Rhode Island College

LEAD Program

2009 RIPA Visiting Team Report

Table of Contents

Overview

On October 18-20, 2009 a visiting team representing the Rhode Island Department of Education conducted an on-site review at Rhode Island College of the advanced educator preparation program in educational leadership leading to certification in the areas of elementary principal and secondary principal.

The Visiting Team was comprised of Dr. Perry Berkowitz from the College of Saint Rose and Ms. Barbara Miller, retired Westerly School Department. Ms. Paulajo Gaines, Ms. Lisa M. Foehr, and Dr. Andre Audette represented the Rhode Island Department of Education.

Based upon a review of the Institutional Report (IR) and institutional exhibits; interviews with administrators, education faculty members, students, and others affiliated with the program; a review of work completed by prospective educators; and an analysis of other documents, the team recommends that the Rhode Island Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education grant the following approval:

- For the preparation program in Educational Leadership-Principal for a period 2 years*.

The ratings on each of the individual standards are provided in the chart below for the LEAD Program (elementary principal/secondary principal) at Rhode Island College.

Number of Years through the Year….	Standard 1 Assessment	Standard 2 Curriculum	Standard 3 Field	Standard 4 Diversity	Standard 5 Resources	Standard 6 Improvement
2 years through 2011	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	On Standard	Approaching Standard

*2 years is a full approval for the LEAD Program to align it with the next Rhode Island Program Approval (RIPA) visit to Rhode Island College.

Program Approval Report

for the Advanced Program in Educational Leadership

at Rhode Island College

October 2009

The following report records the rating for each RIPA Standard and indicator and the ratings that were assigned by the 2009 visiting team. After the each set of ratings, narrative text is provided that records the 2009 visiting team's findings and recommendations. Included in this text is a determination by the 2009 visiting team whether the program met, partially met, or did not meet the 2007 recommendations. Further recommendations for improvement are also provided for all standards and indicators that were not rated "on standard" by the 2009 visiting team.

---

1. Prospective educators recommended for licensure by Rhode Island Educator Certification Programs are proficient in the appropriate professional standards.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

The LEAD program assessment system has benefited from further design, development, and evolution since the 2007 RIPA visit. In 2007, the assessment system and the curriculum that it was based upon were not yet complete. The assessment system is now fully aligned to the ISLLC Standards and uses multiple and varied assessments to determine candidate progress through the program. While progress has been made across the assessment system, none of the indicators for this standard were raised from the "approaching standard" level that each was rated in 2007. One indicator, 1.02 – admissions, was not rated in 2009 because it was rated as "On Standard" in 2007. The 2009 visiting team did not feel that the indicator continued to merit an "on standard" rating as no action was taken to address the 2007 suggestions regarding the admissions process. The 2009 visiting team determined that many of the pieces of a standards-based assessment system are in place in the LEAD program yet an overriding concern is a lack of coherence among the assessment system components – collectively how the pieces of the system fit together to support and assess candidate progress in the program. It also was not clear how the three decision points were used to identify candidate potential for success as school leaders; how the program made valid and reliable judgments against the ISLLC Standards; and if the assessment system was clearly communicated to all candidates.

1.01 Assessment, Advisement, Feedback, and Counseling throughout the Program.
Prospective educators are assessed through an ongoing process that begins with admission to the program and continues through recommendation for licensure. The results of these assessments are used to monitor candidates' progress toward meeting the standards and to provide academic and professional advisement throughout the program.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: 1.01A – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that Educational Leadership Program review its assessment system and rubric expectations to ensure greater alignment with ISLLC standards and indicators.
2007 Recommendation: 1.01B – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review its assessment system and program and course assessments to increase the expectations for rigor and in-depth knowledge and application of the ISLLC standards and indicators.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR identifies the mission of the LEAD program to "prepare and influence courageous, socially responsible educators to become leaders who will improve the quality of learning for all students by working creatively, reflectively, and ethically to create vital, democratic and caring places for powerful teaching and learning." The LEAD program further states in the IR that the assessment system that is used to monitor and evaluate candidate progress towards meeting the program mission is "program-embedded beginning with the admissions portfolio and followed during the program in the form of student portfolios, instructor observation of professional work characteristics, and field-supervisor evaluation of student progress." The program identifies three decision points in the assessment system – admission, readiness for internship, and recommendation for licensure as the structure for the assessment system. The IR, evidence in the exhibit room, and meetings with candidates and program faculty indicate that the decision points have criteria that must be completed prior to a candidate advancing past the decision point. The assessment system is embedded in program courses and uses a variety of measures to assess candidate progress in meeting the program outcomes and the ISSLC Standards.

There are several concerns with the assessment system. An overriding concern for the visiting team is the overall coherence and clarity of the assessment system. While each decision point has criteria, there are several items that are unclear at the decision points: how candidate work

and performance was assessed; how candidate scores and performances were compiled into an overall grade for courses; and how a final determination of "successful completion" for supervised internship and recommendation for licensure were made. Evidence in the exhibit room and comments from candidates confirmed these concerns including conflicting or incomplete versions of rubrics and portfolio directions as well as candidate reports of confusion regarding aspects of the assessment system. An additional concern is that most of the assessment tasks are embedded in courses and portfolios and focus on knowledge and reflection. There is a limited focus in the assessment system on actual candidate performance in relation to the ISLLC Standards. Candidates complete many reflections, observations, analysis of practice, and the like, yet there are limited opportunities for candidates to be assessed based upon their performance as school leaders against the ISLLC Standards beyond the two site evaluations conducted during each of the 150 hour internships.

Although efforts are made to make the assessment system public, the assessment system is not clearly communicated to all candidates. Candidates at varying stages in the program reported not understanding that LEAD 504 was a decision point for readiness for internship; how portfolios were assessed to determine recommendation for licensure; and what role assessments such as the comprehensive exam and the School Leadership and Licensure Assessment (SLLA) factored into determining progress and performance in the program. It also was not clear how the program level tasks that were assessed as part of the exit portfolio such as the site mentor evaluations, the educational platform document, and the ISLLC-based artifacts were assessed, with what criteria, and how the results are weighted into a final determination of candidate progress and performance. Candidates are required to complete several portfolios for the program and courses including a 504 portfolio, internship notebooks, and an exit portfolio. While there are criteria for these portfolios and notebooks, the purpose, the means of assessing the products to determine an overall grade, and the relationship between the various notebooks and portfolios are not evident to the visiting team or fully understood by candidates. Since there was no evidence of candidate attrition from the program, it was not clear that candidate progress and attrition from the program is a result of the assessment system and feedback that candidates receive from program faculty and internship supervisors. Additional concerns include the absence of a formal advising process and the inconsistent nature of feedback that is provided to candidates resulting from course and program assessments – sometimes based on standards-based rubrics, sometimes based on generic rubrics, sometimes just qualitative comments.

The assessment system is aligned with the ISLLC Standards and candidates reported and the team observed that these standards drive much of their instruction. Candidates indicated that the program faculty members are readily available for ongoing and informal feedback. Additionally, candidates are assessed using multiple measures and multiple opportunities throughout their instruction. Collectively, the framework of the assessment system may be an appropriate means to assess candidate performance, but it currently does not represent a coherent, aligned, and public system. *(Recommendation 1.01 A, partially met; 1.01B not met)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the assessment system to ensure that the individual parts collectively are sufficient to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and performance, and that all components of the assessment system are aligned, coherent, and understood by candidates.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program revisit the assessment system design to determine if the design is sufficient to evaluate candidate progress through the program *and* their actual performance against the ISLLC Standards.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program revisit the process by which the weights of individual items in the assessment system – educational platform, site mentor evaluation, comprehensive exam, ILLSC artifacts, etc, are determined and communicated; how they impact candidate progress through the program; how they collectively result in a course grade; and how they impact candidates advancing past a decision point.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review the process by which candidates receive feedback and advisement throughout the program including receiving consistent, standards-based feedback across program courses and products *and* a formal advisement process to ensure that all candidates receive necessary and effective support throughout the program.

