

PROGRAM REPORT FOR THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS (School Building Leadership Level) Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)

Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

Rhode Island College

2. State

Rhode Island

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2010

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Tyler Page

Phone:

Ext.

(401) 456-9610

E-mail:

wpage1@ric.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Phone:

Ext.

() -

E-mail:

6. Name of institution's program

Educational Leadership Program (LEAD)

7. NCATE Category

Educational Leadership-Principal

8. Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared

Early childhood; k-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

9. Program Type

- Advanced Teaching
- First teaching license
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Rhode Island Elementary and Secondary Administrators Certificate

14. Program report status:

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:
NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable

state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

Yes

No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ELCC standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Rhode Island College is located in Providence, Rhode Island, and serves as the primary state educational institution for the preparation of teachers and school administrators. Situated in the CEP department (Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Leadership), the LEAD program is committed 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 program faculty is strongly committed to developing learning communities grounded in collaborative and responsive relationships with candidates, each other, and area schools and communities. The Masters degree in Educational Administration is a 31-credit program that prepares candidates for certification as elementary and secondary principals. In Rhode Island, to obtain principal certification, candidates must have three years of teaching experience, hold a Master Degree in educational administration, and complete a university/college-approved program. While the State does not mandate an external leadership assessment for licensure, Rhode Island College and LEAD require candidates to take and pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) for program completion.

The LEAD program is guided by five core values: learning, democratic collaboration, diversity, critical inquiry, and continuous improvement. Learning is the core issue in education; curriculum, instruction and assessment cycles facilitate learning. Attending to our own learning and reflective practice helps us to keep learning central. Deep, useful learning, from field and class, experience is facilitated through dialogue encompassing deliberate, simultaneous reflection upon experiential and conceptual elements. Democratic collaboration sees “program” as a group of faculty who remain in conversation/dialogue with students as they develop and modify practice to facilitate learning outcomes consonant with the FSEHD and LEAD mission. Quality education is a responsibility shared by school systems, families, communities, businesses, and governments and involves facilitating dialogue across boundaries, building alliances and partnerships for change; school leaders have outreach and initiatory responsibility.

In the context of diversity and equity, ethical and social justice imperatives drive leadership behavior toward ensuring all children and youth the opportunity and the support to grow, learn, and become contributing members of our democratic society. Culturally competent leaders are vital to empowering schools to address the needs of a diverse society.

Critical Inquiry and Continuous Improvement are equally important whereby leaders manifest a spirit of critical inquiry, ongoing reflective and critical self-examination, and willingness to change when new insights develop.

LEAD believes in true collaboration; the cohort model was chosen because it aligns with the core beliefs (values) of the program. The cohort model involves a series of semester long courses and field/internship experiences. Candidates complete the required sequence of courses as a learning community and engage in class and field-based experiential learning projects designed to develop important leadership skills. In addition to rigorous course work, educational leadership program candidates complete two field experiences and two internships in multiple settings, tailored to individual career objectives as well as state and SPA standards. Shared experiences in seminars enhance learning

opportunities and lay the foundation for connection/collaboration after graduation.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

LEAD faculty members believe that for candidates to become fully professional, they must begin to develop philosophical and methodological perspectives based on consideration of fundamental issues, exemplary practices, theories and research. Effective educational leaders understand leadership and management concepts and recognize that the primary role of the school leader is to facilitate learning and teaching. 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 rationale behind this approach is to provide a developmental curve that assimilates advanced competencies at the program level with the knowledge and application of ISLLC/ELCC and Rhode Island leadership standards. Effective field experiences allow candidates to apply leadership practice through guided field experiences. It also offers candidates the targeted opportunities to practice skills gleaned from coursework, discussion, and observation. Therefore, the field experiences are examples of what candidates know, can do, and need to develop to become effective leaders.

