence by either 2 connections among <b>3</b> of these: participant-identified issue, goal, selected alternative, and the (three parts together making up the) plan of action <b>OR</b> connects <b>all 4</b> but not explicitly (logic must be <b>inferred</b> ).	Participant communicates an <b>explicit</b> line of logic among all <b>4</b> of these: participant-identified issue, goal, selected alternative, and (the three parts together making up) the plan of action.

Calculating the total score:

	Possible Points	Total
Step 1 Question 1A Question 1B Question 1C Question 2 Question 3	0-3 0-3 0-3 0-3 0-3	<b>Step1 sub-total 0-15</b>
Step 2 Question 1 Question 2 Question 4	0-3 0-3 0-3	<b>Step2 sub-total 0-9</b>
Step 3 Question 1A, part 1 Question 1A, part 2 Question 1B, part 1 Question 1B, part 2	0-3 0-3 0-3 0-3	<b>Step3 sub-total 0-12</b>
Step 4 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4	0-3 0-3 0-3	<b>Step4 sub-total 0-9</b>
Cross-cutting Element of Coherence	0-3	<b>sub-total 0-3</b>
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>0-48</b>

## References

- Argyris, C. (1999). *On organizational learning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell
- Orr, M.T., Young, M.D. & Rorrer, A. (2010). Developing evaluation evidence: A formative and summative evaluation planner for educational leadership programs. National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP): Salt Lake City: University of Utah.
- Schon, D. (1991). *The Reflective turn: case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat: Leading and learning in schools*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Scott, A.V, Tucker, P.D. & Dexter, S. (2010). Pre-service administrators' problem-framing ability: Seeing the elephant as part or whole.