ASSESSMENT 6. CAPSTONE OR SUMMATIVE EXPERIENCE: PROFESSIONAL IMPACT PROJECT

DESCRIPTION:

Successful graduate program candidates create a relevant Professional Impact Project for Advanced Programs that includes the following Practice aspects of the Advanced Competencies: Evidence-Based Decision Making; Technology Use; Diversity; and Professional Identity Development. Through this Professional Impact Project process, graduate candidates provide credible evidence of their ability to facilitate impact on constituent(s) and reflect upon their practice. Scores range from 1-2=Unacceptable; 3-4= Acceptable and 5-6=Target. Candidates must achieve a minimum score of 3 on all components.

Evidence-Based Decision Making

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

- *Candidate implements action plan*
    - Implement action plan
    - Collect and analyzes data;
    - Present information
- *Candidate evaluates impact of action*
    - Analyze impact of action
    - Assess degree to which action contributes to school improvement and/or renewal or promotes well-being of children, family systems, school systems, or communities;
- *Candidate reflects on emerging professionalism*

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

Evaluation Rubric

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

| PHASE I

DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
What has caused the candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth?

Domain-Specific Knowledge | Although an area targeted for growth is identified and described, the candidate's statement is **too broad** or the description **fails to establish** the importance of the targeted area | The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth **with reasonable explanation of its importance** | The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth **with significant detail as to importance,** including the scope and impact of the area targeted for growth |
| *What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth?*

Information Literacy | The candidate selects literature   from **unreliable** sources or the literature **does not support** the stated aim of the impact project. | The candidate's literature review reflects **relevant, reliable, appropriate** professional literature. It identifies **several** ideas, variables or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project. | The candidate's literature review integrates **critical and logical** details from appropriate professional literature. It identifies **important** ideas, variables, or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project.

Attention is given to different perspectives, conditions, and threats to validity. |

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the proposed setting? **Contextual Perspective**	The candidate's description of data sources is **limited or incomplete; lacks relevance** to the aim of the impact project, or **fails to consider** key community, school, or constituent factors.	The candidate identifies data sources that account for **some**, general community, school, and constituent factors and identifies **at least 1** viable approach for working with constituents.	The candidate identifies data sources that account for **multiple** community, school, and constituent factors, both general and specific; considers viable approaches for working with constituents, including constituent skills and prior understandings
Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth? **Contextual Perspective**	The candidate **does not provide an effective argument** for the likelihood of the project's benefit to the constituent(s), or **has failed to consider** possible negative effects to the constituent(s). The candidate **has not provided reasonable opportunities** for the constituent(s) to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.	The candidate provides a **reasonable argument** for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s) with no to minimal negative impact. The candidate provides **reasonable evidence** of constituents' opportunities to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.	The candidate provides a **compelling argument** for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s), with no to minimal negative impact. The candidate provides **substantial evidence** that the constituent(s) have either contributed or had **multiple opportunities** to contribute to the project's aims and/or design.
Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to	The candidate is **unable to connect** professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.	The candidate applies and integrates a **limited amount** of professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended	The candidate e**ffectively applies and integrates** professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.

PHASE I	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH			
learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project? **Information Literacy**	Proposed area of study is **inappropriate** given the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.	area of study. Proposed area of study is **supported** by professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.	Proposed area of study is **clearly and succinctly stated and linked** to the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.

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

PHASE II	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
PLAN OF ACTION			
What is the action plan? **Evidence-Based Decision-Making**	The candidate's description of planned action is **unclear, lacking sufficient detail, or is missing** key components such as scope, duration, or intended outcomes	The candidate's description of planned action is **clear** and includes scope, duration, and intended outcomes	The candidate's description of planned action is **very clearly stated**, **detailed** and includes well-targeted scope, duration, and intended outcomes
	The candidate's rationale is **unclear** or does not indicate potential to have significant impact on constituent(s)	The candidate's rationale for action is **clear** and supports the potential for significant impact on constituent(s)	The candidate's rationale for the action's potential to significantly impact constituent(s) is **strong and clearly stated**.

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
What factors were used to select or design the action? **Evidence-Based Decision-Making**	The candidate's selection/design of planned action **fails to account** for key contextual factors or possible limitations or constraints	The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects **more than one** key contextual factor and acknowledges any significant limitations or constraints	The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects **multiple, highly relevant** contextual factors and acknowledges possible limitations and constraints
Does the action plan demonstrate understanding of the area targeted for growth? **Evidence-Based Decision-Making**	One or more of the candidate's **goals are unclear**, of marginal significance, or inappropriate for constituent(s) One or more of the candidate's goals **are not** aligned with best practice or professional standards, as appropriate One or more of the candidate's goals **are not** aligned with the stated parameters of the action plan	The candidate's **key goals** are **clear, significant, and appropriate** for constituent(s) The candidate's **key goals** are **aligned** with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate The candidate's **key goals** are **aligned** with stated parameters of the action plan	**All** of the candidate's **goals** are **clear, significant, and highly appropriate** for constituent(s) **All** of the candidate's **goals** are **clearly aligned** with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate **All** of the candidate's **goals** are **clearly aligned** with stated parameters of the action plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATA

Academic Year	N	Mean Scores
2010/11	0	None completed at this time.
2009/10	0	None completed at this time.
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended