

FSEHD Professional Impact Project for Advanced Programs (PIP)

March 2010

Overview of the FSEHD Professional Impact Project for Advanced Programs (PIP)

The Vision

Successful graduate program candidates create a relevant Professional Impact Project for Advanced Programs that includes the following Practice aspects of the Advanced Competencies: Evidence-Based Decision Making; Technology Use; Diversity; and Professional Identity Development. Through this Professional Impact Project process, graduate candidates provide credible evidence of their ability to facilitate impact on constituent(s) and reflect upon their practice:

Evidence-Based Decision Making

- *Candidate defines area targeted for growth clearly*
 - Define area targeted for growth clearly;
 - Use data to inform decision making;
 - Address target population (constituent dynamics, with emphasis of knowledge of diversity of self and others).

- *Candidate develops a plan of action:*
 - Incorporate considerations of other professionals and/or stakeholders while determining plan of action;
 - Address target population (constituent dynamics, with emphasis of knowledge of diversity of self and others);
 - Aim to contribute to school improvement and/or renewal; or Promotes well-being of children, family systems, school systems, or communities;
 - Use knowledge of self and others to design effective practice.

- *Candidate implements action plan*
 - Implement action plan
 - Collect and analyzes data;
 - Present information

- *Candidate evaluates impact of action*
 - Analyze impact of action
 - Assess degree to which action contributes to school improvement and/or renewal or promotes well-being of children, family systems, school systems, or communities;

- *Candidate reflects on emerging professionalism*
 - Examines own emerging, developing or acquired professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that result in competent practice;
 - Creates plan to further professional growth.

Evidence-Based Decision Making is the primary focal point of this project for Advanced Candidates. The other aspects of the Practice Competencies, namely Technology Use, Diversity of Practice, Professional Identity Development, are infused in this project. Thus, it is assumed that candidates will ably use technology to present/collaborate/inform/research their project, readily incorporate understanding of diversity in practice, and examine their own professional knowledge, skills, communication, and dispositions that result in effective/competent practice as well.

Note:

Constituent(s) is a term used to refer to the target(s) of this project and could include any possible individuals or groups that are relevant to Advanced Programs such as: students, families, community members, clients, teachers, and/or administrators.

Throughout, the term *action* is used generically to represent the varied program efforts to instruct, develop, counsel, and/or lead, etc. that reflect constituent(s) who are students, clients, teachers or administrators, respectively. The constituent might be one individual or a group of individuals.

Assignment

You are required to create a Professional Impact Project for your constituent(s) (e.g. teaching unit, academic or other skill-based action) that contributes to school improvement and/or renewal, or promotes the well-being of individuals, children, family systems, school systems, or communities.

Once an area targeted for growth has been identified or chosen, you will review the evidence/literature regarding successful actions for addressing the area. This will lead to implementing an action plan that you hypothesize will impact your constituent or constituents. Prior to and throughout the action, you will collect data, analyzing the impact on your constituent(s), and then reflect in terms of your own professional strengths/needs in order to effect positively change.

This Professional Impact Project process is intended to provide credible evidence of your ability to facilitate impact on constituent(s) and reflect upon your practice. You are required to make evidence-based decisions and use ongoing data analyses to determine the overall effectiveness of your practice on constituent(s). Evidence-based decisions include: sound professional practice, adjustments based on analyses of impact on constituent(s), and congruence between modifications and impact goals.

Phase I

Identify and Define Area Targeted for Growth

The candidate reviews relevant literature, contextual factors, and views of constituent(s) to define an area to investigate.

Questions to Consider

- 1) What has caused the candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth?**
- 2) What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth?**
 - a. Review program specific literature that relates to a Professional Impact Project topical issue
 - b. Review other content area literature relevant to the constituent
- 3) What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the particular context in the proposed setting?**
 - a. Review general community, school/organization, and constituent characteristics
 - b. Review specific characteristics and approaches to working with constituent(s)
- 4) Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth?**
- 5) Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project?**
 - a. Effectively apply and integrate the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input
 - b. Articulate clearly and succinctly an area of proposed study

PHASE I: The candidate reviews relevant literature, contextual factors, and views of constituent(s) to define an area targeted for growth.