The Educational Leadership (LEAD) Program requires students to engage in four (4) field experiences during their course of study. The practicum and internships are intended to provide access to all aspects of the profession. For example, in LEAD 501, candidates complete two three-hour shadowing experiences to explore issues in school leadership and the impact on student learning. The primary purpose of this initial field experience in the first semester is to engage candidates in observing and collecting descriptive data beyond the classroom level with a focus on organizational perspectives, structures, and processes. The two shadowing experiences, one of a school leader, the other of a student, highlight the initial field experience.

For the second field experience, LEAD faculty members believe that educational leaders must expand the developing leadership lens to promote the success of all students outside the confines of the school. This is done by collaborating with families and community members, while responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. The purpose of a second field, therefore, is to extend prior learning and to offer candidates the opportunity to apply and hone their developing communication, organization, and collaboration skills in a real setting. Candidates' clinical experience in LEAD 503 takes place as they are enrolled in LEAD 502 (Building Connections), where the focus is on candidates exploring how to communicate with and influence decision-makers outside the school community to promote equitable access to learning. The clinical experience requires a fifty-hour field experience in a family or youth agency in an urban center with a diverse clientele. Emphasis is on building sociopolitical and fiscal resources to support learning. The concurrent enrollment in these two courses creates a bridge integrating theory and practice. Ideas from class enrich practice, and experiences in the workplace enrich class work.

The internship component(s) of LEAD are two 150-hour experiences resulting in practice and leadership artifacts that illustrate candidate competency. Leadership Internship I is designed to develop and nurture competencies that prepare candidates for leadership positions in schools. Each internship includes a variety of substantial experiences planned and guided cooperatively by university and school district personnel. The experiences provide interns with significant responsibility which increases over time in amount and complexity, and involves direct interaction, involvement, and at times, intervention, with students, staff, parent, and community leaders.

Clinical experiences in the initial LEAD 511 internship are focused on “leading learning”. Each candidate is required to create a portfolio chronicling his/her experiences throughout the entire internship. Additionally, a candidate's clinical experience in LEAD 511 takes place as he/she is enrolled in LEAD 505, with an emphasis on collaboration, supervision, and technology. LEAD 505 also focuses on candidates developing and enacting an equitable educational platform for learning, which is characterized by collaborative instructional teams, effective supervision, and systematic monitoring of learning outcomes. The concurrent enrollment in these two courses, again, creates a bridge integrating theory and practice. As written earlier, discussions from class enrich practice, and experiences in the workplace supplement class work.

The second, and culminating experience, LEAD 512, continues exploring leadership issues that link to theoretical concepts, models, and process of leadership and change. The intended purpose is to manage/influence change and its resulting outcomes, and to apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions from LEAD 507 and LEAD 508 to the school setting. Specifically, students examine school change and improvement with focus on: models for facilitating change; school culture; and fundamental issues related to development of personnel within educational organizations. This culminating internship experience is focused by a powerful synthesis of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the workplace environment. At the conclusion of this final internship experience, candidates have completed tasks and activities that develop and demonstrate competency in each relevant standard.

In sum, students spend 150 hours a semester in internship activities, attend seminars, prepare logs, and finalize portfolio sections for a culminating presentation. Candidates' clinical experiences in both LEAD 511 and LEAD 512 promote individual and group reflective practice for leading change. The concurrent enrollment in these courses creates a bridge integrating theory and practice. Ideas from class enrich practice, and experiences in the workplace supplement class work.

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Admission to the LEAD program requires candidates to complete the admission packet; applications are screened/scored by three LEAD faculty members and candidates are admitted as fully matriculated students.

LEAD has common assessment criteria for admission to an advanced program. These include: 1) undergraduate GPA or graduate GPA (whichever is most recent), 2) Miller's or GRE Scores, 3) a Professional Goals Essay, 4) Reference Forms, 5) a Performance-Based Evaluation, and 6) indication of Teaching/Education Experience.

