



RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE

*Feinstein School of Education and Human Development
NCATE/RIPA Accreditation*

M.ED. IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

LINDA CAPALBO PH.D., PROGRAM COORDINATOR

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

HM066 lcapalbo@ric.edu (401)456-9571

Table of Contents

Program overview	2
Learning Outcomes	2
Program description	2
Enrollments	3
Faculty.....	3
ASSESSMENTS	4
Assessment 1. PRIOR CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	4
Assessment 2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE.....	5
Assessment 3. PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS.....	7
Assessment 4. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE/ACTION RESEARCH.....	8
Assessment 5. DIVERSITY.....	11
Assessment 6. “CAPSTONE” OR SUMMATIVE EXPERIENCE	21

Evaluation Rubric.....	22
Assessment 7. OPTIONAL.....	31
Evaluation Rubric.....	31
Data Use.....	31

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

LEARNING OUTCOMES

<u>LEARNING OUTCOMES</u>	<u>Conceptual Framework: Advanced Competencies</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION STANDARDS</u>
1. Students will develop and/or refine professional skills associated with effective teaching and learning in a variety of contexts.	Knowledge 1 Practice 1 Knowledge 3 Practice 3	No SPA affiliation for this program
2. Students will examine and incorporate principles of change models in practical applications	Knowledge 1 Practice 1 Knowledge 3 Practice 3	
3. Students will enhance their capacity to critique relevant research in the field, as well as conduct their own professional impact projects	Knowledge 1 Practice 1 Knowledge 2 Practice 2 Knowledge 3 Practice 3 Knowledge 4 Practice 4	
4. Students will become increasingly knowledgeable in a specialized area of study	Knowledge 1 Practice 2 Knowledge 3 Practice 3	
5. Students will have the opportunity to develop and benefit from collegial relationships with peers and other professionals	Knowledge 4 Practice 4	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The M.Ed. in Elementary Education is designed for practicing teachers seeking professional preparation leading to an advanced degree. Our goal is to develop candidates' potential to become academic leaders through emphasis on action research, problem based learning, and self-inquiry. Candidates complete an 18 credit professional core as well as a 12 credit emphasis strand of their choosing. Coursework reflects current best practices while supporting candidates' active, reflective engagement in their own classrooms and schools.

The mission of the M.Ed. in Elementary Education program is to provide opportunities for educators to extend and deepen their understanding of best practices for teaching and learning in today's schools. We support graduate students' professional growth both through coursework and site-based projects as they engage in problem-based learning and inquiry around topics of relevance to their field. By selecting an area of professional interest to study in depth, graduate students increase their potential to become academic leaders in their school, district or beyond.

The current M.Ed. program replaces the former M.Ed. program which was voluntarily suspended in 2007. The redesigned program began implementation in Fall 2009.

ENROLLMENTS

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>ENROLLED</u>	<u>COMPLETED</u>
2010/2011	5	0
2009/10	5	0
2008/09	Program voluntarily suspended for revision	

FACULTY

1. Patricia Cordeiro Ed. D. Elementary Education
2. Anne Goodrow PH.D., Elementary Education
3. Constance Horton M.S., Educational Studies
4. Janet Johnson Ph.D., Educational Studies
5. McGregor Kniseley Ed.D., Elementary Education
6. Corinne McKamey Ed.D., Elementary Education
7. Ezra Stieglitz Ph.D., Elementary Education
8. Ying Hui Ph.D., Special Education

ASSESSMENTS

ASSESSMENT 1. PRIOR CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: ADMISSION TO PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION: FEINSTEIN SCHOOL OF EDUCATION GRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS

Candidates' prior knowledge is evaluated according to three (3) criteria drawn directly from the FSEHD graduate admissions checklist: official transcripts documenting each candidate's undergraduate and graduate grade point average (minimum cumulative GPA of B - 3.00 on a 4.00 scale); appropriate teaching certificate (elementary grades); and official standardized test scores (Graduate Record Examination or Miller Analogies Test).

EVALUATION RUBRIC OR INSTRUMENT

Not applicable.

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	
2009/10	5	3.41
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

* GPA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>CRITERIA MET</u>
2010/11	0	
2009/10	5	YES
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

*Valid Teaching certificate

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	
2009/10	5	375 (MAT)
2008/09	0	

*Standardized test scores

ASSESSMENT 2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: ELED 513 Designing and Assessing Teaching and Learning

DESCRIPTION

This core program course relates instructional design and systematic planning for assessing student learning to the needs and interests of students. Candidates will understand theory and strategies for designing curriculum and assessing student learning. Candidates will consider the factors that affect teaching and learning such as the nature of content, ways of knowing, diverse learning needs, culture, politics, class, gender, ethnicity. Course readings and requirements enable candidates to apply a “backwards design approach” to develop a teaching and learning portfolio. Candidates design and implement a self chosen unit plan that conforms to the criteria set forth in the attached checklist. The minimum passing score for this assessment is 80/100 points.

