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GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete this program report. To complete the report, institutions must provide data from multiple assessments that, taken as a whole, will demonstrate candidate mastery of the Kansas standards. These data will also be used to answer the following questions. Reviewers expect these prompts to be answered by the report.

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan or fulfill other professional education responsibilities?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

I. **Contextual Information** – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program.

II. **Assessments and Related Data** – provides the opportunity for institutions to submit multiple assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.

III. **Standards Assessment Chart** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.

IV. **Evidence for Meeting Standards** – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards.

V. **Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, and skills; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type. Each attachment required in Sections I and IV of the report should be kept to a maximum of five text pages. Although attachments longer than five pages will be accepted electronically, staff will require institutions to revise reports submitted with lengthy attachments.

Except for the required attachments, institutional responses can be entered directly onto the form. Specific directions are included at the beginning of each section.
SECTION I—CONTEXT

Complete the following contextual information:
A program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for all candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles and hours of credit per course. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet--maximum of five text pages.) NEW PROGRAMS MUST SUBMIT SYLLABI IN THE DOCUMENT WAREHOUSE AND IN A FOLDER ON THE CD.

1. Chart with the number of candidates and completers. (Title-Chart with Candidate Information) ¹ (response limited to 6 pages, not including charts)

1. Program of Study:
Provide the following contextual information:

- Description of the relationship of the program to the unit’s conceptual framework.
- The Teachers College Conceptual Framework reflects the philosophy that for educators to help all students learn, they must have a command of content, critical ideas and skills, and the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and learn from their practice so that it continually improves. While there are different ways that successful professional educators can be highly effective, the following proficiencies are defined within the conceptual framework: providing service to society, applying interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engaging in effective practice, responding to uncertainty and change, relying on self-reflection, and belonging to professional community. The candidates preparing to be a leader at the building level within the administrative profession, that is, a principal, assistant principal, or other building level leadership roles as indicated by KSDE are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology. ESU’s professional education programs offered through The Teachers College are devoted to helping candidates learn and grow as professional educators and assisting candidates to advance either within their field or embrace additional skills that prepare them for additional career roles. As such, the Building Level Leadership Educational Administration (EA) Program is designed to prepare candidates to assume leadership roles as principal and assistant principal. Each candidate will be prepared to be a highly effective professional as he/she participates in leadership activity within their building level administrative position.

Satisfactory completion of admission requirements, required course work of 27 credit hours, two-semester practicum totaling 8 credit hours, and the comprehensive exam are necessary to be eligible for program

¹ KSDE 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.
completion. Additionally, candidates are required to successfully complete the State required Praxis Exam. Upon successful completion of the 35 graduate credits and Praxis Exam, the candidate can apply to the ESU certification officer for the building level license. An outline of the Building Leadership Program follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER752</td>
<td>Analysis of Research</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED833</td>
<td>Beliefs, Values, &amp; Issues in Ed.</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED820</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership: Models and Strat.</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA773</td>
<td>Adv. Ed. Psych. for Teachers &amp; Admin</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA888</td>
<td>School Systems Management</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA750</td>
<td>Tech Applications in School Ldrshp</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA811</td>
<td>Supervision and Evaluation</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA830</td>
<td>School Leadership Theory</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA849</td>
<td>Educational Law &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA885</td>
<td>Human Relations and Group Processes</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA896</td>
<td>Building Practicum, Fall</td>
<td>4 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA897</td>
<td>Building Practicum, Spring</td>
<td>4 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Indication of the program's unique set of program assessments and their relationship to the program's assessment system.**

The unit’s assessment system consists of four assessment steps/decision points, i.e., admission to program of study, practical application/practicum, completion of practical application/practicum, and program completion. The EA Building Level Program is a Degree or Non-degree seeking program. For the first decision point, after the candidate applies to the Graduate Office and completes the graduate application form (degree-seeking candidates submit official transcripts of all college work to the Graduate Office and non-degree seeking candidates submit transcripts the Department Office), candidates are subjected to a careful screening process that includes the submission of 1) the departmental application which includes a writing sample of three short essays, 2) review all undergraduate and graduate transcripts with evidence of a 3.0 GPA on the last 60 undergraduate and graduate hours of college course work or 3.0 on the last 30 graduate hours for Building Level certification utilized in the application process, 3) successful completion of the MAT or GRE, 4) a copy of a valid teaching license in public schools, 5) current resume, 6) two recommendations on approved university forms from supervising administrators, 7) a signed disposition form, 8) evidence of at least three years of teaching experience prior to application for licensure, and 9) statement of professional goals for school administration. Assessment point two takes place after a candidate has successfully completed Admission to Program of Study requirements and the 'approval form' has been signed by the department chair and completion of required courses. At this point, the candidate is permitted to participate in the two-semester practical field experience (8 credit hours total). Both field supervisors and university supervisor assist, mentor, and monitor the candidate’s progress in the various activities which include the special project during the eight hours of practicum. A grade is issued for each four-hour practicum experience. The comprehensive exam is completed during this assessment time period. Assessment point three occurs upon completion of the field experience. Candidates must maintain a "B" average in all course work and during the two-semester practicum. In addition, Candidates are involved in self-assessment, faculty evaluation, and field supervisors’ assessment on dispositions related to the conceptual framework and standards/indicators related to the candidate’s field of study. The fourth assessment point occurs as a thorough review of all previously stipulated requirements by both the advisor and department chair clearing each candidate for application to the ESU certification officer for licensure approval and processing of licensure application. A final step in securing licensure is successful completion of the State required Praxis Test.

- **Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including**

---

2 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 KSDE/NCATE Standard 2.
Gaining admission to a graduate program in the School Leadership/Middle Secondary Teacher Education department must be initiated by contacting the School of Graduate Studies and Research, Campus Box 3, Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas, 66801, (620) 341-5403; completing the Graduate Application form, and paying the Graduate Application fee. Both the Graduate Application and $40 fee are to be submitted to the Graduate Office. Individual graduate students can apply and submit the fee electronically by applying online at the following secure website https://slim.emporia.edu/esugrad/appl2.htm. Upon completion of the application and submittal of the $40 fee to the Graduate Office, graduate students are admitted to the graduate program and cleared to enroll in courses. During the first semester of classes, the candidates must complete the admission to program requirements set by Department of School Leadership and Middle/Secondary Teacher Education for admission to the Building Level Leadership Program. These requirements are:

Items must be completed within the first semester of course work:
1) Official transcripts of all college work (for masters degree send to Graduate Office, non-degree send to Department office)
2) GPA of 3.0 on the last 60 hours of college course work for undergraduate and graduate hours or 3.0 on the last 30 graduate hours for Building Level Certification utilized in the application process.
3) Completion of either the MAT or the GRE
4) Copy of a valid teaching certificate in public schools
5) Current resume or vita
6) Statement of professional goals for school administration
7) Successful completion of the Graded Departmental Application
8) Two recommendations on approved university forms from supervising administrators
   (Evidence of one year accredited experience in a certified position verified on back of recommendation form) *Note: three years teaching experience required prior to application for licensure.
9) Complete the Disposition Guidelines form
10) Writing Sample – Graded departmental application/writing sample

To continue in and graduate from the program, candidates will need the following:
• Course Work -- must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or greater.
• Practicum I & II -- must receive proficient marks from the university supervisor as well as the principal mentor.
• Comprehensive Exam -- must satisfactorily complete a written exam over the entire preparation program coursework.

State requirement for the license:
• Pass the Praxis Exam – Praxis is a state requirement and not part of the Building Level Leadership Program requirements. Candidates must pass with a minimum score of 165 or higher to be licensed in the state of Kansas as a building level administrator.

- 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.

An eight credit hour clinical field experience is required within the Building Level Leadership program, i.e., EA 896 Building Practicum I - fall (4 hrs) and EA897 Building Practicum II - spring (4 hrs). Candidates enrolled in the EA896 and EA897 practicums will fulfill approximately 100 hours of academic requirements each semester, be responsible for meeting policies and procedures established in the host school or school district, meet the expectations of field and university supervisors, attend monthly meetings and/or complete online discussion board activities, complete fifty assigned activities.
and complete a major project. The candidate will create a practicum portfolio that includes summary reports or reflections for all assigned activities, supplemental materials, special project materials, resume, philosophy of education, other materials, and signed/dated activity log. Candidates will work under the supervision of the university faculty member responsible for their particular practicum course/practicum section unless otherwise stipulated.

The purpose of the building level leadership practicum is two-fold. First, candidates will have the opportunity to “find out what it is really like in the field” by observing and working in some activities that are not found in textbook material. Second, candidates will begin to synthesize and assimilate their academic knowledge by completing a major term project and attending the monthly administrative practicum meetings. Specific Intended Learning Outcomes for EA896 & EA897 follow.

Candidates will:

1. articulate a personal philosophy of school leadership based on the social, philosophical, and historical foundations of American Education.
2. practice effective leadership skills of decision making, problem solving communication and conflict resolution.
3. give evidence of effective planning and group facilitating skills necessary to meet the changing needs of 21st century schools.
4. exhibit knowledge and skills necessary for effective instructional leadership.
5. display knowledge and skills required for the effective supervision of human resources.
6. show the ability to facilitate needed curricular and co-curricular development.
7. demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to effectively discharge student management responsibilities.
8. exhibit the interpersonal skills necessary to build exemplary trusting relationships between and among faculty, staff, and students within an appropriate school climate.
9. understand the authority, power and influence entrusted to the building administrator and recognize the limits of each.
10. understand personal and professional ethics and educational equity and its role in our pluralistic society.
11. demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to manage the fiscal affairs at the school-building level.
12. analyze personal strengths and weaknesses as they relate to building leadership.
13. develop the skills required in the utilization of technology.
2. **Chart with 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. Please report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (initial):</th>
<th>Building Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Year</strong></td>
<td><strong># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (Post-baccalaureate – Added Endorsement):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 An enrolled candidate is officially admitted to the program.

4 KSDE 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.
### SECTION II— ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED DATA

In this section, list the multiple assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the Kansas standards for this content area. **All programs** must provide a **minimum of six assessments, maximum of eight assessments**; assessments #1-6 are required for all programs. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is required/administered in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Required/Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>(Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment)</strong></td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>During practicum or after program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Praxis II-content test data and sub-score data if utilized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Assessment of candidate ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction</strong></td>
<td>Project with Rubric Assessment</td>
<td>In EA811 Supervision and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Story Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Assessment of clinical experience</strong></td>
<td>Rubric - Portofolio Assessment of Standards by ESU Supervisors</td>
<td>At completion of Courses and Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II Impact on Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Assessment of candidate leadership and management skills to promote success for all students</strong></td>
<td>Portfolio with Rubric Assessment</td>
<td>EA888 School System Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Leadership Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Content-based assessment</strong></td>
<td>Case Study Exam/Essay Scored with Rubric</td>
<td>End of Program/During Practicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
6 Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, portfolio).
7 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 number], or completion of the program).
8 Assessment #1a Praxis II sub-score data may be used as an assessment for meeting content standards. A data table for Praxis II content test and a data table for sub-score data must be submitted but a rubric is not required.
9 Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships within the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Required/Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards OR course grades-based assessments related to content knowledge. EA Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 [Assessment of candidate abilities in organizational management and community relations] * (Required)</td>
<td>Section III Practicum Leadership Project - Rubric Assessment of Standards</td>
<td>After coursework and completion of practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 [Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards (Optional)] Section I Practicum Knowledge</td>
<td>Rubric-Portfolio Assessment of Standards by ESU Supervisor</td>
<td>At completion of courses and practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 [Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards (Optional)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Required Assessments

---

10 Course grades-based assessments can only be used for Assessment 5.
**SECTION III—STANDARDS ASSESSMENT CHART**

For each Kansas standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. **One assessment may apply to multiple Kansas standards.** In Section IV you will describe these assessments in greater detail and summarize and analyze candidate results to document that a majority of your candidates are meeting Kansas standards. To save space, the knowledge and performance indicators of the Kansas standards are not identified here, but are available on the website — [www.ksde.org](http://www.ksde.org). The full set of standards provides more specific information about what should be assessed. **Please include information on assessments used for PreK if this is an all-level program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KANSAS STANDARD</th>
<th>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☒ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☐ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation,</td>
<td>☐ #5 ☒ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supported by the school and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☑ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☐ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a building</td>
<td>☐ #5 ☒ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☐ #1a ☐ #2 ☒ #3 ☐ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations,</td>
<td>☒ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☐ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☒ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by collaborating with families and community members,</td>
<td>☒ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responding to diverse community needs and interests, and mobilizing community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☐ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☒ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical</td>
<td>☒ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the</td>
<td>☐ #1a ☐ #2 ☒ #3 ☐ #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the</td>
<td>☒ #5 ☐ #6 ☒ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the multiple assessments listed in Section II and the data findings must be reported in this section. 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.

For each assessment, the evidence for meeting standards should include the following information:

- A brief description of the assessment, project, portfolio and its use in the program. Explain specificity of the assessment to the standard/s. An assessment may assess several standards at the same time;
- The alignment of the assessment with the specific KSDE standards addressed by the assessment, as they are identified in Section III;
- A brief summary of the data findings;
- An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.

The response to each assessment is limited to the equivalent of two text pages.

For each assessment listed, you will need to attach the following:

- Scoring guides, criteria or rubric (specific to content of standard/s) used to score candidate responses on the assessment;
- A table (include # of candidates) with the aggregated results of the assessment providing, where possible, data for at least the most recent three years. Data should be organized according to the categories used in the scoring guide/criteria. Provide the percentage of candidates achieving at each category.

For each assessment #1a (sub-score data) and assessment #5(course grades-based assessments), you will include the following information:

- Praxis II sub-score data tables must be clearly labeled to indicate alignment with the standard it is assessing. Section IV narrative must clearly show alignment of sub-score data to the standard or elements of the standard.
- Course grades-based assessments have a brief description in the matrix. A more detailed and specific discussion of the alignment of activities, exams, and projects in the course to the standard should be included in the narrative description of assessment 5. The course grades-based assessments data tables will be included in the narrative of assessment 5. Each course grades-based assessments is numbered and lettered as 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F. Use the same number and letter in the narrative and the data table. If the course grades-based assessments are used as evidence for meeting two standards, the course key assessments’ data (exams, projects, portfolio tasks) must be disaggregated in a data table for each of the two standards. This is necessary to provide evidence of meeting each standard. One course MAY NOT MEET more than two standards.

In the two columns for attachments, click in the box for each attachment to be included with the report. Each attachment should be no longer than five pages. The two attachments related to each assessment must be included for the program report to be complete. The report will not be reviewed until it is complete.
#1 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests for content knowledge. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV. PRAXIS II Content—Submit overall score data for all candidates. Data tables for standards must be PRAXIS II sub-score data that are aligned to specific standard/s.)

Assessment #1: State Praxis Exam – School Leaders Licensure Assessment, 1010 or 1011 (SLLA)

☐ A brief description of the assessment, project, or portfolio and its use in the program.

State Praxis – School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA): This SLLA is not part of the Building Level program but is a State administered standardized test required of Building Leadership Level candidates. Successful completion (score of 165 or higher) must be obtained before application is made for the Building Level Program license. This assessment is used to determine competency of KSDE standards #3-5 as indicated in Section III of this report.

Initial Praxis - 1010 (2005-Summer 2009)
There are three subtests in the exam, i.e., subtest one is entitled Evaluation of Actions I & II, subtest two is entitled Synthesis of Information and subtest three is entitled Problem Solving, and Analysis of Information and Decision Making. Subtest 1, part 1 contains 10 short vignettes describing situations a principal might commonly encounter and respond too. Subtest 1, part two has six longer vignettes that present dilemmas based on teaching and learning issues. In Subtest 2, there are 2 one-hour case analyses formed upon issues of learning and teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels. Finally, Subtest 3 presents the candidate with seven document-based exercises that consist of a scenario typically encountered by the principal. This last activity relates to issues involving learning and teaching as well.

Revised Praxis - 1011 (Fall 2009 to present)
The Kansas State Department of Education validated this revised assessment based upon the building level program standards and a Praxis cut score of 165 which was set in the fall of 2009. The ETS Praxis test was revised and several new versions were implemented during the 2009-10 academic year. The SLLA is divided into two sections with 5 subtests in section one and 3 subtests in section two of the exam. In Section I (multiple choice) there are vignettes which address Vision and Goals, Teaching and Learning, Managing Organizational Systems and Safety, Collaborating with Key Stakeholders, and Ethics and Integrity. The subtest for Section II (constructed-response) are based on scenarios and sets of documents that an education leader might encounter to include The Education System, Vision and Goals, and Teaching and Learning. The SLLA measures whether entry-level education leaders have the standards-relevant knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. The content of the assessment was defined by a National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty and confirmed by a national survey of the field.

(To date, 94 candidates have completed the SLLA Praxis test with 91 candidates receiving a passing score or a 97% success passing rate for the Praxis exam)
* It should also be noted that candidates taking the test during the 2010 spring semester, i.e. January, 2010, reported that the testing site in Leavenworth did not have heat which directly affected their ability to concentrate on the exam. Candidates taking the Praxis at the Leavenworth and Topeka sites also reported that the version of the exam provided to them contained questions on ELL issues which was not previously included and preparation was limited within our building level program. As a result, content on ELL was added to the program content.

Alignment with KSDE standards #3, #4 and #5.
KSDE Standard #3 states the building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Section I, Subtest 3 of the SLLA aligns with Standard #3 and specifically includes situations drawn from such content as strategic planning, monitoring and use of technology, allocation of funds, welfare and safety of students and staff, and facilitation of student learning.

KSDE Standard #4 states that the building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community needs and interests, and mobilizing community resources. Section I, Subtest 4 of the SLLA aligns with Standard #4 and is anchored in issues of meeting the needs of diverse learners, utilizing resources in the community as well as working with families and other key stakeholders.

KSDE Standard #5 states the building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Section I, Subtest 5 of the SLLA aligns with Standard #5 as each exercise consist of scenarios typically encountered by the building level administrator in which issues involving vision, ethical decision making, and reflection.

Summary of Data
Standard #3: The data reflects a 97% success rate to date for the 94 candidates with scores ranging from 162 to 197 and a mean score of 180.38. (Cut score of 165 is needed to pass.) During the the three year period total possible points varied for subtest #1 on the Praxis test.

SLLA (1010)
Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2007-2008 had a subtest #1 mean score of 15.4 out of a possible 20 points and a mean score of 10.1 out of 12 for subtest #2. Candidates completing the SLLA praxis test during 2008-2009 had a subtest #1 mean score of 16.5 out of a possible 20 points and mean subtest #2 score of 7.8 out of 12. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2009 summer semester, i.e. June, had a subtest #1 mean score of 10 out of 20 and mean score for subtest #2 of 10 out of 12. Note: only two candidates took the exam during this period (June 2009).

SLLA (1011)
Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2009 fall semester, i.e. September, had a subtest #3 mean score of 9.6 out of a possible 12 points. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2010 spring semester, i.e. January, had a subtest #3 mean score of 10.7 out of a possible 12 points. An individual candidate’s Praxis score equates to pass or not pass.

Standard #4: The data reflects a 97% success rate to date for the 94 candidates with scores ranging from 162 to 197 with a mean score of 180.38.
(Cut score of 165 is needed to pass.)

SLLA (1010)
Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2007-2008 had a subtest #3 mean score of 9.1 out of a possible 12 points. Candidates completing the SLLA praxis test during 2008-2009 had a subtest #3 mean score of 8.7 out of a possible 12 points. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2009 summer semester, i.e. June, had a subtest #3 mean score of 6.5 out of 12. Note: only two candidates took the exam during this period (June 2009).

SLLA (1011)
Candidates completing the SLLA praxis test during 2009 fall semester, i.e. September, had a subtest #4 mean score of 13.4 out of a possible 16 points. Candidates completing the SLLA praxis test during 2010 spring semester, i.e. January, had a subtest #4 mean score of 12 out of a possible 14 points. An individual candidate’s Praxis score equates to pass or not pass.

Standard #5: The data reflects a 97% success rate to date for the 94 candidates with scores ranging from 162 to 197 with a mean score of 180.38. (Cut score of 165 is needed to pass.)

SLLA (1010)
Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2007-2008 had a subtest #4 mean score of 8.7 out of a possible 20 points. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2008-2009 had a subtest #4 mean score of 10 out of a possible 14 points. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2009 summer semester, i.e. June, had a subtest #4 mean score of 5.5 out of 14. Note: only two candidates took the exam during this period (June 2009).

SLLA (1011)
Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2009 fall semester, i.e. September, had a subtest #5 mean score of 11.6 out of a possible 15 points. Candidates completing the SLLA Praxis test during 2010 spring semester, i.e. January, had a subtest #5 mean score of 13.1 out of a possible 17 points. An individual candidate’s Praxis score equates to pass or not pass.

□ Interpretation of data

The Kansas State Department of Education validated this assessment based upon the building level program standards and a Praxis cut score of 165 which was set in the spring of 2005 and became effective in fall of 2005. This passing score (165) was continued with the revised Praxis test for the fall of 2009. To date, 94 candidates have completed the SSLA praxis test with 97% passing the praxis exam. In looking at the Institutional Summary Report various comparisons to state results can be made within the subtest category for each standard. The source of the state and national subtest data regarding percent of questions correct is the ETS institutional summary report, which is not yet available for 2009-10. Where percentages are used, they refer to the percent of questions correct as provided in the ETS summary report. Comparison data, including subtests, follows:

Standard #3, Subtests I and II:
Testing period of 9/1/07-8/31/08 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest I, Evaluation of Actions, candidate average was 75% correct compared to a state-wide average of 69% and national average of 68%.
In Subtest II, Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving, candidate average was 84% correct compared to a state-wide average of 80% and a national average of 79%.
Data demonstrates standard #3 as being met successfully.