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<i>What has caused the candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth?</i> <i>Domain-Specific Knowledge</i>	Although an area targeted for growth is identified and described, the candidate's statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the targeted area	The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth with reasonable explanation of its importance	The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth with significant detail as to importance , including the scope and impact of the area targeted for growth
<i>What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth?</i> <i>Information Literacy</i>	The candidate selects literature from unreliable sources or the literature does not support the stated aim of the impact project.	The candidate's literature review reflects relevant, reliable, appropriate professional literature. It identifies several ideas, variables or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project.	The candidate's literature review integrates critical and logical details from appropriate professional literature. It identifies important ideas, variables, or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditions, and threats to validity.
<i>What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the proposed setting?</i> <i>Contextual Perspective</i>	The candidate's description of data sources is limited or incomplete; lacks relevance to the aim of the impact project, or fails to consider key community, school, or constituent factors.	The candidate identifies data sources that account for some , general community, school, and constituent factors and identifies at least 1 viable approach for working with constituents.	The candidate identifies data sources that account for multiple community, school, and constituent factors, both general and specific; considers viable approaches for working with constituents, including constituent skills and prior understandings
<i>Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth?</i> <i>Contextual Perspective</i>	The candidate does not provide an effective argument for the likelihood of the project's benefit to the constituent(s), or has failed to consider possible negative effects to the constituent(s). The candidate has not provided reasonable opportunities for the constituent(s) to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.	The candidate provides a reasonable argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s) with no to minimal negative impact. The candidate provides reasonable evidence of constituents' opportunities to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.	The candidate provides a compelling argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s), with no to minimal negative impact. The candidate provides substantial evidence that the constituent(s) have either contributed or had multiple opportunities to contribute to the project's aims and/or design.

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project?</i></p> <p><i>Information Literacy</i></p>	<p>The candidate is unable to connect professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is inappropriate given the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>	<p>The candidate applies and integrates a limited amount of professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is supported by professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>	<p>The candidate effectively applies and integrates professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is clearly and succinctly stated and linked to the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>

Phase II

Develop a Plan of Action

The candidate uses information from the contextual factors, literature, and data that impact constituent(s) to set goals, design an action plan, and assess impact. The candidate sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate goals designed to positively affect constituent(s) in some way. The candidate considers multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with relevant goals to assess impact on constituent(s) before, during and after implementing the action plan.

Questions to Consider

1) What is the action plan?

- a. Describe the parameters of the action plan, including scope, duration, and intended outcomes
- b. Make a valid case for the significance of the chosen action plan

2) What factors were used to select or design the action plan?

- a. Identify salient factors that contributed to selection or design of the particular action plan

3) Does the action plan demonstrate understanding of the area targeted for growth?

- a. Generate goals (for and/or with constituent(s)) that are clear, significant, and appropriate
- b. Align goals with best practices, and professional standards as appropriate
- c. Align goals with identified parameters of the action plan

4) Does the action plan include valid and reliable measures for assessing the impact of the action plan?

- a. Provide clarity on criteria for performance
- b. Address technical soundness of assessment methods.
- c. Use multiple modes and approaches to assess the impact of the implemented action plan

5) Does the proposed action plan demonstrate consideration of constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?

- a. Design/include adaptations and modifications based on individual constituent(s)' needs and constraints
- b. Provide for input from constituent before, during, and after implementation

PHASE II: The candidate uses information from the contextual factors, literature, and data that impact constituent(s) to set goals, design an action plan, and assess impact.

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>What is the action plan?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is unclear, lacking sufficient detail, or is missing key components such as scope, duration, or intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale is unclear or does not indicate potential to have significant impact on constituent(s)</p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is clear and includes scope, duration, and intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale for action is clear and supports the potential for significant impact on constituent(s)</p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is very clearly stated, detailed and includes well-targeted scope, duration, and intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale for the action's potential to significantly impact constituent(s) is strong and clearly stated.</p>
<p><i>What factors were used to select or design the action?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action fails to account for key contextual factors or possible limitations or constraints</p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects more than one key contextual factor and acknowledges any significant limitations or constraints</p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects multiple, highly relevant contextual factors and acknowledges possible limitations and constraints</p>
<p><i>Does the action plan demonstrate understanding of the area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>One or more of the candidate's goals are unclear, of marginal significance, or inappropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with best practice or professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with the stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>The candidate's key goals are clear, significant, and appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>All of the candidate's goals are clear, significant, and highly appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>