The admissions committee independently scores admissions materials using a weighted rubric, compile scores for acceptance, conditional acceptance, or denial. For those candidates near the cutoff, committee members confer to make final admission decisions; an interview may be required. Materials are then forwarded with LEAD program rubric scores and FSEHD admission standards to the Dean's office for processing to complete admission. It should be noted that some non-educational candidates seek to attain a leadership degree and may be admitted with a “letter of understanding” indicating the conferred degree does not ensure State certification. Upon admission to the program, each new graduate student is assigned to a faculty advisor. Students must confer with their advisor to develop a plan of study. This plan serves as official documentation and is filed with the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. After this initial planning session, it is the candidates apprise the their advisor of any anticipated changes to their plan.

Evaluation of student progress is program-embedded beginning with the admissions portfolio/application and followed during the program in the form of portfolios, observations of professional work, and field-supervisor evaluation of student progress.

Instructors with serious concerns about a student's performance talk with the student and then submit a written statement describing the nature of the problem, a plan to solve the problem, evaluation criteria, and possible outcomes (e.g., grades, continuation in the program). The candidate's program advisor coordinates efforts to resolve the issue with the student, instructor, campus services, and other faculty as needed.

Advisors regularly check their advisees' cumulative grade point averages and individual course grades. Failure to meet any one of the above requirements is sufficient cause for dismissal from the program. Satisfactory progress in compiling the program portfolio is assessed through meetings with advisees and communication with the instructors in advisees' courses.

Faculty have revised its assessment system and rubric expectations bringing us in closer alignment with ISLLC and ELCC standards. Program expectations are directly connected to the ISLLC standards as evidenced by course syllabi, outcomes, tasks, and assessments. Continued evaluation of coursework and candidate understanding of standards is ongoing

At the course level, faculty members continue to study candidate work samples to determine the characteristics that separate one level of quality from the next, and refine/delete early rubric descriptors that are no longer relevant, within the context of the advanced competencies and the ISLLC/Leadership standards.

As the program grows, there are more regular and thoughtful attempts to counsel LEAD students throughout their work. Written feedback on reflective assignments creates opportunities for ongoing conversations between professor and student, advisor and advisee. These relationships continue outside of the formal classroom, on to the students' culminating internship settings (LEAD 511/512).

A self-evaluation against the ISLLC standards, recently successful completion of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) by the first cohort, and the program-specific comprehensive exam, suggests/indicates program effectiveness and a constant feedback loop for academic advisement.

4. Description of the relationship ⁽²⁾ of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The FSEHD Conceptual Framework serves as a foundation for LEAD and all education programs at Rhode Island College. It is aligned with RI Professional Teacher Standards and national professional association standards. The Framework provides a basis for assessment of candidate, graduate level advanced competencies qualifications and program quality. The current version emphasizes three roles:

- The educator as a planner
- The educator as an implementer, and
- The educator as a reflective and collaborative practitioner.

It is the responsibility of program faculty members to align specific program elements to the Conceptual Framework, and professional organizational association standards (e.g. ISLCC, ELCC, RI Leadership standards).

The Conceptual Framework emphasizes the FSEHD mission to develop reflective practitioners for the 21st century. Candidates are introduced to reflective practice as they progress through FSEHD professional programs, and continue to grow as reflective practitioners throughout their careers.

There are two motifs – PAR and the Four Themes – that organize the Conceptual Framework. The first motif, PAR, an acronym for "Planning, Acting, and Reflecting," represents the recursive process involved in reflective educational practice, be it administration, counseling, or teaching.

The other motif for graduate programs is the Four Themes – Knowledge, Practice, Diversity, and Professionalism – which constitute the shared knowledge base of reflective practice. Whereas PAR denotes the way in which reflective practitioners ply their craft, the Four Themes describe the requisite knowledge and skills.

This foundation for best professional practice includes (1) thorough Knowledge of content, context, and human development, (2) theoretical and practical grounding in Practice, (3) sensitivity and

responsiveness to human Diversity, and (4) agreed-upon standards of Professionalism.

Reflective practitioners must have background knowledge and skills in each of the Four Themes. However, just as the PAR acronym articulates discrete phases of reflective practice, which in reality cannot be separated, the Four Themes similarly distinguish domains of knowledge and endeavor, which profoundly overlap. Indeed, the overlap is so deep and pervasive that to separate these themes in theory runs the risk of fragmenting the shared knowledge base of professional education practice. Keeping their pervasive interaction in mind, the Four Themes are summarized below.

- **Knowledge:** all educators need a broad base of knowledge in the liberal arts, including mastery of oral and written communication, mathematical and reasoning skills, and technological competence. They need a working familiarity with the discrete ways of knowing, as well as a global perspective that emphasizes people's interdependence with one another and with nature.
- **Practice:** refers to the instructional process itself, encompassing both the method employed and its underlying rationale. Teachers, administrators, school psychologists, and counselors all engage in practice in some form or other. As such, they go through the reflective cycle by conceiving educational aims and objectives.
- **Diversity:** Students, clients, and families in the United States differ markedly in race, ethnicity, language, social class, religion, gender, sexual orientation, special need, and exceptionality. Given the democratic ideals and pluralistic nature of our society, the preparation of reflective practitioners must include careful study of both the differences and commonalities that bind them together.
- **Professionalism:** refers to the standards of practice and code of ethics adopted by the education profession that reflect the ideals and values of a democratic society. FSEHD supports the growth of professionalism of reflective practitioners by highlighting professional ethics, collaboration and advocacy, and professional development.

(2): The response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system⁽³⁾. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The FSEHD provides guidelines for LEAD candidates as they progress through the program: LEAD also has a number of program-specific assessments to provide structure and direction. The following describes key assessment points:

- 1) Upon admission to the program, each new graduate student is assigned to a faculty advisor. As soon as possible, students must confer with their advisor to develop a plan of study. Upon acceptance into the program, students must meet with their faculty advisor to develop a plan of study;
- 2) Advisor regularly examine his/her advisee's performance in LEAD coursework to ensure that the candidates stay on track and are retained in the program.
- 3) The LEAD program faculty members identify readiness for Supervised Internship as the formative checkpoint in the advanced programs. The common requirements that candidates must meet to achieve the formative transition checkpoint include a minimum GPA of B or better, performance-based work samples, a self-evaluation (ISLLC evaluation), and a faculty/advisor evaluation/approval
LEAD 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.

4) Program faculty have developed and adopted a rubric for assessing candidate's comprehensive exam results. All LEAD faculty members review each candidate's work using a rubric in which all reviewers have been trained. Each reviewer was trained how to interpret the rubric criteria and apply them consistently. Preliminary inter-rater reliability checks reveal consistency. Reviewers score each candidate's assessment results and make a recommendation that the candidate should pass or fail. Where divergent recommendations are made, reviewers meet to discuss the details of the candidate's assessment and arrive at a consensus regarding the results. Where a consensus cannot be reached, the chair of the department or another outside referee will be brought in to break the deadlock. Reviewers are required to document their rubric scores and other ratings.

A candidate who fails the comprehensive examination may be permitted one reexamination in the part or parts failed, if re-examination is recommended. The second comprehensive examination may be taken only at the next regularly scheduled examination date. Candidates may not take the comprehensive exam more than two times.

5) School Leaders Licensure Assessment

The content of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (Educational Testing Service) is based on the standards developed by ISLLC members and on a national job analysis. The standards are based on:

- o a thorough analysis of what is known about effective educational leadership at the school and district levels
- o a comprehensive examination of the best thinking about the types of leadership that will be required for tomorrow's schools

- o syntheses of the thoughtful work on administrator standards developed by various national organizations, professional associations, and reform commissions

- o in-depth discussions of leadership and administrative standards by leaders within each of the 24 states involved in the ISLLC

6) Review of Program Portfolio (Program Exit)

A review team of LEAD faculty members examines each candidate's final program portfolio using a rubric in which all reviewers have been trained. Inter-rater reliability checks ensure consistency. Once trained, reviewers score each candidate's portfolio and make a recommendation that the candidate should pass or fail. Where divergent recommendations are made, reviewers meet to discuss the details of the candidate's portfolio and arrive at a consensus regarding the assessment decision.

(3) This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

6. Attach the following contextual information:

Files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

7. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

SECTION I-#7-Course Outlines

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ⁽⁴⁾
2008-2009	29	6
2007-2008	16	N/A
2006-2007	4	N/A

(4) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

9. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Gracia, Susan
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽⁵⁾	PhD: Boston College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁶⁾	Faculty; Assessment Coordinator
Faculty Rank ⁽⁷⁾	Assoc. Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁸⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁹⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽¹⁰⁾	Scholarship: Gracia, S. (2009). Under scrutiny: State, SPA, and NCATE considerations in graduate assessment. Paper presented at the New England Educational Research Association conference, Portsmouth, NH. Professional: Providence Public Schools: Designed and led evaluation of district's career and technical education program Service: Chair, RI College Committee for the Assessment of Student Outcomes
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽¹¹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	Page, Tyler
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽⁵⁾	PhD: Educational Leadership Boston College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁶⁾	Faculty; Program Coordinator clinical supervisor
Faculty Rank ⁽⁷⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁸⁾ , Leadership in	Scholarship: Presentation: Valencia, Spain: March, 2009 "The use of influence in

Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁹⁾ :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽¹⁰⁾	education: an out-of –the-box approach to leadership practice”. Professional: Board & Steering Committee Member: Rhode Island Center for School Leadership. Development & Articulation of new RI Leadership Standards Service: Advisor/Member: Rhode Island Principals Committee for Athletics
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽¹¹⁾	Service: Advisor/Member: Rhode Island Principals Committee for Athletics Consulting: Block Island Public Schools- School climate initiative

Faculty Member Name	Snyder, Andrew
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽⁵⁾	EdD: Educational Leadership Boston University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁶⁾	Faculty: clinical supervisor
Faculty Rank ⁽⁷⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁸⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁹⁾ :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽¹⁰⁾	Scholarship: Co-Presenter-Madrid: “Building the principals leadership team” Professional: Co-Principal Investigator: Title II grant: “An Integrated Model of Professional Development”. Focus on RTI, PLC’s, and School Culture Service: Rhode Island College Curriculum Committee
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽¹¹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	Anderson, William
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽⁵⁾	MEd: JD: Suffolk University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁶⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁷⁾	Instructor
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁸⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁹⁾ :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽¹⁰⁾	No
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽¹¹⁾	

(5) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(6) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(7) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(8) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one’s work for professional review and evaluation.

(9) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit’s mission.

(10) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(11) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the

discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ELLC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment (12)	Type or Form of Assessment (13)	When the Assessment Is Administered (14)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)	ETS Licensure Assessment (SLLA)	ETS Licensure Assessment (SLLA)
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership (required)	COMPREHENSIVE EXAM	COMPREHENSIVE EXAM	Completion of LEAD 507 Final Semester-3rd Year
Assessment #3: Assessment of ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction (required)	COURSE PORTFOLIO	COURSE PORTFOLIO	Required Course: LEAD 504 Leading Learning I: Planning, Instruction & Assessment
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship/clinical practice (required)	INTERNSHIP MENTOR EVALUATION	INTERNSHIP MENTOR EVALUATION	Required Courses: LEAD 511 & 512 Leadership Internship I & II
Assessment #5: Assessment of ability to support student learning and development (required)	SUPERVISION & EVALUATION	Supervision & Evaluation Project	Required Courses: LEAD 505 Leading Learning II: Collaboration, Supervision, Technology
Assessment #6: Content-based assessment-application of content(required)	PROGRAM PORTFOLIO	PROGRAM PORTFOLIO	Completion of Program End-3rd Year
	FIELD EXPERIENCE SUPERVISOR EVALUATION	Organization & Community Relations	Required Course: LEAD 503, Building Connections in Diverse Contexts

Assessment #7: Assessment of abilities in organizational management and community relations (required)			
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)			

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ELCC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ELCC standards.