Testing period of 9/1/08-8/31/09 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest I, Evaluation of Actions, candidate average was 83% correct compared to state-wide average of 73% and national average of 69%.
In Subtest II, Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving, candidate average was 65% correct compared to a state-wide average of 74% and a national average of 76%.
Data demonstrates standard #3 as being met successfully.

Testing period of September 2009 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest III, Evaluation of Actions, candidate average was 78% - comparable data is not available for state and national data.
Data demonstrates standard #3 as being met successfully.

Testing period of January 2010 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest III, Evaluation of Actions, candidate average was 89% - comparable data is not available for state and national data.
Data demonstrates standard #3 as being met successfully.

Standard #4, Subtest III:
Testing period of 9/1/07-8/31/08 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest III, Analysis of Information and Decision Making, candidate average was 77% correct compared to a state-wide average of 75% and a national average of 74%.
Data demonstrates standard #4 as being met successfully.

Testing period of 9/1/08-8/31/09 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest III, Analysis of Information and Decision Making, candidate average was 73% correct compared to a state-wide average of 73% and a national average of 72%.
Data demonstrates standard #3 as being met successfully.

Testing period of September 2009 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest IV, Synthesis of Info and Problem Solving, candidate average was 82% - comparable data is not available for state and national data.
Data demonstrates standard #4 as being met successfully.

Testing period of January 2010 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest IV, Synthesis of Info and Problem Solving, candidate average was 86% - comparable data is not available for state and national data. Data demonstrates standard # 4 as being met successfully.

Standard #5, Subtest III:
Testing period of 9/1/07-8/31/08 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest IV, Analysis of Information and Decision Making, candidate average was 62% correct compared to a state-wide average of 60% and a national average of 60%.
Data demonstrates standard #5 as being met successfully.

Testing period of 9/1/08-8/31/09 (Initial Praxis test):
In Subtest IV, Analysis of Information and Decision Making, candidate average was 71% correct compared to a state-wide average of 65% and a national average of 64%.
Data demonstrates standard #5 as being met successfully.

Testing period of September 2009 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest V, Synthesis of Info and Problem Solving, candidate average was 82% - comparable data is not available for state and national data.
Data demonstrates standard # 5 as being met successfully.

Testing period of January 2010 (Revised Praxis test):
In Subtest V, Synthesis of Info and Problem Solving, candidate average was 86% - comparable data is not available for state and national data.
Data demonstrates standard #5 as being met successfully.

NOTE: This particular breakdown of information became available to the department faculty recently and summary Praxis data will be used in the future to analyze subject content assessed within the subtests. To date, 94 candidates have completed the SSLA praxis test with 97% passing the praxis exam.

Attachments

| Assessment #1 | Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric | Data Table\(^\text{11}\) |

\(^\text{11}\) Licensure test data must reflect the percentage of candidates who have passed the state licensure test for each year since the last accreditation visit. The most recent year of data must include the range of total scores and sub-scores on the licensure test. Data must be presented for all program completers, even if there
**#2 (Required) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS:** [Assessment of candidate ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction, and other identified professional responsibilities in educational leadership.]

Examples of assessments include school improvement plans, needs assessment projects, and faculty intervention plans. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment #2 Case Story Project

☐ Brief Description of the Assessment

The Supervision and Evaluation Project is a simulation project (case study) carried out by all candidates during EA811 Supervision and Evaluation. Candidates are expected to apply knowledge and skills gained from the course or from their own experience to support teacher growth in the areas of instruction, planning for student learning, and professional collaboration. Candidates demonstrate their ability to analyze the growth needs of a mediocre or incompetent teacher, establish a positive relationship with the teacher, and develop a comprehensive plan complete with strategies to bring about the professional growth of the teacher – growth that in turn contributes to student success. The case story project measures candidates’ ability to:

- identify the level of professionalism of a teacher
- determine the type of supervision that would be accepted by the teacher
- identify the teacher’s career stage, including growth needs, incentives, and support systems that would work best with the career stage
- utilize research-based data to determine what serves as motivation for the teacher
- identify the best learning profile for the teacher
- describe actions taken to establish a positive working relationship with teacher
- develop a comprehensive set of skillful supervisory responses or strategies
- develop an improvement or growth plan, in simulated collaboration with teacher
- evaluate (in simulation) teacher’s performance using objective, specific, evidence-supported narrative

All candidates in EA811 are allowed to continue improvement of their case story project until reaching a proficient level on each of the desired...
outcomes. Ratings of the indicators are based on a three-point scale: 0 points for Needs Improvement, 1.0 point for Proficient, and 2.0 points for Exemplary.

Each Element is reviewed through four (4) identified components. A student is judged to be Exemplary through the accurate and comprehensive inclusion of all four (4) identified components within an element. Students that include three (3) accurate and comprehensive identified components are judged Proficient. Students that identify less than three (3) components for an Element fall into the Needs Improvement category.

In the establishment of a mean score no student that receives a 0 in any Element will be allowed to receive credit in the course. Those students will be required to continue learning until they have demonstrated proficiency in each Element. A mean score of 1.5 or greater is deemed Exemplary. A mean score of 1.44 to 1.0 will be recorded as Proficient. In a case where a student fails to raise their individual learning to a the Proficient level and chooses not to continue learning they will be placed in the Needs Improvement category. See Assessment 2 Rubric.

Alignment with KSDE Standard #2

KSDE Standard #2 states the building level administrator is to promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a building climate and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. This assessment is designed to evaluate the candidate’s content knowledge, via the case story project, to develop an individualized plan for one teacher that demonstrates the candidate’s ability to nurture and support all teachers while holding high expectations for all instruction and instructional programs in the building. The project places a strong emphasis on adult and student learning. Specific activities relating to Standard #2 are mentioned above in the description and can also be found on the Assessment 2 Rubric. The special project indicators aligned with KSDE Standard #2 require candidates to demonstrate an ability to advocate, nurture, and sustain 1) a building climate conducive to student learning, 2) a building climate conducive to staff professional growth and 3) instructional programs conducive to student learning, and instructional programs conducive to staff professional growth.