PHASE II	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
PLAN OF ACTION			
<i>Does the action plan include valid and reliable measures to assess the impact of the action?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	<p>Some of the candidate’s assessment criteria are not clear or are not linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate’s assessment measures are not valid and/or reliable</p> <p>The candidate’s assessment relies on one or more limited measures that are not consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and/or do not support intended action.</p>	<p>The candidate’s key assessment criteria are clear and linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate’s assessment measures appear to be valid and reliable</p> <p>The candidate measures impact through one to two modes and approaches that are consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and appropriate to the action</p>	<p>All of the candidate’s assessment criteria are clear and explicitly linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate’s provides strong evidence of validity and reliability of assessment measures</p> <p>The candidate measures impact through multiple modes and approaches that are consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and appropriate to the action</p>
<i>Does the proposed action demonstrate consideration of constituent(s)’ needs/viewpoints?</i>	The candidate’s action plan does not solicit or support constituent(s)’ views, needs or concerns	The candidate’s action plan reflects consideration for constituent(s)’ views, needs and concerns, as appropriate during key phases of the action.	The candidate’s action plan encourages active engagement with constituent(s)’ views, needs and concerns, as appropriate throughout the plan of action
<i>Diversity of Practice</i>	The candidate’s action plan includes few or no adaptations or modifications designed to meet the needs of constituent(s)	The candidate’s action plan identifies adaptations and/or modifications to meet the needs of most constituent(s)	The candidate’s action plan clearly identifies adaptations and/or modifications to meet the identified needs of all constituent(s)

Phase III

Implement Action Plan

The candidate implements an action plan aligned with specific goals and constituent characteristics and needs and with strong consideration of contextual factors.

Questions to Consider

- 1) What is the nature of the alignment/fidelity of actions with the action plan?**
 - a. Provide evidence that the action plan is implemented as intended
 - b. Provide evidence of competent professional judgment regarding timing, order, or other key elements of the action plan

- 2) Is the action plan implemented with respect to constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?**
 - a. Show that the action plan implementation integrates constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints in an ongoing manner

- 3) Are adequate data collected and presented in a systematic way?**
 - a. Provide evidence that data is collected according to plan indicated with no unaccounted for gaps in data

- 4) Is data analysis appropriate to address the questions asked or areas investigated?**
 - a. Show that data analysis directly addresses the questions asked or areas investigated in a meaningful way

- 5) Is data analysis thorough and accurate?**
 - a. Provide evidence that data analysis is comprehensive with no errors

PHASE III: The candidate implements an action plan aligned with specific goals and constituent characteristics and needs and with strong consideration of contextual factors.

PHASE III IMPLEMENTATION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>What is the nature of the alignment/fidelity of actions with the action plan?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as outlined in the action plan.</p> <p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides some evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>
<p><i>Is the action plan implemented with respect to constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?</i></p> <p><i>Diversity of Practice</i></p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action does not integrate constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints in any systematic way</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout most of the implementation of the action plan</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action systematically integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout implementation of the action plan</p>
<p><i>Are adequate data collected and presented in a systematic way?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>Candidate data collection is not systematic and/or missing data or modification of data collection plan are not accounted for.</p> <p>Candidate represents data inaccurately or in a manner that is not understandable to the intended audience.</p>	<p>Candidate systematically collects adequate data and accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.</p> <p>Candidate accurately represents data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.</p>	<p>Candidate systematically collects comprehensive data and thoroughly accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.</p> <p>Candidate accurately provides multiple representations of data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.</p>
<p><i>Is data analysis appropriate to address the questions asked or area targeted for growth investigated?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis fails to address indicated questions or area targeted for growth</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis generally addresses the questions or area targeted for growth investigated</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis directly addresses the questions asked or area targeted for growth investigated in a meaningful way</p>

PHASE III IMPLEMENTATION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<i>Is data analysis thorough and accurate?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	The candidate's data analysis is limited or flawed	The candidate's data analysis is adequate with no major errors	The candidate's data analysis is comprehensive and accurate.

Phase IV

Evaluate Impact

The candidate uses assessment data to evaluate impact on constituent(s) regarding constituent progress and achievement. The candidate also evaluates the overall effectiveness of implementation on constituent(s) in order to improve his/her own practice long-term.

Questions to Consider

- 1) Do the candidate's actions contribute to improving the area targeted for growth in a significant way?**
 - a. Interpret impact of actions (intended and unintended) on constituent(s) (e.g., student growth, achievement scores, client efficacy, teacher/administrator skill application)
- 2) What is the relationship between the findings and the research literature/professional best practice?**
- 3) What were unintended outcomes of the action plan?**
 - a. Review consequences in light of goals, action plan steps, and outcomes for all constituent(s)

PHASE IV: The candidate uses assessment data to evaluate impact on constituent(s) regarding constituent progress and achievement. The candidate also evaluates the overall effectiveness of implementation on constituent(s) in order to improve his/her own practice long-term.

PHASE IV	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
EVALUATE IMPACT			
<i>Do the candidate's actions contribute to improving the area targeted for growth in a significant way?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	Candidate fails to include evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes some evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes clear evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).
<i>What is the relationship between the findings and the research literature/professional best practice?</i> <i>Information Literacy</i>	Candidate includes poor/limited discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature or professional best practice; OR the research literature/professional best practice discussed is of little relevance to the candidate's findings.	The candidate refers to a few relevant data-based studies or sources of best practice knowledge in his/her discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature/professional best practice. The candidate provides a satisfactory description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.	The candidate refers to many relevant data-based studies or sources of best practice knowledge in his/her discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature/professional best practice. The candidate provides a detailed description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.
<i>What were the unintended outcomes of the action?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	The candidate is unable to identify any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan.	The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan but does not provide plausible explanations for their causes .	The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan and provides plausible explanations for their causes .

Phase V

Reflect

The candidate reflects on the process of completing this Professional Impact Project. The candidate conducts self-evaluation to describe current skills and necessary areas for development.

Questions to Consider

- 1. How has this impact project contributed to your professional knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions?**
 - a. Consider personal and/or professional insights and skills you gained from completing the impact project

- 2. What are your professional goals for furthering your professional growth?**
 - a. Identify areas for growth and possible ways to address them

PHASE V: The candidate reflects on the process of completing this Professional Impact Project.

<p>PHASE V</p> <p>REFLECTION</p>	<p>Unacceptable</p>	<p>Acceptable</p>	<p>Target</p>
<p><i>How has the impact project contributed to your professional knowledge, skills and dispositions?</i></p> <p><i>Professional Identity Development</i></p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is lacking. S/he does not adequately describe the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.</p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is satisfactory. S/he describes the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.</p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is outstanding. S/he shares critical insights about the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions in an exemplary and highly detailed way.</p>
<p><i>What are your professional goals for furthering your professional growth?</i></p> <p><i>Professional Identity Development</i></p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation is weak; he/she is unable to identify areas for professional growth; or the steps for addressing them are insufficient.</p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation satisfactorily identifies areas for professional growth and outlines general steps for addressing them.</p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation explicitly identifies areas for professional growth and outlines well-defined steps for addressing them.</p>

FEINSTEIN SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE ADVANCED COMPETENCIES

This information is provided to applicants to illustrate anticipated candidate competencies at completion of a FSEHD advanced degree.

<p>Knowledge influenced by diversity and professionalism <i>FSEHD advanced candidates demonstrate the requisite knowledge of content and practice to prepare them to be experts of the diverse fields of their disciplines.</i></p>	<p>Practice informed by diversity and professionalism <i>FSEHD advanced candidates incorporate their domain-specific knowledge into performance with attention to diversity and the standards of their profession.</i></p>
<p>Knowledge 1.) Domain-Specific Knowledge: candidate demonstrates conceptual mastery of subject matter, literature, theory, and methods in one’s chosen field of professional practice.</p>	<p>Practice 1.) Evidence-based Decision Making: candidate defines a problem clearly; collects/analyzes data; uses data to inform decision-making; addresses target population dynamics; and incorporates considerations of other professionals and/or stakeholders while determining a plan of action that: a) contributes to school improvement and/or renewal; and/or b) promotes the well-being of children, family systems, school systems, or communities.</p>
<p>Knowledge 2.) Information Literacy: candidate recognizes when information is needed and has the ability to locate, interpret, and evaluate relevant information.</p>	<p>Practice 2.) Technology Use: candidate selects and uses technology effectively in: a) presentation of information, b) collaborative work environments, c) information collection analysis and management, and d) research based activities</p>
<p>Knowledge 3.) Contextual Perspective: candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of diversity as it relates to field specific content.</p>	<p>Practice 3.) Diversity of Practice: candidate uses knowledge of diversity about self and others to design effective practice.</p>
<p>Knowledge 4.) Professional Awareness: candidate exhibits an understanding of the standards of one’s chosen profession, (e.g., confidentiality, ethics)</p>	<p>Practice 4.) Professional Identity Development: candidate examines own emerging, developing or acquired professional knowledge, skills, communication, and dispositions that will result in competent practice, and creates plan to further one’s own professional growth.</p>