***1.02 Admission into the Program.* Prospective educators are admitted to certification programs based upon clearly articulated criteria that address the students' potential to meet the standards for licensure.**

On Standard (2007)
No Rating (2009)

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The visiting team did not provide a rating for this indicator. As a follow up visit, the 2009 visiting team was not charged with providing ratings for indicators that were previously determined to be "on standard." The 2009 team believes that without revisions to the admissions process a future visiting team would be able to provide an "on standard" rating. The 2009 visiting team agrees with the findings from the 2007 visit that there are clear criteria for admissions, that the criteria are used by the program to admit candidates, and that the criteria for admissions are applied consistently across candidates. The 2009 visiting team also learned from candidate interviews that the admissions process is efficient as well as supportive and welcoming to potential candidates. The 2009 visiting team *did not find* that progress had been made to address the concern from the 2007 visit that the admissions process be revised to include mechanisms to identify and assess candidates' potential for school leadership through focused letters of reference, professional goals statements, interviews, or other measures. As such, the 2009 visiting team suggests that the LEAD program further review the admission process to fully meet the expectations of this indicator.

1.03 Determination of Readiness for Supervised Internship. **Prospective educators demonstrate their readiness for supervised internship through an evaluation of their performance with respect to the ISLLC Standards.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: 1.03A – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review the Readiness for Supervised Internship requirements to promote explicit and authentic connections to ISLLC standards in prior course work and program assessments.

2007 Recommendation: 1.03B – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review and revise the LEAD Program Handbook to more clearly communicate course and program requirements and performance expectations prior to Supervised Internship.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The program identifies in the IR that the formative assessment point in the program is the readiness for supervised internship which occurs after the completion of LEAD 504 in the fall of the second year prior to the first 150 hour internship experience. The IR states that in order to advance past this decision point and to enter into supervised internship that candidates must maintain "a minimum GPA of B or better, performance-based work samples, a self-evaluation (ISLLC evaluation), and a faculty /advisor evaluation/approval." The IR continues that the candidates must "successfully complete (B- or higher) the following courses – LEAD 500, 501, (B or higher) 502, 503, and 504. Candidates complete a "work sample" paper defining the educational leader's role in supporting and promoting learning and good instruction (educational platform); and candidates demonstrate satisfactory progress in completing the program portfolio as well as other specified performance assessments."

While there are partially clear requirements for recommendation for supervised internship, the visiting team saw no evidence that this decision point served as a meaningful transition point in the assessment system. The criteria essentially represent a successful completion of courses and course-based learning tasks. There was no evidence that the decision point represented an opportunity for the program and program faculty to determine if the candidates had gained or could demonstrate the necessary knowledge, skills, dispositions, and performances to succeed in a supervised internship. The program and the IR indicated that ISLLC Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5 are the primary focus of the first internship that occurs immediately after LEAD 504. However, a review of course work, candidate learning tasks, and assessments showed that candidates were just as likely to work on standards 4 and 6 as well the intended ones. The tasks and assessments that candidates complete as part of their course work prior to and including LEAD 504 are valid, connected to ISLLC Standards, and do provide many opportunities to learn about the standards. What was not clear to the visiting team was that the program's intended focus on ISLLC Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5 was implemented as intended and served as the basis for recommendation for supervised internship. *(Recommendation 1.03A partially met.)*

Additionally, there did not seem to be a mechanism in place to assess candidates' potential to succeed in the internship at the program level or by a comprehensive review by program

faculty other than "faculty /advisor evaluation/approval." During interviews, candidates at all levels of progression through the program, early, middle, and late in the program, were not aware that the completion of LEAD 504 represented a transition or that there was any potential decision point that might prevent them from entering into the internship. They assume that if you complete the class, then you proceed to internship. *(Recommendation 1.03B not met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the assessment system to include and communicate explicit and developmental criteria connected to the ISLLC Standards that the program determines necessary for candidates to meet prior the recommendation for supervised internship and ensure that the criteria serve as a focus of candidate learning prior to this decision point.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review the role and differences between the "formative checkpoint in the advanced programs" at Rhode Island College and the "recommendation for supervised internship decision point" in the Rhode Island Program Approval process. The recommendation for supervised internship decision point is to represent a programmatic determination that the candidates have attained some predetermined level of competency that indicates a potential for success as an intern rather than a transition point based on the completion of courses. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program ensure that this decision point is designed and implemented consistent with these requirements.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review how it communicates the recommendation for supervised internship decision point to candidates so that they are aware that the recommendation for supervised internship is based on clear criteria for knowledge, skills, dispositions, and performance expectations and that it represents an actual decision point in the program assessment system.

1.04 Assessment at the Completion of Clinical Experiences and as a Basis for Recommendation for License. Prospective educators demonstrate their performance with respect to the standards for the completion of supervised internship through an evaluation process that is shared by the college or university supervisor and the internship supervisor. Programs recommend prospective educators for licensure based on performance with respect to the ISLLC Standards.

<div align="center">

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

</div>

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program work with the FSEHD to complete and finalize the course syllabi and recommendation for licensure requirements to clarify and clearly communicate the requirements for the recommendation for licensure.

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the recommendation for licensure gates include clear criteria for successful performance that are linked to standards.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The program has identified program completion, specifically the completion of LEAD 512 as the recommendation for licensure decision point. The program has explicit requirements that candidates must complete prior to completion of LEAD 512 and the recommendation for licensure decision point. These include: a minimum GPA, successful completion of the comprehensive assessment, a capstone performance assessment, a self-evaluation based on the ISLLC Standards, a mentor and faculty ISSLC-based evaluation from the internship experience, an exit portfolio that requires an educational platform statement and ISLLC-based artifacts, and successful performance on the SLLA. Collectively, these represent a wide and deep assessment of candidate performance in relation to the ISLLC Standards and have the potential to serve as an effective decision point that recommends candidates based upon their future potential as school leaders. A particular strength of this decision point is the multiple measures that it includes and the multiple raters that are potentially engaged in the determination of candidate success. This indicator was rated as "approaching standard" however, because like the recommendation for supervised internship decision point, candidate performance in advancing past this decision point is based primarily upon successful course completion with a passing grade of "B" or better. There was no evidence of weighting, minimum standards, or expected levels of performance on the individual criteria or how collectively they were compiled into a total grade. It was unclear if a candidate could "fail" one criterion but move past the decision point by "passing" other criteria. There also was not sufficient focus on performance at this transition point – rather candidates primarily needed to complete portfolios and other course-based work. Assessments such as the SLLA, the comprehensive assessment, or the internship evaluations did not have explicit, minimum performance levels that indicated a minimum standard for candidates to meet. An additional concern with the recommendation for licensure decision point is that despite the variety of assessments and the significance of the decision point, that with the exception of the comprehensive assessment, all program-based assessments and the exit portfolio are assessed

by individual raters as part of course assessments. *(Recommendation 1.04A partially met; 1.04B not met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program continue to review and revise the recommendation for licensure decision point to ensure that there are clear criteria for recommendation for licensure that are based on the ISLLC Standards and on candidate potential for success as a school leader.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the criteria for recommendation for licensure should include performance-based assessments that are evaluated at the program level, require more than the completion of courses, and are based on clearly articulated minimum standards and weights to determine candidates' overall ability to move past this decision point.

