

## TEAC Annual Report

### Montana State University Educational Leadership Program

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 both an assessment administrator and data entry person to record the assessment data for the assessments aligned with the Montana State University Educational Leadership Program claims. In addition, 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 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 assignment 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 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 1-8 on pages 14 - 20.

## **Updated Assessments, Student Success Criteria and Program Success Criteria**

### **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?

## **The Educational Theory Into Practice Software (ETIPS) case studies (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature) (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 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:** 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 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.

**Program Success Criteria:** 90% of candidates must score at or above the mean score for the nationally norm group for the Praxis Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision Exam

**EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation Project Grade (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature)  
(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) (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) (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 for 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

**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) (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 Formative 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.

**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 but 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)**

**Grade in EDLD 520: Schools and Community (NCEELPP Program Quality Feature) (Claim 4)**

**Rationale:** Candidates will demonstrate 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**

#### **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.



Table 3.

Doctoral Assessment Results for Claim 1

Admissions Scores	
Candidate Success	Program Success
Yes	Yes

Table 4

Claim 1: Knowledge (Rigor)

<b>M.A. Educational Leadership Cohort (2009-2011)</b>	<b>Admissions Rubric Score<sup>1a</sup> 1b</b>	<b>ETIPS Organizational Leadership<sup>2a, 2b</sup></b>	<b>ETIPS Relational Leadership<sup>2a, 2b</sup></b>	<b>ETIPS Instructional Leadership<sup>2a, 2b</sup></b>	<b>EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation<sup>3a</sup> , 3b</b>	<b>Portfolio Reflection 4a4b</b>	<b>Praxis<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>GPA Cumulative<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>SLPPS Exit Survey 7</b>
	<b>M<sup>a</sup> SD<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>M SD</b>	<b>M SD</b>	<b>M SD</b>	<b>M SD</b>	<b>M SD</b>		<b>M SD</b>	
<b>Rural</b>	23 4.5	NA	83% 17%	89% 9%	94% 6%	3 0	NA	3.97 .02	NA
<b>Online</b>	22 7.5	83% 11%	NA	81% 9%	NA	2.87 3.7	NA	3.95 .06	NA
<b>Billings</b>	24 4	92% 10%	95% 8%	NA	93% 4%	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>-</b>									
<b>-</b>	<b>% Candidates at or above average score of 15</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>% of Students Reaching Mastery</b>			
<b>Rural</b>	98	NA	54%	87%	100%	100%	NA	100%	NA
<b>Online</b>	88	80%	NA	54%	NA	70%	NA	100%	NA
<b>Billings</b>	100	90%	89%	NA	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA



Table 5

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

M.A. Educational Leadership Cohort (2009-2011)	North Carolina Principal Evaluation Form <sup>8</sup>	Logged Hours <sup>9a,9b</sup>	Portfolio Artifacts <sup>10a, 10b</sup>	EDLD 574 Field Experience Grade <sup>11a,11b</sup>	SLPPS Follow-up Survey <sup>12</sup>
		M SD	M SD	M SD	
Rural	NA	203 55	3 0	4 0	NA
Online	NA	233 10	3 .22	NA	NA
Billings	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
-		% with 240 logged hours	% of Students Reaching Mastery	% Earning a B or above	
Rural	NA	47%	100%	100%	NA
Online	NA	85%	85%	NA	NA
Billings	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 6

## Claim 3: Caring Relationships

M.A. Educational Leadership Cohort (2009- 2011)	Portfolio Platform		Follow - up SLLPPS	Job Placement	Job Retention
	M	SD			
Rural	3	0	NA	NA	NA
Online	2.7	.20	NA	NA	NA
Billings	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	% of Students Reaching Mastery				
Rural	100%		NA	NA	NA
Online	23%		NA	NA	NA
Billings	NA		NA	NA	NA

Table 7

Claim 4: Cross-cutting Themes

M.A. Educational Leadership Cohort (2009-2011)	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>	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Rural	3	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
Online	3	0	4	0	3.6	.20	3.9	.28
Billings	NA		NA		NA		NA	
	% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery	
Rural	100%		100%		100%		100%	
Online	100%		100%		100%		100%	
Billings	NA		NA		NA		NA	