1. 1.0 Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning.	b	b	e	b	b	b	e	e
1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.	b	e	e	b	b	b	e	e
1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.	b	e	e	b	b	b	e	e
1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.	b	e	e	b	b	b	e	e
1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.	b	e	e	b	e	b	e	e

2. Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture.	b	e	b	b	e	b	e	e
2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.	b	b	b	b	e	b	e	e
2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.	b	b	b	b	b	b	e	e
2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.	b	b	b	b	b	b	e	e

3. Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
3.1 Manage the Organization.	b	b	e	b	e	b	b	e
3.2 Manage the Operations.	b	b	e	b	b	b	b	e
3.3 Manage the Resources.	b	e	e	b	e	b	b	e

4. Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.	b	b	e	b	e	b	b	e
4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.	b	b	e	b	e	b	b	e
4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.	b	e	e	b	e	b	b	e

5. Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
5.1 Acts with Integrity.	b	e	e	b	b	e	e	e
5.2 Acts Fairly.	b	e	e	b	e	e	e	e
5.3 Acts Ethically.	b	b	e	b	e	e	e	e

6. Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.	b	e	e	b	e	b	b	e
6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.	b	e	e	b	e	e	b	e
6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.	b	b	e	b	e	e	b	e

7. Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
7.3 Candidates apply skills and knowledge articulated in the first six ELCC standards as well as state and local standards for educational leaders. Experiences are designed to accommodate candidates' individual needs.	e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in

Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5 (below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
 - (a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
 - (b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
 - (c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be avail

1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include, but are not limited to: 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 6.1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 6.1. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, essays, and case studies⁽¹⁵⁾, and portfolio tasks⁽¹⁶⁾. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Comprehensive Examination

See **Attachments** panel below.

(15) If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the specialty standards.

(16) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively develop supervisory plans for classroom-based instruction, and other identified professional responsibilities in educational leadership.¹⁷ ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3. Examples of assessments include school improvement plans, needs assessment projects, and faculty intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Course Portfolio (LEAD 504)

See **Attachments** panel below.

(17) NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in internship/clinical practice. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, and 6.3. Examples of assessments include faculty evaluations of candidates' performances, internship/clinical site supervisors' evaluations of candidates' performances, and candidates' formative and summative logs and reflections. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

In addition to the assessment a one-page description should be submitted to inform reviewers how the internship/clinical experience(s) have been designed to meet ELCC standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6.

Internship-Supervisor Evaluation

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' ability to support student learning and development. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 1.1; 1.2; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 6.2; and 6.3. Examples of assessments include post-graduate 360 surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, and community feedback surveys of candidates or graduates. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Reframing Supervision & Evaluation: Impact on School Culture & Student Achievement (LEAD 505)

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. Assessment of the application of content knowledge in educational leadership. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 6.1. Examples of assessments include action research projects and portfolio tasks.¹⁸

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Program Portfolio

See **Attachments** panel below.

(18) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments

7. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' abilities in organizational management and community relations. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Examples of assessments include school-based strategic plans, school simulations, and school intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Organizational Management & Community Relations

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, postgraduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, faculty intervention plans, strategic plans, simulations, school intervention plans, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Context

Since 2007, LEAD faculty have engaged in regular and systematic evaluations in all phases of the redesigned LEAD program. This effort has been tempered with several considerations:

- In 2007, the newly designed program was in its infancy; a need to complete a full iteration was necessary for a complete set of data and candidate experience;
- Early and often changes in course and program application yielded inconsistent data and affected reliability and validity
- changes in leadership standards on the State and National level.

Where modifications were clearly in the interest of candidate and program growth, changes were and are being made, this with an eye on enhancing what was already in place and/or allowing for reasonable and meaningful connections to the original plan and desired outcomes.

Change theory is an integral part of leadership development. That the program has been situated in a current of change both nationally and locally has significantly impacted efforts on continuous growth and improvement. For example, from its inception LEAD has used the ISLLC/ELCC standards as the foundational framework for leadership development. As standards evolved (ISLLC/ELCC) in 2007-2008, so too did LEAD course outcomes to keep pace with current thought and practice. The original evaluation instrument, developed using standards emphasizing knowledge, practice, and dispositions, and designed with suggested field activities connected to those standards, has been retained for continuity, mindful that the first opportunities for data collection offer consistency. While course outcomes were adjusted and modified, the evaluation of candidates has remained status quo. The original from the ISLCC/ELCC instrument continues to offer suggested activities seen as solid examples to guide in developing the candidate's learning plan, and that benefit the receiving school for the internship, a targeted school need. These allowed the candidate to focus on a specific activity to provide experience and an artifact connected to program portfolio requirements.