1.05 Validity of Assessment System. **Assessment systems are aligned with educator standards and with instructional processes, use multiple assessments and various methodologies, and have expectations that are clearly communicated to prospective educators.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

> *2007 Recommendation: 1.05A* – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program complete the program and course design and review and revise course tasks to ensure multiple assessments and various methodologies that provide valid measures for alignment to ISLLC standards.

> *2007 Recommendation: 1.05B* – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program develop systems to ensure validity as it completes program design and implements successive cohorts of candidates.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The Lead program provided substantial evidence in the IR, documents in the exhibit room, and through interviews that it recognizes the importance of designing, refining, and implementing a valid assessment system. The program has examined validity in the admission process, at the course assessment level, with course

alignment to ISLLC Standards, and through the end of the program assessments – the SLLA and the comprehensive assessment. The program provided evidence of preliminary investigations that were conducted with program and Counseling and Educational Psychology (CEP) Department to determine validity and alignment. These inquiries provided several recommendations which while yet to be implemented merit careful consideration by the program to continue the program development and improvement process. The assessment system meets expectations for validity in that the overall system is aligned with the ISSLC Standards and candidates appear to graduate from the program well-prepared to meet these expectations. The full range of standards appears to be addressed with some concern about the sufficiency of depth and focus on ISLLC Standard 3. The 2009 visiting team noted that the program increased the emphasis on instructional leadership as was recommended by the 2007 visiting team and encourages a continuing refinement to achieve a balance between instructional leadership and management.   An additional strength with the assessment system as currently designed and implemented is the multiple measures that are used to assess candidate progress.

The assessment system did not meet the expectations for validity in regard to the assessment criteria aligned to program outcomes, attempts to reduce instances of bias, and clear communication of the assessment system to candidates. As noted above, absent admission criteria to predict candidate potential to serve as school leaders, the admissions process is not designed to make valid assessments regarding candidate potential as school leaders. Since the recommendation for supervised internship and recommendation for licensure decision points are primarily course-based, the decision points do not strongly and clearly assess candidate potential to perform as school leaders rather than the completion of courses. The program provided some evidence that aspects of the assessment system are scored by multiple raters, the admissions essay and the comprehensive examination being the most prominent, however most assessments are scored at the course level by individual raters thus not providing strong evidence of attempts to reduce possible sources of bias. An additional concern that was evident across the assessment system is the lack of a public and clearly communicated assessment system that provided candidates with understanding of how each component of the assessment system fits together and exactly how a collective and final determination of candidate success or failure was calculated and determined. *(Recommendations 1.05A and 1.05B partially met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the assessment system to develop and implement a fully valid assessment system that begins with admitting candidates with potential to succeed as school leaders and that recommends them for internship and licensure based on program outcomes and performance levels that are based on the ISLLC Standards rather than recommendation as a result of successful course completion. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program continue to study its assessment system for validity and implement recommendations that emerge from this inquiry.

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program continue with the current efforts to reduce bias in the assessment system through the current multiple assessed tasks and expand this focus to all assessments that the program determines to be critical to assess candidate performance at each decision point.

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program clearly communicate the assessment system including how each component of the assessment system is weighted and used to determine candidate progress through the LEAD program.

1.06 Reliability of Assessment System. Assessment systems yield fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of prospective educators.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program work to improve the validity as well as the reliability of the assessment system by using multiple assessors to score representative candidate work from course and program assessments to clarify rubric expectations and determine appropriate levels of performance.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: As with validity, the program provided evidence in the IR, program exhibits, and through interviews that it recognizes the importance of designing and implementing a reliable assessment system. Similar to validity, the program has conducted initial inquiry which has produced several recommendations for improvement in

the area of reliability including using multiple assessors, increased training for inter-rater reliability, and the revision of some program assessments based on candidate performance. The program collects data from these inquiries on admissions results, candidate performance on the comprehensive exams, and program assessments such as the exit portfolio. While the program has yet to act upon these data, they represent potential for programmatic improvement in the area of reliability. What was not evident is that the program has committed a sufficient focus on training of assessors to ensure consistent judgments on commonly scored program assessments and the many assessments that are embedded in courses yet carry significant weight in determining candidate progress through the program. Another concern is that the program does not support or ensure reliable judgments through explicit and consistent standards-based criteria. Many tasks at the course and program level are assessed against rubrics, yet the rubrics vary considerable in quality and precision. Some are based on language of the standards; some are generic and focus on qualities such as organization and writing effectiveness equal to the content of standards. A further concern in regard to criteria is that in some instances substantial course and program assessments are not assessed against explicit criteria when determining grades and performance levels. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program increase the reliability of judgments in the assessment system through an increased emphasis on training assessors for consistent judgments and ensuring that substantial program assessments are scored by multiple raters. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program continue to study its assessment system for reliability and implement recommendations that emerge from this inquiry.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program ensures that all substantial program assessments are assessed against explicit standards-based criteria and performance levels and that these are consistent across program assessments.

2. Prospective educators in Rhode Island Educator Certification Programs have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, develop the dispositions, and practice the skills that are encompassed in the ISLLC Standards.

Approaching Standard **(2007)**
Approaching Standard **(2009)**

The LEAD program curriculum provides candidates the opportunity to address the full range of experiences articulated in the ISLLC Standards. The LEAD program curriculum is now a complete entity that provides candidates varied and effective learning experiences. The curriculum continues to benefit from ongoing revision, particularly alignment to new national and state leadership standards. As is discussed below, program curriculum still needs to better integrate technology and state initiatives to ensure candidates can develop the knowledge and skills in these areas and to demonstrate performance consistent with these expectations for Rhode Island school leaders. The 2009 RIPA visiting team noted significant progress in the area of curriculum as two standards which had been rated in 2007 as "approaching standard" were rated in 2009 as being "on standard" and one standard identified as "unacceptable" was rated as "approaching standard."

2.01 Professional and Pedagogical Studies. **Prospective educators follow a well-planned scope and sequence of courses and experiences to develop the knowledge, dispositions, and skills encompassed in the ISLLC Standards.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
On Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: 2.01A – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review and revise the existing curriculum to promote balance

between instructional leadership skills and strategies in collaboration with the administrative management tasks identified in the ISLLC standards.

2007 Recommendation: 2.01B – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program complete the curriculum design and development while working to ensure depth of engagement with ISLLC standards through tasks that require more application of appropriate knowledge and skills to balance the current emphasis on reflection.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that the LEAD program curriculum is a "series of courses and experiences that are designed to align to the ISLLC Standards and indicators, as outlined in the program's original design. As courses are being offered, faculty members are making updates from the 1996-2008 ISLLC Standards. Furthermore, program faculty members have co-aligned courses to ELCC Standards and are beginning the process of aligning courses with the recently released Rhode Island Leadership Standards and elements." The IR further states that "the full range of leadership development is evidence in the curriculum design." The RIPA visiting team recognizes the work that the faculty is doing to revise the program with the revised ILLSC Standards and the new Rhode Island Leadership Standards. (The LEAD program curriculum was evaluated by the 2009 RIPA visiting team against the 1996 ISSLC Standards – the standards that were in place at the time of the 2007 RIPA visit.) The visiting team concurs that the LEAD program is appropriately aligned to the ISLLC Standards and the program curriculum provides candidates the opportunity to develop the breadth and depth of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions detailed and embedded in these standards. Candidates were well-versed in the ISSLC Standards and described them as foundational in the revised program design that has developed since the 2007 RIPA visit. The visiting team SUGGESTS that as the program continues to revise the curriculum that it examine whether there is sufficient emphasis on issues in ISLLC Standard 3 such as personnel supervision, scheduling, and school budgets. The visiting team further SUGGESTS that the program continue to examine, as it has already has begun, the structure of the internship experiences to provide candidates the opportunity to experience the full range of leadership responsibilities represented in the program curriculum including experiences that happen in the fall and surround the opening of schools. *(Recommendations 2.01A and 2.01B met.)*

2.02 Subject Matter Knowledge. Prospective educators develop a deep understanding of the subject matter of their area of certification.