## Analysis of Doctoral Assessments

Table 8

Doctoral Data Point for Claim 1

<b>Admissions Rubric Score</b>	<b>4 Academic semesters to the Comprehensive Exam</b>	<b>Comprehensive Exam Pass Rate</b>	<b>10 Academic Years Semesters completed Comprehensive Exam and Dissertation</b>	<b>ETIPS Central Office Year</b>	<b>Cumulative GPA</b>
M SD	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16 2.5					
<b>% of students achieving an admissions score of 15 or above</b>					
100%	NA				

NA = Not assessed Yet

<sup>1a</sup> Candidate Success - Mean rater score of 15 or above

<sup>2b</sup> Program Success - 90% of students achieve a mean score of 15 or above

## 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.

## Appendix E

Inventory: status of evidence from measures and indicators for TEAC <i>Quality Principle I</i>				
Type of Evidence	Available and in the <i>Brief</i> <sup>1</sup>		Not Available and Not in the <i>Brief</i>	
Note: items under each category are examples. Program may have more or different evidence	<u>Relied on</u>	<u>Not relied on</u>	<u>For future use</u>	<u>Not for future use</u>
	Reasons for including the results in the <i>Brief</i> & Location in <i>Brief</i>	Reasons for not relying on this evidence Location in <i>Brief</i>	Reasons for including in future <i>Briefs</i>	Reasons for not including in future <i>Briefs</i>
<b>Demographics</b>	<b>Page #</b>			
1. Cohort		5 & 6		We have adopted a cohort model for delivering instruction. Precondition evidence recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)
<b>Local Assessments</b>				
2. Signature Assignments for EDLD 630 and EDCI 607		10 & 11	Does not inform our claims as originally intended.	
3. Leadership Profile Inventory		10 & 11	Does not inform our claims as originally intended.	

<sup>1</sup> Assessment results related to TEAC *Quality Principle I* that the program faculty uses elsewhere must be included in the *Brief*. Evidence that is reported to the institution or state licensing authorities, or alluded to in publications, Web sites, catalogs, and the like must be included in the *Brief*. Therefore, Title II results, grades (if they are used for graduation, transfer, admission), admission test results (if they are used), hiring rates (if they are reported elsewhere) would all be included in the *Brief*.

4. Signature assessments in EDLD 520 and EDLD 555		10 & 11	The overall course grade is a better assessment for our claims		
5. Onsite Supervisor Field Experience/Internship Evaluation		10 & 11	Lacks established reliability and validity		
6. Course Grades		10 & 11	Grade Descriptors lack precision		
7. EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation Project grade		10 & 11		Program Quality and Formative Assessment of Candidate Knowledge Evidence recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
8. Cumulative GPA		10 & 11		Reflects a holistic view of student performance. Summative assessment of candidate knowledge recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
9. The McREL Balanced Leadership profile student developed goals.		10 & 11		This is a nationally normed, valid and reliable instrument contributing to goal development. Student performance is derived from a locally developed rubric that assesses life-long learning. Program Quality and formative assessment of candidate knowledge National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	

10. EDLD 534 Data Driven Decision Meeting Grade		10 & 11		The grade is a more holistic indicator of student performance and better matches claim 4. Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
11. EDLD 555 Montana School Finance Grade		10 & 11		The grade is a more holistic indicator of student performance and better matches claim 4. Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
12. EDLD 520 Schools and Diverse Communities Grade		10 & 11		The grade is a more holistic indicator of student performance and better matches claim 4. Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
13. Ed.D - Academic semesters completed prior to the Comprehensive Exam		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
14. Ed.D - Academic Semesters from Comprehensive Exam to completion of Dissertation		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	



<b>Nationally-Normed Assessments</b>					
15. Graduate Record Exam		6	We no longer require as an admission criteria for the M.A. program.		
16. Educational Theory into Practice Software Case study organizational Leadership		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
17. Educational Theory into Practice Software Case study Relational Leadership		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
18. Educational Theory into Practice Software Case study Instructional Leadership		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
19. Ed.D - ETIPS Central Office Case Study		10 & 11		Program Quality Assessment recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
20. Praxis Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision		10 & 11		Summative assessment of candidates knowledge recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	

21. School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (SLPPS) - Exit		10 & 11		Assessment of Leadership Practices, Staff and School Practices and Career Advancement recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
22. School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (SLPPS) – Follow-up		10 & 11		Assessment of Leadership Practices, Staff and School Practices and Career Advancement recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
23. North Carolina Principal Evaluation		10 & 11		The instrument has established reliability and validity. Program Quality and summative assessment of candidate knowledge recommended by National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	

<b>Field Experience-Internship</b>					
24. Logged Hours		10 & 11		Program Quality and Summative Assessment of Candidate Knowledge recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
<b>Ratings</b>					
25. Job Placement Rate		10 & 11		Assessment of Career Advancement recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	
26. Job Retention Rate		10 & 11		Assessment of Career Advancement recommended by the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCEELPP) and UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration)	



**EXCEL Data Spreadsheets for the M.A. in Educational Leadership**

**Claim 1 - Knowledge (Rigor)**

M.A. Educational Leadership Cohort (2009-2011)	Admissions Rubric Score <sup>1a 1b</sup>		ETIPS Organizational Leadership <sup>2a 2b</sup>		ETIPS Relational Leadership <sup>2a ,2b</sup>		ETIPS Instructional Leadership <sup>2a 2b</sup>		EDLD 508 Supervision Simulation <sup>3a, 3b</sup>		Portfolio Reflection <sup>4a4b</sup>		Praxis <sup>5</sup>		GPA Cumulative <sup>6</sup>		SLPPS Exit Survey <sup>7</sup>	
	M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
<b>Rural</b>	23	4.5	NA		NA		89%	9%	94%	6%	3	0	NA	3.97	.02	NA		
<b>Online</b>	22	7.5	83%	11%	NA		81%	9%	NA		2.83	3.7	NA	3.95	.06	NA		
<b>Billings</b>	24	4	92%	10%	95%	8%	NA		93%	4%	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 candidæ 80% or better on two of three ETIPS case studies

<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 r an average score of 2 (competent understanding)

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

Claim 2: Applying Knowledge for Effective Decision-Making (Relevance)					Claim 3: Caring Relationships							
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>	Portfolio Platform <sub>13a,1 3b</sub>	Follow - up SLLPPS <sub>14</sub>	Job Placement <sub>15</sub>	Job Retention <sub>16</sub>		
	M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>	M	SD	M	SD	M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>				
NA	203	55	3	0	4	0	NA	3	0	NA	NA	NA
NA	233	10	3	.22	NA		NA	2.7	.20	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA		NA		NA		NA	NA		NA	NA	NA
	% with 240 logged hours		% of Students Reaching Mastery		% Earning a B or above			% of Students Reaching Mastery				
NA	47%		100%		100%		NA	100%		NA	NA	NA
NA	85%		85%		NA		NA	23%		NA	NA	NA
NA	NA		NA		NA		NA	NA		NA	NA	NA

<sup>a</sup>mean

<sup>b</sup>standard deviation

NA = Not Assessed Yet

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

<sup>9b</sup> Program Assessment - 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

<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)





### Claim 4 : Cross-cutting Themes

McREL Balanced Leadership Profile/Goals <sub>17a,17b</sub>		EDLD 534 Data Driven Decision Making Grade <sub>18a,18b</sub>		EDLD 555 Montana School Finance Grade <sub>19a,19b</sub>		EDLD 520 Schools & Diverse Communities Grade <sub>20a,20b</sub>		SLLPPS Follow-UP Survey <sub>21</sub>
M <sup>a</sup>	SD <sup>b</sup>	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
3	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	NA
3	0	4	0	3.6	.20	3.9	.28	NA
NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery		% of Students Reaching Mastery		
100%		100%		100%		100%		
100%		100%		100%		100%		
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

**EXCEL Data Spreadsheets for the Ed. D in Educational Leadership**

## Ed.D Educational Leadership 2010 Cohort

Claim 1						Claim 2	
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	Cumaltive GPA	Dissertation	SLLPPS Exit Survey
M    SD	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16    2.5							
<b>% of students achieving an admissions score of 15 or above</b>							
100%							

NA = Not assessed Yet

<sup>1a</sup> Candidate Success - Mean rater score of 15 or above

<sup>2b</sup> Program Success - 90% of students achieve a mean score of 15 or above

Claim 3		Claim 4	
SLLPPS Exit Survey	SLLPPS Follow-up Survey	Dissertation	Grade In EDLD 643 Social Justice
NA	NA	NA	NA