Unit Plan Prompts:

1. Use a backwards planning approach to develop a unit plan relevant to a specific school context and grade level.
2. Describe what theoretical frame (or your own beliefs) about curriculum and instruction informed your constructing of this unit.
3. Pilot part or all of the unit plan in your teaching practice this semester.
4. Using student work, formative assessments, or critical incidents collected during unit plan implementation, reflect upon and make improvements /changes to the lesson plan.
5. Serve as a critical friend and respondent to other students in the class as they make progress on their projects.

EVALUATION RUBRIC

513 Unit Plan Checklist

Section	Criteria	Points
1. Title Page	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the title clear, and does it capture attention? • Is there a visual aid (e.g. photo, drawing, other visual) that represents the unit? 	5

2. Table of Contents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete • Clear 	5
3. Note to reader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit briefly summarized • 3 Features of the school/classroom context described, with examples • Author makes a connection between contextual features and their unit plan design. In other words, why is this unit plan particularly appropriate for this context/these students? • Author describes a broader curricular reform initiative (e.g. one of Kliebard’s reform movements) and explains why this unit is aligned with this perspective. One or two examples from the unit are used to illustrate. 	10
4. Summary discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Unit Plan Goals are named <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Goals are varied and include things like knowledge (fact), procedure, process (skills, ways of analyzing) and dispositions. • Some goals are aligned with some state standards. • Paragraph: How students will exhibit understanding through authentic performance tasks (e.g. Final Assessment) • Paragraph: Other selected assessments of key goals (assessments should be varied forms, including self assessments). 	10
5. Scope and Sequence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson topic, activity, goals, types of assessments planned. (1-2 lines per lesson) 	10
6. Selected lesson plans and supporting materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans (4) and supporting materials are included • Lesson plans include goals, standards, assessments, activity plan, other items discussed in class/on template. • Assessment and Activity are aligned with lesson plan goals • Lesson plan is informed by Grasps 	20
7. Student Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples of two students’ work • Discussion of why these two students’ work were chosen (e.g. demonstrating individual progress over time, contrasting two different learners, examples of student work that changed your thinking about instruction, etc). • Written commentaries of students’ work, providing at least one example for each student about why you chose this student work/how it illustrates your point. 	20

8. Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did you learn about yourself/curriculum design in doing this project? • Provide a case study/example of how you encountered an obstacle or changed your thinking about some design aspect. 	5
----------------------	--	---

In class participation:

- Ongoing feedback to each other: 5
- Ongoing “tweaking” based on feedback: 10

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>COURSE GRADE</u>
2010/11	3	A
2009/10	2	A
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

ASSESSMENT 3. PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS: ADMISSION TO PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION: FEINSTEIN SCHOOL OF EDUCATION GRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS

Candidates are required to submit three (3) reference forms with accompanying letters of recommendation completed by former instructors, employers, or other professionals who can assess the candidate’s potential to do graduate work and be a positive influence in the field. On a 4 point scale (1= below average to 4=high) candidates must achieve an overall score of 2 (average) or above.

Candidates are also required to complete a professional goals essay reflecting on their readiness (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) to pursue graduate study and to contribute to the field of education in a positive way. On a 4 point scale (1=unacceptable to 4= exemplary) candidates must score overall at an acceptable (3) level.

INSTRUMENT (OR RUBRIC, IF APPLICABLE)

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	
2009/10	5	3.8
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

* Candidate reference forms

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	
2009/10	5	3.2

2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended
---------	---	-------------------------------

ASSESSMENT 4. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE/ACTION RESEARCH: FNED547: INTRODUCTION TO CLASSROOM RESEARCH

DESCRIPTION

This required course “examines research methods appropriate to the

critical analysis of the teaching and learning process within educational settings and [emphasizes] the methods and methodologies of critical qualitative research...as a means of creating educational change.” Candidates are required to demonstrate skills such as generating a research question, collecting and interpreting data, developing a literature review, and presenting findings and implications for practice to peers in a formal 15-20 page paper. Final papers are scored on a 5 point scale (1=absent to 5= exceptional). Candidates must score at least a 3 (adequate) overall to meet the assignment criteria.