NA (2007)

NA (2009)

2.03 Technology. **Prospective educators develop an understanding of the role of technology in education and learn how to use technology as an instructional and administrative tool.**

Unacceptable (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program adopt a set of technology standards, require technology proficiency upon admission, and develop and incorporate learning experiences and tasks that require engagement with authentic uses of technology consistent with the expectations articulated in the ISLLC standards.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that technology is an "important concept in leadership development" and it provides a list of examples through which candidates interact with technology. The list includes items such as using the internet for course projects and research, exploration of the RIDE website, crafting and making presentations, creating and using spreadsheets, and the like. The visiting team saw evidence of program and course tasks that are consistent with these and other examples provided. The team particularly noted a program wiki that was initiated by the most recent cohort and supported by program faculty as an effective means to extend learning and candidate development against the program outcomes. The visiting team did not see sufficient evidence that technology as a tool for school leaders was an explicit expectation of the program design; was not a focus of program instruction; and was not prominent in program and course assessment tasks. Furthermore, there was limited focus on the important school leadership skill of using technology to collect and analyze school and student performance data for the purposes of school improvement and increased student learning. The IR states and the program reported that it had adopted the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards and is "exploring the Technology Standards for School Administrators (TSSA) for additional alignment" and to program expectations. The visiting team did not see evidence that either set of technology standards were an emphasis in the program curriculum. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program determine which set of national technology standards should guide the program curriculum and clearly integrate these standards as an essential component in the program curriculum.

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the program curriculum and course assessments to include technology for school leaders as an integral element of the curriculum and include performance expectations for the use of technology consistent with ISSLC and national technology standards.

2.04 Additional Rhode Island Certification Requirements. Prospective educators develop any additional knowledge and or skills required by Rhode Island educational law or regulations of the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review and revise its curriculum to meaningfully integrate and incorporate key state initiatives and work with agencies such as RIDE, RIASP, the Center for School Leadership, and other educational leadership organizations to increase the prominence of state initiatives within the curriculum design.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that the program "provides multiple opportunities for candidates to become knowledgeable about significant state initiatives." Evidence was provided in the exhibit room and reported in interviews that the state GLE/GSEs were prominent in program curriculum, particularly LEAD 504. Evidence was also provided that the LEAD program has been actively engaged in the development of the new Rhode Island Leadership Standards. However, it was not evident that the program curriculum provides candidates with sufficient opportunities for candidates to learn about Rhode Island state initiatives from a leadership perspective rather than their current lens as being primarily Rhode Island teachers. A further concern is that for participants in the program who are not Rhode Island teachers or educators they do not begin with the Rhode Island lens, thus they are recommended for Rhode Island licensure and may not have the requisite knowledge of Rhode Island state initiatives. *(Recommendation not met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program revise the program curriculum to integrate significant state initiatives into the program curriculum and to ensure that all candidates recommended for licensure are provided sufficient opportunities to learn about these initiatives from a leadership perspective that will prepare candidates to be effective school leaders within Rhode Island schools.

2.05 *Coherence.* Prospective educators pursue coherent educational studies that are grounded in research and theory.

Approaching Standard (2007)
On Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program complete the design of the program curriculum to increase the application of knowledge and skills contained in the ISLLC standards while assessing it for coherence and grounding in current research and theory as well as best practices in instructional leadership.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program curriculum represents a coherent curriculum that is developmentally and appropriately sequenced. The program begins with foundational courses that introduce the ISSLC Standards and the major issues inherent in school leadership including developing leadership, reflective leadership skills, leading in diverse contexts, and curriculum development. The curriculum extends the candidate focus to issue such as instructional management, equity and law, and the change process. Candidates are provided varying field experiences that parallel the curriculum design and provide candidates with opportunities to practice and apply what they are learning in program courses. The program uses a variety of assessment strategies at the end of the program to ensure that the full range of the ISLLC Standards that have been addressed in the program curriculum are measured including the exit portfolio, a comprehensive exam, and the SLLA. The visiting team SUGGESTS that to further strengthen the program's coherence that it continue to address the absence of candidate field experience in the fall to coincide with the leadership responsibilities at the beginning of the year and to examine whether LEAD 503 is a sufficient vehicle for candidates to engage the full depth and breadth of ISLLC Standard 3. *(Recommendation met.)*

> **3. Prospective educators have the opportunity to develop their learning in a variety of high quality field sites with professionals who model effective educational practice, assume responsibility for educating prospective colleagues, and are committed to ongoing professional development.**
>
> *Approaching Standard (2007)*
> *Approaching Standard (2009)*

The Lead program provides candidates several opportunities to practice school leadership in field experiences that begin in the first course in year one and conclude with a final 150 internship in year three. The program allows candidates to select their own field placements, primarily in their place of employment. While this brings benefits to the program such as having working educators as program candidates with knowledge of schools, it also presents several structural issues that limit the program's ability to establish and ensure consistent expectations and experiences for field placements throughout the program. The program did make some progress in relation to standard three as is evident in RIPA Standard 3.06 partnerships with schools and districts, which was rated as "approaching standard" in place of the "unacceptable" rating from 2007. Despite this progress, the visiting team was not able to rate the other five field indicators higher than the 2007 rating of "approaching standard".

3.01 Extensive Clinical Experience. **Prospective educators complete purposeful and sequenced field experiences, including field experience prior to internship periods. Through an internship they have the opportunity to experience all aspects of the profession.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

> *2007 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review its field experiences expectations and requirements in light

of the curriculum design to ensure that all candidates receive extensive field experiences that promote instructional leadership as well as administrative management through active participation and deep engagement with all aspects of school leadership.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that "the clinical dimensions of the LEAD program are sequenced to prepare candidates to experience broad and effective internships, connecting course theory to hands-on application." The LEAD program student handbook further describes the clinical experiences as being developmentally designed to parallel course work and a "unique design that provides the integration of theory and practice – ideas informing work in school and professional experiences informing the assessment of theory." The visiting team concurs that the LEAD program has worked to provide developmental experiences that provide opportunities for candidates to apply what they are learning in program courses. The program provided evidence and it was also reported through interviews and meetings with candidates and program faculty that creative effort is used to try to provide candidates with extensive field experiences. Candidates conduct an initial field experience in the two courses in the first year, shadowing a principal and at-risk student in LEAD 501 and conducting a 50 hour internship in LEAD 503 in a community-based family agency or an urban education site. In years two and three, candidates complete a 150 hour supervised internship in a school setting. Through these experiences, candidates must complete a variety of learning tasks and assessments as well as conduct self-assessments and receive ILLSC-based evaluations from internship supervisors and LEAD program faculty. Candidates reported these experiences to be valuable learning opportunities in which they gained additional perspectives on schools and serving as school leaders. Candidates also reported that in many cases these opportunities enabled them to assume, often in ongoing ways, leadership responsibilities that extend beyond the scope of the course-based internships.

The field experiences in the LEAD program, while valuable, as currently designed do not provide candidates with the extensive field experiences that are sufficient to experience a good approximation of the intensity of full school leadership responsibility. LEAD program documents that have analyzed the field experiences report the program's concern that since both internships occur in spring semesters, candidates do not have the opportunity to experience school leadership in the months from September to January and all the attendant learning opportunities that occur during this time. The visiting team concurs with this assessment and the same concern was echoed in candidate interviews. While some candidates reported continuing the internships beyond the spring semester, this was voluntary and does not ensure

extensive field experiences for all candidates. The current field experience design does not allow candidates opportunities to experience opening a school, facilitating state testing, implementing teacher evaluations, and other activities that typically occur in the fall months. An additional concern regarding extensiveness of field experiences is the method in which candidates conduct the internship. As practicing educators, with few exceptions, candidates conduct the internships on released time during their school day. Thus candidates do not experience being school leaders for whole or consecutive days – the actual schedule of a practicing school leader. While the initial experiences in LEAD 501 and 503 are creative attempts to provide additional field experiences to candidates, the developmental connection between these experiences and candidate coursework is not clear. In particular, several candidates reported that the community-based experience in LEAD 503 was disconnected from school leadership and the program curriculum. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the design of the field experiences to ensure that all candidates have extensive field experiences that occur across the entire school year to experience the full range of leadership responsibilities articulated in the ISLLC Standards.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program explore ways to provide all candidates with field experiences that approximate the actual daily schedule of practicing school leaders to experience the full range of leadership responsibilities articulated in the ISLLC Standards.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program review and revise the initial field experiences in LEAD 501 and 503 to ensure a developmental connection to the program curriculum and the ISLLC Standards.

3.02 Clinical Experience in a Variety of Settings. **Prospective educators complete field experiences in a variety of educational settings, including schools which serve culturally, linguistically, and economically diverse students and classrooms that serve students with a range of abilities, including students with exceptional needs.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: 3.02A – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program ensures that the LEAD 503 field experience occur in a variety of settings as intended.

2007 Recommendation: 3.02B – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program continue to work with the candidates, the College, and other stakeholders to secure means to ensure field experiences for other courses and program requirements in a variety of settings.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program provided evidence that is has worked to provide creative means for candidates to experience field placements in a variety of settings, including settings different from the candidate's home school, and in settings that serve racially, culturally, linguistically, and economically diverse students. The Rhode Island College School of Education makes available substitute reimbursement funds for each candidate for up to five days to experience internship hours beyond their home school. Candidates are required to complete the LEAD 503 placement in a community agency or urban setting to experience varied settings. Candidates are encouraged to consider conducting some or all of the two 150 hour internship placements in a setting other than their home school. The LEAD program provided evidence, and candidates confirmed that many students do respond to this encouragement and experience some portion of their field experiences in a variety of settings. Of the six graduates in cohort one, five spent at least some of the internship hours in placements other than their home school. However, the program design does not ensure varied placements as most candidates in cohort 2 conducted their first internship in their home school. While the program does document and record field experiences placements for the variety of settings in which placements occur, the program design allows for candidates to complete the program without practicing school leadership in a variety of settings. The team recognizes the attempt that the LEAD program has made with the community-based field experience in LEAD 503 to require candidates to engage in learning activities in diverse settings. However, the design of this field experience and the attendant learning tasks for candidates are disconnected from school leadership responsibilities thus limiting the effectiveness of this placement as a consistently meaningful field experiences for developing school leaders. *(Recommendation 3.02A met; 3.02B not met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program work with the CEP department and the School of Education to revisit the field experience design for the LEAD program and the expectations that candidates can conduct the field

experiences primarily in their home schools. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program develop a requirement for field experiences that ensures candidates experience a substantial portion of their field experiences in a variety of settings consistent with the expectations of RIPA Standard 3.02.

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program develop a monitoring system that will parallel a revised field experience design so that the program can ensure candidates participate in field experiences in a variety of settings consistent with the expectations of RIPA Standard 3.02.

3.03 Effective Field Sites. **Prospective educators complete field experiences in settings where they have the opportunity to practice their learning in a way that is consistent with the ISLLC Standards.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: 3.03A – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program explores and develops processes and criteria to ensure that candidates experience field placements in setting that are aligned to ISLLC standards and expectations for practice.

2007 Recommendation: 3.03B – The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program develop monitoring and evaluation processes and criteria to ensure the ongoing quality and effectiveness of field sites.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that the LEAD program "believes field experiences are critical components of candidate leaning and experiences. A good site provides exposure to, and practice in, all competencies as well as leadership standards." The LEAD program provided evidence in the exhibit room that it tracks the placements that candidates use for each of the field experiences throughout the program. Program faculty reported that they monitor the quality of sites through their knowledge of the sites, their presence during initial placement meetings, and follow-up evaluation visits. They also report that collectively through these activities, program faculty act as "moderating influences" on the quality of placements and any potential challenges that may arise for

candidates. The program faculty identify that since the candidates select their own placements the program has looked to creative, reactive means to provide support that they and/or the candidates determine to be lacking in a placement site to improve the effectiveness of the site. In an attempt to monitor sites for effectiveness and possible future placements, candidates are asked at the end of field placements to conduct an evaluation of the site and the supervising mentor. The program also reported in the IR and provided evidence in the exhibit room that it has begun to develop a list of effective placements for the community based or urban placement for LEAD 503 based on less than effective placements that have occurred for previous cohorts. While these actions may be beneficial to candidates, they do not equate to a program design that has established clear criteria for effective sites that ensure candidates will practice school leadership in a way consistent with the ISLLC Standards and then use these criteria to evaluate new and current field sites. Since candidates select their own placements, the current responsibility for the determination of site effectiveness lies with the candidates based on factors other than clear criteria the program may set and monitor. *(Recommendation 3.03A and 3.03B not met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program establish clear criteria for all field placement sites and use these criteria to evaluate all new and current sites to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to practice school leadership in field placements that are consistent with the full expectations of the ISLLC Standards.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that program ensure that field experiences for all candidates occur in placements that are consistent with the criteria that the program will establish and that the program develop an evaluation process to monitor the alignment of new and current sites to these criteria.

3.04 Effective Internship Supervisors. Approved programs place prospective educators exclusively with internship supervisors whose practice is consistent with ISLLC Standards. The internship supervisors know how to help prospective educators develop and how to evaluate prospective educators in order to make a recommendation regarding successful performance with respect to the standards.