At the same time that ELCC/ISLLC was evolving, Rhode Island was diligently working toward developing its own standards based on ISLLC standards. LEAD faculty have been deeply involved in the process. As leadership groups collaborated on new standards, LEAD faculty, as part of that leadership team, has been cognizant of assimilating new understanding and specific practice in coursework and course outcomes reflective of the drafts and direction emanating from the RI standards literature. There is still much to do in aligning initial ELCC/ISLLC indicators to updated "functions", and RI "elements". However, faculty are confident based on initial SLLC scores, and direct involvement with the RICS in developing and aligning standards, and a recent successful State accreditation visit, that the leadership program is positioned to turn out informed and effective candidates to lead our schools.

While these change initiatives have been playing out, the FSEHD has also been involved in developing a comprehensive approach to advanced competencies and its own set of dispositions. LEAD faculty are involved in both of those initiatives and are studying ways to streamline program design to add that dimension to candidate development.

With change as a backdrop, the following areas offer a relatively comprehensive, yet incomplete, snapshot of many of instances where LEAD faculty have used data, feedback, and reflection to enhance the program.

LEAD Content and Course Outcomes

As a result of coursework, developing new rubrics that align with standards, elements, and key indicators, LEAD faculty are continually updating coursework with more relevant required textbooks and articles that are specifically connected to the new ELCC/RI Leadership Standards, the FSEHD advanced competencies, and the recently developed dispositions connected to the Rhode Island leadership standards. Examples include:

1. seminal textbooks:

- Shipman & al. : (All courses) Transforming School Leadership with ISLLC & ELCC
- Starratt, J. : (ELCC 5- LEAD 507) The Ethical School
- Zepeda, S. : (ELCC 3- LEAD 505) Supervision Across the Content Area & (ELCC 2) The Principal as Instructional Leader
- Epstein, J. (ELCC 4- LEAD 502) School, Family & Community Partnerships & Pawlas, G, (ELCC 4- LEAD 502) The Administrator's Guide to School Community Relations
- Patterson & al (ELCC 1 & 2). Crucial Conversations & Crucial Confrontations
- Patterson & al (ELCC 3, 2, 5, 6). Influencer
- Cialdini, R. (All standards- LEAD 500; 502; 511; 512)

2. revisiting the nature of the required artifacts for the exit portfolio;

3. examine and possible redesign of the comprehensive examination to complement the SLLA; inbox tasks may be too similar;

4. develop a task that is specific to student achievement. Even though the nature of school leadership is an indirect application, be able to quantify an intervention to show a significant change is desirable;

5. with respect to # 4, and with the direction that the FSEHD is headed, design and implement a specific intervention that is substantially different from those already practiced by the candidates in assessment 8.

Knowledge, Practice, & Dispositions

The new LEAD program was built around the policies and principles of ELCC and ISLLC. As we continually evaluate our assessments and student achievement, we are currently looking to primarily focus on the following:

1. Inter-departmental sharing

One of the strengths of the LEAD program is its position as one of three programs in the CEP Department. Along with the Counseling and School Psychology programs, the CEP department espouses a collaborative approach to address leadership across all disciplines. As ISLLC/ELCC and RI standards have transitioned away from leadership as strictly an administrative domain, and recognizes leadership as a shared venture, CEP asks how we can best work together to craft experiences that are meaningful to all candidates.

For the past two years, the School Psych and LEAD programs have asked, “what does leadership look like across the board?” To answer that question in part, a collaborative effort has seen a team-teaching approach where LEAD faculty address SP interns in answering questions like. “what should school psychologists expect in IEP/505 meetings in terms of leadership?”