Summary of Data

Standard #2: The data reflects a 100% success rate for the 221 course completer candidates. (See Assessment 2 Data Table). The total average mean score on the four indicators is 6.97 with an individual range of 4 to 8. (See Assessment 2 Data Table).

Interpretation of Data

Standard #2: The average mean scores for each of the four indicators are 6.54 (2007-2008), 7.02 (2008-2009), and 7.35 (2009-2010) which are well above the proficient mean of 4.0. Individual course completer scores range from 4 to 8. The mean scores for each of the indicators drawn from KSDE Standard #2 are 1.0 or higher. All of the 221 course completer candidates or 100% scored at or above the 1.0 or proficient level, earning a 4.0 or higher out of a possible of eight points, for the four indicators. Of the 221 candidates, 153 scored the within the exemplary level
of 7 to 8 points. Since 100% have successfully completed the Supervision and Evaluation Project, including almost 70% at the exemplary level, and since the mean average on each section and total score of the assessment is at the exemplary level, the program is meeting the expectations of Standard #2 which states the administrator is to promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a building climate and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The evidence indicates that Standard #2 has been met successfully.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Assessment of candidate ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction] * (Required) Supervision and Evaluation Project (EA811)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#3 (Required) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge and skills are applied effectively in practice. (Clinical/internship experience) 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. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment #3 Practicum Performance (Section II)

☐ Description

The eight credit hour practicum (EA896 Practicum I, fall 4 credit hours and EA897 Practicum II, spring 4 credit hours) is to be fulfilled during the final academic year of the program. All candidates are required to complete activities that demonstrate an application of program knowledge in an authentic field experience. Proficient candidates complete each task, a written essay describing information gained, observations, and actions taken in completing each of the required 53 activities. Activities include, but are not limited to, such things as shadowing elementary and secondary administrators, special education activities, evaluation process, observation of the disciplinary process, textbook selection process, supervision of student activities, annual reports, organization and communication, school climate, minority populations, diversity visit, time management, etc. Exemplary candidates provide additional insights and implications for current or future administrative practice. The descriptive reflections on each activity are included within the portfolios at the end of the academic year and presented to the university supervisor. The university supervisor uses the Section II portfolio scoring rubric to determine whether or not the candidates have satisfactorily completed each activity. Candidates are...
required to redo activities that do not meet proficiency in order to successfully complete the program. Candidates’ portfolio entries are scored on a three-point scale: 0 points for Needs Improvement, 1.0 point for Proficient, and 2.0 points for Exemplary.

A candidate achieves a rating of Needs Improvement if the candidate fails to complete 5 of 7 (71%) activities in element one, fails to complete 4 of 5 (80%) activities in element two (80%), fails to complete 3 of 4 (75%) activities in element three, and fails to complete 4 of 6 (67%) activities in element four.

A candidate achieves a rating of Proficient if the candidate complete 5 of 7 activities in element one (71%), completes 4 of 5 activities in element two, completes 3 of 4 (75%) activities in element three, and completes 4 of 6 (67%) of the activities in element four.

A candidate achieves a rating of Exemplary by completing at least 6 of the 7 (86%) activities in elements one, 5 of 5 (100%) and 3 of 3 (100%) of the activities in elements two and three respectively; and at least 5 of the 6 (80%) activities in element four. Additionally, the reflections provide insights and implications for current or future administrative practice. as listed in Assessment 3 Rubric.

Alignment with KSDE Standards 3 & 6.

KSDE Standard #3 states the building level administrator is to promote the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Within the practicum portfolio assessment, Section II – Practicum Performance, there are specific activities that address: 1) management of the organization, 2) operations, and 3) resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Specific activities relating to these three areas include working with building staff and field supervisors, attending at least one administrative meeting, one board meeting, and working within the building structure. Additional information can be found in the previous description and can be found on the Assessment 3 Rubric. The specific activities within the practicum experience contain indicators that demonstrate candidates’ knowledge and skills that have the potential to impact student learning. Practicum portfolio indicators aligned with Standard #3 are: II-A) exhibit knowledge and skills necessary for effective instructional leadership; II-B) show the ability to facilitate needed curricular and co-curricular development.

KSDE Standard #6 states building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. Within the practicum portfolio assessment, Section II – Practicum Performance, there are those specific activities that promote the success of all students by 1) understanding, 2) responding to, and 3) influencing the larger political, social, economic, and legal, and cultural context. Specific activities include items such as working with building staff and field supervisors while shadowing administrators at the elementary, middle and high school. Additionally, the candidate will identify minority populations within their building, organize activities at the elementary and secondary levels, and participate in the teacher evaluation process. Finally, various activities will assist in understanding the placement of special education students. Additional information can be found in the previous description and can also be found on the Assessment 3 Rubric. The practicum portfolio indicators aligned with Standard #6 are: II-C) give evidence of effective planning and group facilitating skills necessary to meet the changing needs of 21st century schools; II-D) understand personal and professional ethics and educational equity and its role in our pluralistic society.
Summary of Data

Standard #3: Of 215 program completers for the 2007-2010, the average mean score on Indicator II A (effective instructional leadership) is 1.78 and on Indicator II B (curricular development) is 1.77. The average total mean score for the three years of obtained data is 3.55 out of a possible 4 points. Overall individual completer scores range from 2.0 (Proficient) to 4.0 (exemplary) on this assessment. The highest possible score is four points.

Standard #6: Of 215 program completers for the 2007-2010, the average mean score on Indicator II C (skills for 21st century schools) is 1.8 and on Indicator II D (educational equity and our pluralistic society) is 1.73. The average total mean score for the three years of obtained data is 3.53 out of a possible 4 points. Individual completer scores range from 2.0 (Proficient) to 4.0 (exemplary) on this assessment. The highest possible score is four points.

Interpretation of Data

Standard #3: Data demonstrates Standard 3 as being met successfully.

The mean scores for the two indicators aligned with Standard #3 are 1.59 or higher as found on Assessment 3 Data Table. Every candidate scored at least a 1.0 on each of the two indicators. The means scores for each indicator exceeded the minimum level of “Proficiency.” One hundred percent of the 215 candidates scored at the proficient level or higher in both indicator categories. Total mean scores for the two indicators for the three year period ranged from 3.28 to 3.71 with mean scores for the individual indicators ranging from 2 to 4. Overall, 85% or 182 candidates scored at or above 3.0, as seen on Assessment 3 Data Table. Indicators II-A and II-B align with Standard #3 which promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment and provide evidence that the standard is met.

Standard #6: Data demonstrates Standard 6 as being met successfully.

The mean scores for the two indicators II-C and II-D are 1.64 or higher for each year during the reporting period with the total average mean scores of 1.8 and 1.73 for the three years. Every candidate scored at least a 1.0 on the two indicators, i.e. the individual mean scores for each reported period met or exceeded the minimum of "Proficiency." One hundred percent of the 215 candidates scored at the proficient level of 1.0 with 84% scoring at or above 3.0, as seen in Assessment 3 Data Table. Indicators II-C and II-D align with Standard #6 which promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context and provide evidence that the standard is met.

(No more than 2 pages)
#4 (Required) EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment of candidate leadership and management skills to promote success for all students. Examples of assessments include post-graduate surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, and community feedback surveys of candidates or graduates. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment # 4: Ethical Leadership Portfolio

☐ Description

The ethical leadership portfolio is a semester-long activity required of all candidates during EA888 School Systems Management. Candidates are expected to apply knowledge gained from the course textbooks, class discussions, dialogue with those currently in the field to clearly articulate a personal foundation for ethical leadership. Candidates demonstrate their ability to analyze challenging scenarios and current educational issues by identifying appropriate ethical actions for school leaders. Candidates apply their personal ethical foundation to select fair and ethical strategies for dealing with:

• student behavior management
• staff development
• budget
• informing students, staff, parents, and community
• student, staff, parent, and community input
• involving others in decision making/problem solving
• recruiting, screening, interviewing, and hiring new teachers and other staff
• orientation of new teachers and other staff
• curriculum
• scheduling
• school philosophy, policy, and response to poverty
• school philosophy, policy, and response to special education

12 Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships within the program.
13 Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.
School philosophy, policy, and response to diversity
- philosophy, policy, and response to school sponsored activities
- philosophy, policy, and response to emergencies and crisis

Each candidate must develop a personal ethics statement.

Each of the three content areas are scored with a range of 0 - 2 points and an overall total range of 0 to 6 points for all three content areas. For Indicators I, II, and III a rating of 0 points is given for Needs Improvement, 1 point for Proficient, and 2 points for Exemplary in each content area. Although the portfolio is assessed on each individual item examined in the course, the following definitions are intended to support a reliable score.

Needs Improvement: Portfolio lacks clarity and fails to articulate candidate ethical beliefs, stated strategies are minimal or used inappropriately. Responses to scenarios do not reflect stated beliefs or strategies. Students total mean score is less than 1.0.

Proficient: Portfolio clearly identifies beliefs for ethical leadership in relation to historical philosophy, in response to challenging scenarios, current educational issues and real life situations; and, identify strategies for ethical leadership related to the items identified in Part 3. Students total mean score is between 1.0 and 1.74.

Exemplary: Portfolio includes extensive usage of those items included in the above descriptors. There is expert use of concepts or strategies and thorough analysis of situations. Responses to scenarios indicate thorough understanding of issues and when and how to apply ethical leadership strategies. Students total mean score is 1.75 or higher. See Assessment 4 Rubric.

Alignment with KSDE Standard #5
- Standard #5 states that the building level administrator is to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Within the Ethical Leadership Portfolio there are specific activities that address the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Specific activities relating to these areas include candidate’s ability to articulate his/her beliefs as related to ethical leadership, strategies for ethical leadership and actions of ethical leadership. Additional information is mentioned in the previous description, i.e. staff development, budget, emergencies and crisis, scheduling, working with diverse and special interest populations and can also be found on the Assessment 4 Rubric. These specific activities within the practicum experience contain indicators that insure that candidates have the resources, foundation, and skills to lead with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Practicum portfolio indicators aligned with Standard #5 are: 1) articulate beliefs for ethical leadership, 2) articulate strategies for ethical leadership, and 3) articulate actions for ethical leadership.
- Summary of Data

Standard #5: Two hundred and forty eight (248) candidates have completed the Ethical Leadership Portfolio since 2007. Of those 248 candidates,
214 (86%) have achieved an exemplary score rating, 33 candidates (13%) achieved a proficient rating, and only one student was rated at needs improvement. In summary, 99% of the candidates during this three year period received a proficient rating or better and the overall total average mean score for the three indicators was 5.44.