EVALUATION RUBRIC

Appendix B

Name: _____ **Semester:** _____

FINAL PROJECT RUBRIC

	Exceptional 5	Strong 4	Adequate 3	Needs Improv. 2	<u>ABSENT</u> 1	<u>NOTES</u>
INTRODUCTION: Offers an inviting introduction to the research question						
ARGUMENT: Makes an argument based on the data collected						
METHODS/METHODOLOGY: Explains the process and procedures of the project.						

Includes reflections on struggles and successes along the way.						
THEMES: Supports the argument statement with clearly articulated themes from the data						
<i>DATA-DRIVEN CLAIMS</i> <hr/> Uses data to substantiate themes — data should be rich and descriptive in order to convince the reader that your interpretation is compelling						
ANALYSIS: Offers analysis of the data in your own voice to explain <i>how</i> the data supports the theme. Don't expect data to speak for themselves.						
LITERATURE: Uses relevant literature to support the topic at hand						
CONCLUSION: Summarizes discussion and offers suggestions for future research						

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	No candidates have completed this course yet
2009/10	0	No candidates have completed this course yet
2008/09		Program voluntarily suspended

ASSESSMENT 5. DIVERSITY: PROFESSIONAL IMPACT PROJECT

DESCRIPTION : **PROFESSIONAL IMPACT PROJECT FOR ADVANCED PROGRAMS (PIP)**

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. This project requires the candidate to tailor the design of the project to meet the needs of diverse constituents from conception to completion. 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
<p><i>What has caused the candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p><i>Domain-Specific Knowledge</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth with reasonable explanation of its importance</p>	<p>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</p>
<p><i>What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p><i>Information Literacy</i></p>	<p>The candidate selects literature from unreliable sources or the literature does not support the stated aim of the impact project.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Attention is given to different perspectives, conditions, and threats to validity.</p>

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the proposed setting?</i></p> <p><i>Contextual Perspective</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>
<p><i>Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p><i>Contextual Perspective</i></p>	<p>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).</p> <p>The candidate has not provided reasonable opportunities for the constituent(s) to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a reasonable argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s) with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>The candidate provides reasonable evidence of constituents' opportunities to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a compelling argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s), with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><i>Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to</i></p>	<p>The candidate is unable to connect professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p>	<p>The candidate applies and integrates a limited amount of professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended</p>	<p>The candidate effectively applies and integrates professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p>

PHASE I	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH			
<i>learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project?</i> <i>Information Literacy</i>	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			
<i>What is the action plan?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	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 rationale is unclear or does not indicate potential to have significant impact on	The candidate's description of planned action is clear and includes scope, duration, and intended outcomes The candidate's rationale for action is clear and supports the potential for significant	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 for the action's potential to significantly

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
	constituent(s)	impact on constituent(s)	impact constituent(s) is strong and clearly stated .
<i>What factors were used to select or design the action?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	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
<i>Does the action plan demonstrate understanding of the area targeted for growth?</i> <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	<p>One or more of the candidate's goals are unclear, of marginal significance, or inappropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with best practice or professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with the stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>The candidate's key goals are clear, significant, and appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>All of the candidate's goals are clear, significant, and highly appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>

PHASE II	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
PLAN OF ACTION			

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	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
IMPLEMENTATION			
<p><i>What is the nature of the alignment/fidelity of actions with the action plan?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as outlined in the action plan.</p> <p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides some evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>
<p><i>Is the action plan implemented with respect to constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making and Diversity of Practice</i></p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action does not integrate constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints in any systematic way</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout most of the implementation of the action plan</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action systematically integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout implementation of the action plan</p>

PHASE III	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
IMPLEMENTATION			
<i>Are adequate data collected and presented in a systematic way?</i>	Candidate data collection is not systematic and/or missing data or modification of data collection plan are not accounted for.	Candidate systematically collects adequate data and accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.	Candidate systematically collects comprehensive data and thoroughly accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.
<i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>	Candidate represents data inaccurately or in a manner that is not understandable to the intended audience.	Candidate accurately represents data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.	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	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
EVALUATE IMPACT			
<i>Do the candidate's actions contribute to improving the area targeted for growth in a significant way?</i>	Candidate fails to include evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes some evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes clear evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).
<i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i>			

<p><i>What is the relationship between the findings and the research literature/professional best practice?</i></p> <p><i>Information Literacy</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The candidate provides a satisfactory description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The candidate provides a detailed description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.</p>
<p><i>What were the unintended outcomes of the action?</i></p> <p><i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate is unable to identify any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan and provides plausible explanations for their causes.</p>

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

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

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	None completed at this time.
2009/10	0	None completed at this time.
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

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	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH			
<i>What has caused the</i>	Although an area targeted for growth is	The candidate identifies and	The candidate identifies and describes

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<i>candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth?</i> Domain-Specific Knowledge	identified and described, the candidate's statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the targeted area	describes relevant area targeted for growth with reasonable explanation of its importance	relevant area targeted for growth with significant detail as to importance , including the scope and impact of the area targeted for growth
<i>What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth?</i> 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.
<i>What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the proposed setting?</i> 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

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p>Contextual Perspective</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>The candidate has not provided reasonable opportunities for the constituent(s) to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a reasonable argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s) with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>The candidate provides reasonable evidence of constituents’ opportunities to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a compelling argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s), with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><i>Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project?</i></p> <p>Information Literacy</p>	<p>The candidate is unable to connect professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is inappropriate given the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>	<p>The candidate applies and integrates a limited amount of professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is supported by professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>	<p>The candidate effectively applies and integrates professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is clearly and succinctly stated and linked to the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p>

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

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

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>understanding of the area targeted for growth?</i></p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>constituent(s)</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with best practice or professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with the stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>constituent(s)</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>	<p>for constituent(s)</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p>

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

PHASE III IMPLEMENTATION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p><i>What is the nature of the alignment/fidelity of actions with the action plan?</i></p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as outlined in the action plan.</p> <p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides some evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p>
<p><i>Is the action plan implemented with respect to constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?</i></p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making and Diversity of Practice</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action does not integrate constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints in any systematic way</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout most of the implementation of the action plan</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action systematically integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout implementation of the action plan</p>

PHASE III	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
IMPLEMENTATION			
<i>Are adequate data collected and presented in a systematic way?</i>	Candidate data collection is not systematic and/or missing data or modification of data collection plan are not accounted for.	Candidate systematically collects adequate data and accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.	Candidate systematically collects comprehensive data and thoroughly accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.
Evidence-Based Decision-Making	Candidate represents data inaccurately or in a manner that is not understandable to the intended audience.	Candidate accurately represents data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.	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	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
EVALUATE IMPACT			
<i>Do the candidate's actions contribute to improving the area targeted for growth in a significant way?</i>	Candidate fails to include evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes some evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).	Candidate includes clear evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s).
Evidence-Based Decision-Making			

<p><i>What is the relationship between the findings and the research literature/professional best practice?</i></p> <p>Information Literacy</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The candidate provides a satisfactory description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The candidate provides a detailed description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice.</p>
<p><i>What were the unintended outcomes of the action?</i></p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate is unable to identify any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan and provides plausible explanations for their causes.</p>

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

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

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11	0	None completed at this time.
2009/10	0	None completed at this time.
2008/09	0	Program voluntarily suspended

ASSESSMENT 7. OPTIONAL

DESCRIPTION

Identify another assessment your program uses, for example, graduates follow-up study, additional exams. Copy and paste a description of this assessment. Include the rubric or scoring guide used to evaluate the assessment.

EVALUATION RUBRIC

Copy and paste here

DATA

<u>ACADEMIC YEAR</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN SCORES</u>
2010/11		
2009/10		
2008/09		

* If more than one measure is used, repeat the table for each measure.

Note: If scores are not available, use course grades as a proxy.

DATA USE

This completely revised graduate program began implementation in the Fall of 2009, after having been voluntarily suspended in 2007. Currently enrolled candidates were not matriculated, formally, until the Spring and Summer of 2010. Because the program is designed for working professionals (certified teachers), virtually all candidates will complete the program on a part time schedule. Consequently, we have very few hard data, at this point, to evaluate with an eye to improving our program. However, it is fair to say that the process of preparing this current assessment of the status of the program has enabled the M.Ed. committee to (re)consider individual components as well as the overall mission of the program and to begin to identify those areas where additional attention is warranted. For example, in order to ensure that candidates are ready to complete the capstone project in timely fashion, we may need to re-sequence the coursework that will best prepare them for this task. Additionally, after collaboration with colleagues outside our department who use the same capstone task, we are

considering ways to perhaps co- or cross- teach the seminar attached to the capstone to extend candidates' (and our own) understanding of how this major assessment reflects the broad outcomes of graduate education, and how it demonstrates our candidates' ability to, potentially, effect change in a wide range of settings.