This cross-discipline approach has led us to the next step: how can we expand on this model to include conversations between candidates? In other words, can we craft classes and activities that would provide additional opportunities and experiences that would enhance leadership skills across all levels?

Discussions are underway; a third collaboration will take place in the spring with the goal of bringing at least two groups together.

2. An increased focus on technology

LEAD expects candidates to be knowledgeable about technology applications and their impact on leadership, school improvement, and their influence on practice and initiatives. Candidates are required

to show proficiency in presentations (Powerpoint or Keynote); data collection (surveys/Survey Monkey); websites (RIDE, etc); communication (wikis), and spreadsheets (Excel/budget and finance), to name a few.

Candidates are also involved in seminars that have a technology component. For instance, Dr. Susan Patterson, new FSEHD technology coordinator, presented at the final LEAD 512 seminar last Spring on cutting edge technologies for school administrators. Cohort 1 candidate Mark Tortolani did a follow-up presentation to Dr. Patterson on the use of wikis and blogs.

This year, LEAD candidates are being introduced to using wikis to enhance communication and offer opportunities for ongoing reflection and conversation related to current topics and class discussions. Many candidates are using the technology for the first time; the collaboration among students (and faculty) connects to standards, competencies, and is specific to dispositional development and shared leadership.

The new wiki application in LEAD 500 and 501 is student-driven with an emphasis on practice. An early inventory of technology knowledge and skills for all cohorts is not surprising: the younger candidates fall into what Dr. Patterson describes as “digital natives”, young professional/practitioners who have grown up with technology. More experienced candidates (and faculty), often fall into the “digital immigrant”, or “digital traveler” category, designations that indicate a developmental mode.

From a course perspective, the program has explored and adopted the textbook *The Technology School Administrator* by Dr. Clinton Born. The text offers a clear understanding of technology standards connected to the Rhode Island technology standards and provides an initial framework for guiding LEAD practice and candidate development.

3. Refining the relationship among assessment tools

The LEAD program operates under four distinct, not-always-complementing, assessment expectations. ELCC, ISLLC, the new Rhode Island Leadership Standards (RILS), and Rhode Island College Feinstein School of Education and Human Development all offer standards, benchmarks, and tools. At the program, departmental, and school level, LEAD must refine and articulate the relationship among them and create a transparent report for students and stakeholders.

4. Examining the recommendation of a diverse internship experience

It is a strong recommendation of the LEAD program that all candidates participate in a diverse placement for at least part of one of their internship experiences. The Dean has supported this recommendation by providing some funds in support of students procuring a substitute at their current placement, enabling them to attend a substantially diverse setting. We must make a decision about “strongly recommending” versus requiring.

Student Learning

In response to assessments and student achievement, the LEAD program is exploring the following:

1. Reconsidering the 3-year program calendar:

A 2-year program (better utilizing the summer and winter intersession) would allow for both a fall and a spring internship experience in place of the current 3-year program, or as an option/alternative for candidates. In discussions with RIDE, conversations have included a diminishing pool of qualified candidates. A significant aspect for LEAD is the current calendar that calls for both internships in the spring semesters. As a result candidates get little or no exposure to:

- Opening of school
- State testing procedures
- Calendar challenges
- Culture/climate connections (particularly as relates to ISLLC/RI Standards 1 & 2)

The challenges for a program shift are more calendar-related than programmatic. A compacted calendar would require innovative approaches (e.g. Friday/Saturday classes), but an informal poll of current candidates, and recent graduates, indicated that they would prefer a faster track toward degree and certification, a move that would address that wish, and a state need.

2. Exploring 503 placements:

The LEAD faculty would like to offer more and varied options for placements. We are working with the new Assistant Dean of Partnerships and Placements.

3. Considering the 504 transition point

As students complete LEAD 504, they pass into the first internship experience, having moved from theory to practice in their coursework. Fleshing out this transition point, both in terms of content and assessment will enhance student learning opportunities as they commence field work.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4>. (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

N/A

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.