> ***Approaching Standard (2007)***
> ***Approaching Standard (2009)***

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program explore effective means to evaluate and monitor Internship Supervisors to ensure that candidates are supervised by Internship Supervisors who practice consistent with ISLLC Standards.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program has established criteria for internship supervisors whom the program refers to as "Intern Mentors." These criteria include a willingness to serve as a mentor, at least five years experience as a school leader, positive recommendation from district leadership, agreeing to follow LEAD program requirements, attend orientation training, and the like. The program also has established clear roles and responsibilities for the mentor that include actions such as meeting regularly with the intern, providing meaningful feedback, and ensuring candidate responsibility for at least one major project during the internship period. These criteria and roles and responsibilities are presented to the mentor by the candidate as part of an "Intern Packet" that includes a cover letter, an intern checklist, an internship agreement, a learning plan template, ISSLC Standards, reflection journal forms and templates, portfolio guidelines, and an evaluation form. The program reported that it has worked with candidates to begin the process of identifying mentors earlier in the year beginning in the fall to better attempt to "secure solid placements and clarity of expectations." The IR indicates that candidates engage in learning tasks to help them select effective mentors. The program also provided evidence that it has tracked the mentor supervisors for all placements for LEAD 503, 511, and 512. The program reports in the IR that it has had only one "site that was deemed less than effective" and was the result of a "relatively new principal and a district that was transitioning to a new middle school model." The program reports that it monitors the quality of the mentors through evaluations the candidates complete at the end of their field experiences and also formatively through program faculty interactions with the candidates and the mentors. The visiting team agrees that the program has attempted to establish clear criteria for internship supervisors. The visiting team also recognizes that the LEAD program has and is making efforts to support candidates to identify and work with effective mentors in a variety of ways. Similar to RIPA 3.03, effective field sites, these actions while beneficial and ameliorative in nature, do not equate to a program design that has established clear criteria for internship supervisors that are consistent with the ISLLC Standards and then uses these criteria to evaluate new and current internship supervisors. Since candidates select their own internship supervisors, the current responsibility for the determination of supervisor effectiveness lies with the candidates based on factors

other than clear criteria the program may set and monitor. *(Recommendation 3.04 partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that program establish clear criteria for internship supervisors that are based on ISSLC Standards and the supervisor's ability to serve as effective mentors. This should include the ability to evaluate candidate progress and make an appropriate recommendation for licensure. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program use these criteria to evaluate all new and current supervisors to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to practice school leadership and be supervised by mentors who serve consistent with the full expectations of the ISLLC Standards and the LEAD program requirements.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that program ensure that field experiences for all candidates are supervised by mentors who practice school leadership consistent with the criteria that the program will establish and that the program develop an evaluation process to monitor the alignment of new and current internship supervisors to these criteria.

3.05 Recruit and Provide Professional Development for Internship Supervisors. **Approved programs recruit internship supervisors and mentors whose practice is consistent with the ISLLC Standards and who are committed to supporting the development of prospective educators. The programs provide professional development opportunities and other incentives to help these educators enhance their effectiveness in these roles.**

> **Approaching Standard (2007)**
> **Approaching Standard (2009)**

> *2007 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership implement its plans to recruit effective internship supervisors and develop

the materials necessary to train and support them with effective professional development.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program provides a thoughtful discussion in the IR that was echoed in meetings with program faculty and supported by documents in the exhibit room that actively recruiting, retaining, and rewarding internship supervisors has been a challenge for the LEAD program and that despite efforts by the program faculty has met "limited success." The program reports that the limited control the program has over site selection therefore limits the program's control over recruiting and retaining supervisors. The program has taken actions to bolster its efforts to recruit and retain supervisors including designing learning tasks for candidates that offer opportunities for candidates to provide service to their field sites, by connecting candidates with interested agencies through the LEAD 503 field experience, and through connections the program makes through its leadership development work across the state. Through interviews with internship supervisors, candidates, and program faculty it appears that supervisors benefit from and appreciate the learning that results from working with candidates and their focus on the leadership standards as well as the service the candidates provide to their schools. It also appears that the internship supervisors' perspectives are valued and their formative and summative recommendations are considered and integrated into the assessment of candidates' progress. The program reports in the IR that orientation and support of internship supervisors is also a challenge for the program as supervisors have "shown willingness, but cite time and pressing school/district commitments as barriers to both." The program also reports that internship supervisors serve as volunteers; there are no stipends for their service. The visiting team concurs that the program has had limited success in regards to this standard and addressing the 2007 recommendation. As currently designed and implemented, the program makes limited efforts to recruit supervisors, offers limited incentives to serve as mentors, and does not provide ongoing professional development. The structural issue of candidate self-selection of field placement sites has limited the program's ability to ensure variety of sites, effectiveness of sites, effectiveness of internship supervisors, and the ability to recruit and retain effective supervisors. *(Recommendation not met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program develop effective means to recruit, retain, and support effective internship supervisors that will parallel a candidate field placement process that is not based on candidate self-selection of sites.

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program examine how it provides incentives for internship supervisors and determine if these are meaningful and sufficient. Meaningful incentives need not include monetary incentives, but collectively should generate support for the program among supervisors and effectively encourage them to participate in program provided professional development and other learning experiences.

3.06 College/University and School Partnerships. **Approved programs establish collaborative and respectful relationships between college and university faculty and their institution and field-based educators, their schools, and their school districts that benefit both the institution of higher education and the K-12 school district for the common goal of preparing prospective educators.**

<div align="center">

Unacceptable (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

</div>

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that Educational Leadership Program invest time and resources in securing helpful partnership to support program implementation, revision, and improvement and that will support the wider field of K-12 education.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The program reports in the IR that "the LEAD approach has been to secure informal partnerships with interested school/districts with the win-win attitude and approach." The program further reported and exhibit room evidence confirm that the program has made several informal partnerships with schools and districts that include candidate placements and offering targeted professional development such as is occurring in North Kingstown, Central Falls, and Newport. An additional support that should add to the program partnerships is the recent hiring of an Associate Dean for Field Placement and Partnerships. Program faculty also report that an additional faculty line has been approved for an additional faculty member for the LEAD program. The program envisions that part of this new faculty member's responsibility will be to advance the partnerships the program is able to develop with schools and districts. The visiting team recognizes that the program has made considerable efforts in this area while also revising and completing the LEAD program design

and curriculum. The efforts to connect to schools and districts through creative means, through statewide leadership development efforts, and through the providing of professional development have created informal partnerships that advance school improvement and reform. The LEAD program has not yet created formal partnerships with schools and districts in which its candidates practice school leadership that are mutually beneficial to the LEAD program and schools and districts. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that program continue the informal partnerships that have helped to strengthen the LEAD program and schools and districts in the state. The visiting team further RECOMMENDS that the program work with the schools and districts that it places school leadership candidates in to develop formal partnerships that are mutually beneficial.

4. Rhode Island Educator Certification Programs and their institutions demonstrate a commitment to affirming the diversity[1] of our state, our communities, and our public schools by preparing educators who can work effectively with students, families, community members, and colleagues from diverse backgrounds to create learning communities in which all students succeed.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

The Lead program has made some progress regarding Standard 4 and its component indicators. Two of the indicator ratings were raised from 'unacceptable' to 'approaching standard' – two remain unchanged and one indicator was not rated this year. Three recommendations were partially met, whereas one recommendation was not met.. While issues of diversity may represent a challenge for institutions and programs, the progress made towards these indicators and recommendations indicates positive steps that can be made to demonstrate a commitment to affirming the diversity of our state, our communities, and our public schools.

4.01 Curriculum. **Prospective educators develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential to preparing them to be effective teachers of diverse students. The preparation includes a curriculum that engages all students in issues of diversity in our world and in our schools. The curriculum also expands the socio-cultural awareness of prospective educators by helping them become more aware of how their own world views are shaped by their life experiences. The curriculum helps prospective educators develop affirming attitudes towards individuals from diverse backgrounds and a commitment to making schools places where all**

---

1 Diversity is used throughout this standard to address ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual-orientation, and geographical area.

students succeed. Throughout their preparation, prospective educators learn about diverse communities and students and learn to teach in diverse communities and classrooms. They learn to create classrooms in which instruction builds from the cultures of their students' communities.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program and the FSEHD work to develop systems to ensure that all candidates are prepared to practice and apply the curriculum and demonstrate the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified in the program and FSEHD assessment system in diverse settings.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR indicates that the continuing evolution of the program has allowed the program to respond to the recommendations regarding diversity in the curriculum. The IR further states that an expanding vision of leadership that occurs across the three years of the program as well as increased learning tasks in key courses that focus on diversity strengthen this aspect of the curriculum. A review of course syllabi and student work products indicate that diversity is a focus in some components of the curriculum. Further, candidates reported that issues of diversity and multiple perspectives are a point of class discussion and reflection. However, issues of diversity and the full range of diversity did not appear to be systematically integrated into course syllabi, evident in course outlines, or emphasized in course or program materials. Several learning tasks that are assigned to candidates and were identified in the evidence room as featuring issues of diversity did not focus on diversity but general leadership issues such as leadership style, emergency procedures, and improving overall student achievement. (Several other evidence folders for 4.01 included a cover page for diversity tasks from specific courses, but contained no tasks or student work.) Candidates also reported that there were limited texts and readings that featured diversity issues. *(Recommendation not met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program continue to review and revise the program curriculum to ensure that it engages all candidates in issues of diversity in our world and in our school through more a systematic and formal embedding of diversity issues into the curriculum and corresponding learning tasks.

4.02 Field Experiences that Capitalize on the Diversity of P-12 Schools. Prospective educators successfully complete field experiences that are designed to assure interaction with exceptional students, and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, socio-economic, language, and religious groups. Through these experiences prospective educators examine issues of diversity in teaching and learning. Skilled cooperating teachers and college and university faculty help the prospective educators use these experiences to improve their ability to teach students from diverse backgrounds effectively.

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program examine its requirements for field experiences to ensure that all candidates have opportunities to develop their leadership practice in diverse settings.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR response to indicator 4.02 begins with the statement that the program "recognizes the importance of field experiences that engage diverse learners and allow candidates opportunities to design and implement instruction that is accessible to various groups of students." The program and the School of Education have made efforts to address the need to ensure that candidates have field experiences that capitalize on the diversity of PK-12 schools – the 501 and 503 initial field experiences, providing funds to provide substitutes for candidates who seek to experience internship placements in settings different from their place of employment, and encouraging candidates to pursue and benefit from varied placements. Candidates report and evidence was provided to the visiting team that these varied placements strengthen the preparation of leaders to engage issues of diversity. Concern was also reported by candidates, by meeting participants, as well as noted in evidence in the exhibit room, that the current program design in which candidates are eligible to complete both the 511 and 512 internships in their place of employment may preclude these individuals from developing their educational leadership in diverse settings. Further, while the 501 and 503 experiences are designed to provide additional and creative means to provide opportunities to experience diverse settings, it is not clear that these experiences represent meaningful opportunities in which candidates practice developing their leadership capacity in diverse settings. *(Recommendation not met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program work with the CEP department, the School of Education, and district partners to identify and implement a systematic process in which all candidates will be provided with sufficient opportunities to develop their leadership capacity in diverse settings.

4.03 An Environment that Values Diversity. **Colleges and universities and their teacher preparation programs make issues of socio-cultural awareness, affirmation of diversity, and the preparation of culturally responsive teachers central to their mission   Colleges and universities establish a campus environment that promotes and sustains a diverse community. They capitalize on the community's diversity to promote deeper understanding of issues of equity and diversity in our state, our communities, and our schools.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
No Rating (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program review its policies and practices in regards to establishing an environment including policies that emphasize socio-cultural awareness and affirmation of diversity, creating a diverse community, and promoting a deeper understanding of diversity to make specific and substantial changes to better realize this goal.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The visiting team recognizes that several efforts continue both at the institution and program level to develop and support an environment that values diversity. These efforts include an emphasis on recruiting a diverse faculty and student body, supporting organizations that advocate for diversity issues, revising the advanced program competencies, and outreach and support for diverse learners. The 2009 visiting team did not provide a rating for this indicator as it was charged only with reviewing the LEAD program and was not able to provide a rating for a campus-wide issue indicative of 4.03.

4.04 Faculty. **Colleges and universities and the teacher preparation programs recruit, hire, support, and retain a diverse faculty. Prospective educators have the opportunity to learn**

from faculty members whose diverse backgrounds enable prospective educators to view their craft through a wide lens.

Unacceptable (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

> *2007 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program work with the college community and other stakeholders to develop effective means to promote a more diverse faculty presence within the program.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The program recently hired an additional faculty member for the LEAD program. Evidence was provided to the visiting team that an intentional and systematic search process was conducted to ensure that diverse candidates were recruited to apply for this position. Several candidates in the initial pool were from diverse backgrounds as were two of the three finalists for the position. While the ultimate hire was not from a diverse background, the program presented evidence that it engaged in several varied strategies to recruit and potentially hire a diverse candidate including contacting historically black colleges and universities, advertising in periodicals that emphasize diversity, and networking with colleagues. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that for the upcoming approved additional faculty hire that it continue the promising recruitment strategies that it used in the last faculty search as well as continue to explore and implement additional practices that may result in an increase in the diversity of program faculty.

4.05 Students. **Colleges and universities and their teacher preparation programs recruit, admit, support, and retain a diverse student body. The program's admission processes, curriculum, access to student services, and counseling and mentoring programs are designed to support the preparation of a more diverse teaching force. Prospective teachers from diverse cultural backgrounds and with experiences that differ from the other prospective teachers find their participation is elicited, valued, and affirmed throughout the preparation program.**

Unacceptable (2007)

Approaching Standard (2009)

> *2007 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program work with the college community and other stakeholders to develop effective means to recruit, admit, support, and graduate a more diverse student body.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The Lead program cites in the IR three strategies that have helped to increase the diversity of program candidates – networking, sending brochures to every school and district in Rhode Island, and recruiting through current cohort members. The visiting team also reviewed evidence that a graduate school open house, the mailing of postcards, and development of two elective courses may also support efforts to increase the diversity of program students. While these efforts have resulted in some diversity of candidates in the program cohorts, it has not been sufficient to ensure a cohort of candidates that is reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island. A possible advanced teacher certificate program that is currently being discussed as well as a non-licensure track may provide an additional source of diverse candidates for the program. Continued and increased efforts to develop partnerships with community and leadership agencies may also support the efforts to recruit and retain a more diverse student body. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program continue those efforts that it recognizes to be successful in increasing the diversity of the program candidates while continuing to explore and implement additional practices that may result in candidate diversity.

5. Rhode Island Educator Preparation Programs are supported by college and university structures that provide the resources necessary to ensure quality programs; a faculty which is engaged in scholarship, demonstrates exceptional expertise in its teaching fields, and is actively involved in PK-12 schools; and coherence within and across preparation programs.

Approaching Standard (2007)
On Standard (2009)

The LEAD program has made substantial progress regarding Standard 5 and its component indicators. The program has responded effectively to the recommendations from the 2007 report – one of the three recommendations for Standard 5 has been met and two have been partially met. One indicator rating increased from "approaching standard" to "on standard." One indicator rating increased from "unacceptable" to "approaching standard." Two other indicator ratings remain unchanged. Continued effort on the part of the program faculty and the support of the Counseling and Education Psychology Department and the School of Education are necessary to address the remaining indicators and recommendations for this standard.

5.01 Qualified Faculty Members. **The Professional Education Faculty is composed of individuals with exceptional expertise as teachers and scholars in their teaching fields. They exemplify the qualities of effective instruction including the proficiencies described in the ISLLC Standards.**

On Standard (2007)
On Standard (2009)

The LEAD program courses are taught by faculty members who are exemplify the qualities of effective instruction including the proficiencies described by the ISLLC Standards. The faculty members' curriculum vitae show appropriate preparation for their assignments with specialized expertise in several critical areas of educational leadership necessary to support the

development of new school leaders. The program has a comprehensive evaluation system that evaluates teaching and faculty member scholarship that includes a formal institution evaluation system and course evaluations conducted by students in the program. Additionally, candidates and others affiliated with the programs applaud the accessibility and commitment to the preparation of school leaders that is exemplified by the program faculty.

***5.02 Faculty Responsibilities and Professional Development.* The Professional Education Faculty is involved in teaching, scholarship, and service. They are involved with practice in K-12 schools. Approved programs ensure the ongoing professional development of their faculty.**

<div align="center">

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

</div>

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that program faculty ensure that they meet each of the expectations identified in this standard to promote and improve teaching, scholarship, and service.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: Evidence provided to the visiting team indicates that program faculty members are actively engaged in the advancement of educational leadership through service to the community, scholarship, and teaching. Program faculty develop and deliver presentations to schools and educational organizations, secure grants to support the improvement efforts of local school districts, and work as consultants in the field on a variety of education and leadership issues. Program faculty members engage in these activities while also maintaining responsibility for the ongoing design, implementation, and continuous improvement of the LEAD program. Despite these significant contributions to the educational leadership field and program, this indicator was rated as "approaching standard" due to an absence of evidence of ongoing professional development necessary to support the continuous learning needs of program faculty. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

2009 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program work with all program faculty members to identify critical ongoing professional development needs that will support the continuous improvement of the program and ensure that such professional development is part of all program faculty members' professional responsibilities.

5.03 Resources. **Approved programs assure access to adequate resources to support teaching and scholarship, including the necessary facilities, equipment, library, curriculum resources, educational technology, and financial resources to support quality programs.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
On Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership faculty, other members of the RIC community and other stakeholders continue to work to maximize available funds, seek additional funding sources, and prioritize actions that match available funds.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program has adequate resources to meet the expectation of the RIPA Standards and the learning needs of the program candidates. There are sufficient program faculty members to support candidate growth in the classroom and in the field. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technology, library, curricula, and financial resources to support the candidates and program faculty. Candidates and faculty report that they have access to sufficient educational materials and resources. The program has been supported by the recent appointment of a second program faculty member, an Associate Dean for Field Placement and Partnerships, and the program reports that it has been granted approval to hire an additional faculty member for the LEAD program. *(Recommendation met.)*

5.04 Professional Community. **Approved programs support collaboration among higher education faculty, school personnel and other members of the professional community to prepare new educators and to improve the quality of education of children.**

Unacceptable (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program identify and develop partnerships to support the preparation of

educators and the quality of education for children with organizations outside of the college.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The LEAD program has provided evidence that is has developed several current and emerging partnerships. These partnerships include the Rhode Island Legal/Educational Partnership, the Rhode Island Center for School Leadership, the Rhode Island Association of School Principals, the Rhode Island Principal's Council on Athletics, and Channel 36, WSBE. The program and program faculty also support instructional improvement efforts in several schools and districts including Central Falls, North Kingstown, Portsmouth, and Bristol-Warren. The appointment of an Associate Dean for School Placements should further advance these and other emerging partnerships. Collectively, although these represent important advances, these partnerships remain initial efforts and/or do not yet rise to the level of clearly defined partnerships that support the advancement of educators and improve the quality of education for children. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the LEAD program work with the School of Education, the newly appointed Associate Dean for Field Placements and Partnerships, and other members of the professional community to extend and increase its partnerships to ensure that they represent clearly defined partnerships that improve the quality of education for children.

<div style="border:1px solid #000; background:#bbb; padding:1em; text-align:center">

6. Rhode Island Educator Preparation Programs engage in a process of regular evaluation to ensure program improvement.

Approaching Standard (2007)

</div>

The LEAD program provided evidence that it recognizes the need for continuous improvement and is committed to the ongoing development of the program. Several improvements have been made in the program since the 2007 RIPA visit and these have been articulated in this report.. The one indicator that was rated for RIPA Standard 6, continuous improvement, remained at the same rating as in 2007, "approaching standard." The visiting team noted progress in relation to 6.01 but did not see evidence of a regular and systematic data collection and analysis process that led to the identification *and* action towards programmatic change.

6.01 Commitment to High Quality and Improvement. **Approved programs engage in regular and systematic evaluations (including, but not limited to, information obtained through student assessment, and collection of data from students, recent graduates, and other members of the professional community) and use these findings to improve the preparation of prospective educators through the modification of the program.**

Approaching Standard (2007)
Approaching Standard (2009)

2007 Recommendation: The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program conduct data collection and analysis consistent with checkpoints outlined in the program while working to revise the current unfinished plan and continually improve the program design and performance.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: The IR states that the LEAD program "continues to grow and improve as design and implementation issues are examined, discussed, and measured in terms of the intended learning outcomes built on the ISSLC/ELCC leadership standards and RIC advanced competencies." The LEAD program provided evidence of several improvements that have occurred since the 2007 RIPA visit including completing the program and course design to align with national standards, working to increase partnerships with schools, districts, and the professional community, and increasing the resources that are available to support candidate growth in the program. The visiting team also reviewed evidence of data collection and analysis from several sources that demonstrate that the program is

examining its performance for possible future improvements including candidate performance on program assessments, the effectiveness of some field sites, and the design of the field experience. It is clear to the visiting team that the LEAD program is committed to improvement and has made progress in completing the program and course design and addressing several recommendations from the 2007 RIPA report. It is also clear to the visiting team that significant progress remains to be made. The program has demonstrated that it collects some data and has developed recommendations from the data including several cited in this report. The program has yet to use the data that it has generated or to act on the recommendations that were identified by the program analysis of the data. The program has addressed some of the 2007 RIPA report recommendations such as completing the assessment system and strengthening field experiences, but further work is needed in these areas. . As the LEAD program continues to grow, it should also increase its data collection and analysis focus to include all program assessments, proposed employer surveys, field experience data, and other sources of potential useful information. The visiting team reviewed several pieces of evidence in the exhibit room that included data analysis and recommendations regarding various aspects of program performance. It was not clear to the visiting team how these reports are to be used as a source of program improvement or if the program faculty regularly meets to interpret data to identify and act upon areas of programmatic change. *(Recommendation partially met.)*

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program continue its current efforts to collect and analyze data and to expand this focus to include all aspects of program performance – particularly those areas that initial data analysis identify as sources of concern and areas that address recommendations from this report.

> *2009 Recommendation:* The visiting team RECOMMENDS that the program develop a process to ensure that the program regularly meets to review program data, identify areas of change based upon this data, and monitors and evaluates the changes as they are implemented.

6.02 Coherence Within and Across Programs. Approved programs ensure that coherence exists between the ISLLC Standards and student outcomes, courses, field experiences, instruction, and assessment, both within and across programs.

<div align="center">

Approaching Standard (2007)

No Rating (2009)

</div>

2007 Recommendation: The visit team RECOMMENDS that the Educational Leadership Program with support from the FSEHD complete the design for the program to ensure coherency for each cohort of students within the program.

2009 Visiting Team Findings and Recommendations: Similar to 4.03, an environment that values diversity, the 2009 RIPA visiting team did not provide a rating nor make recommendations for improvement. The visiting team did determine that the LEAD program represents a coherent curriculum and articulated this by rating 2.05, coherence, as being "on standard." The visiting team identified that the curriculum provides candidates an appropriately and developmentally sequenced learning experience and an opportunity to engage the full depth and breadth of the ISLLC Standards. Since the 2009 review was a follow-up visit for the LEAD program only, it was not charged with looking across graduate programs for coherence and as such was not able to rate this indicator.