Interpretation of Data

Two hundred forty seven of the 248 successful portfolio completers scored at or above the proficient level for each of the three indicators. The overall total average mean score is 5.44 out of 6 points on this assessment. Ninety nine percent of the 248 candidates scored at the proficient and/or exemplary level. Data derived from this assessment indicates that Standard #5 has been met successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Assessment of candidate leadership and management skills to promote success of all students] * (Required) Ethical Leadership Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#5 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards OR the option of submitting course grades-based assessment related to content knowledge evaluation. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV. If submitting course grades-based assessment, the detailed description for Assessment #5 must clearly delineate the alignment of the course description and assessments to the standard that is assessed during the course in order to assure that the course grade reflects candidate knowledge of the standard. Describe course key activities, projects, assessments that show specificity to the standard. If course grades are used, include the program or unit definition of grades in the narrative or as an attachment to assessment 5. If the course grades-based assessments are used as evidence for meeting two standards, the course key assessments’ data (exams, projects, portfolio tasks) must be disaggregated in a data table for each of the two standards. This is necessary to provide evidence of meeting each standard. This narrative must state the proficiency level or grade acceptable by the program. COURSE GRADES-BASED ASSESSMENTS ARE LIMITED TO SIX COURSES.
Assessment #5: EA Comprehensive Exam

☐ A brief description of the assessment, project, or portfolio and its use in the program.

Candidates complete a comprehensive exam utilizing thought provoking, problem-based scenarios which assess the effective practices of candidates in their role as building level leaders. Candidates are required to address 10 indicators of which 5 are in section 1 of the Comprehensive Exam and 5 in section 2 of the Comprehensive Exam and apply the standards to real situations in the building school leader’s professional life. The scenario provided is constructed to require candidates to determine school improvement needs, goals, strategies, and the role of the building level administrator in carrying out effective change as well as require candidates to respond to critical questions that engage them in applying core knowledge and processes to issues in school building organization and governance, school improvement issues, identify specific and measurable goal statements, community engagement, educational facilities, and appropriate educational programs for all students. (Specifically, both indicators address Standard #1 with a total of 10 points possible on each indicator or an overall score of 20 points. Indicator II addresses Standard #2 with 10 points possible for a possible total possible score of 10 points. Ratings of the indicators are based on a point scale system is: 0 to 4 points for Needs Improvement, 5 to 8 points for Proficient, and 9 - 10 points for Exemplary on each indicator. Candidates are required to re-write where the total score in any area is in the 0 - 4 point range or when any portion of the exam is scored at a 0.

The project falls into the Needs Improvement category when the finished product indicates that information was gathered from a limited range of sources. The sources lacked relevance, quality, depth and balance. Level of analysis engaged in by the student failed to produce the required depth for the project. Student conclusions simply involved restating information and were not supported by evidence. The student needed to use greater care in documenting sources. The project is not logically or effectively structured and does not effectively communicate with the audience.

Students that include accurate and comprehensive identified components are judged to have completed a Proficient project. The student gathered relevant information from a variety of appropriate electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced, cited with few errors and display strong congruency to the project. Student displayed a good effort in analyzing the evidence collected. Project is logically organized, provides connections among ideas and defectively communicates the project to the audience.

The students judged to produce exemplary work have a thorough, accurate and comprehensive inclusion of all components within each element of the project. The student gathered relevant information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced, correctly cited and include critical readings relating to the project. Student carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Project displays creativity and originality and is presented in a logical format with smooth transitions. See Assessment 5 Rubric.

☐ The alignment of the assessment with KSDE Standards 1 and 2
Standard #1 requires the building level administrator to promote a vision of learning through the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of student learning. The comprehensive exam requires the candidate, through problem solving, to identify school improvement goals and articulate all-inclusive plans to address the issues and increase student learning. The plans must include goals, activities, and evaluations. Specific activities relating to Standard #1 are mentioned above in the description and can also be found on the Assessment 5 Comprehensive Exam Rubric. The specific activities within the comprehensive exam scenarios contain indicators used that demonstrate candidates’ knowledge and skills that have the potential to promote the success of all students. Indicators used to assess Standard #1 are found on both Indicators (Indicator I, School Improvement Issues and Indicator II, Goal Setting for Improvement) which can be found on Assessment 5 Data Table.

Standard #2 requires the building level administrator to promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a district climate and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The comprehensive exam requires the candidate, through problem solving, to apply knowledge and skills that will support needed change, develop strategies to implement improvement, develop appropriate goals, and insure that successful goal implementation can be done. Specific activities relating to Standard #2 are mentioned above in the description and can also be found on the Assessment 5 Rubric. The specific activities within the comprehensive exam scenarios contain indicators that demonstrate candidates’ knowledge and skills that have the potential to promote the success of all students. Indicators used to assess Standard #2 are found on Indicator II which can be found on Assessment 5 Data Table.

Summary of Data Needs

Standard #1: Two hundred thirteen candidates completed the building level Comprehensive Exam assessment during the last three years. Of the 215 program completers, two were not required to take the Comprehensive Exam. (Anyone admitted to the non-degree program prior to January 1, 2006 were not required to complete the exam.) Within each of the two indicators, 5 - 8 is Proficient and 9 -10 is Exemplary. Each indicator has a possible score of 10 points with an overall total mean score of 20 points for both indicators. The overall total average mean score for the 213 program completers for this standard is 8.77 out of possible 10 points. Proficient is scored from 5-8 with Exemplary being scored from 9-10.

Standard #2: Two hundred thirteen candidates completed the building level Comprehensive Exam assessment during the last three years. Of the 215 program completers, two were not required to take the Comprehensive Exam. (Anyone admitted to the non-degree program prior to January 1, 2006 were not required to complete the exam.) Within each of the two indicators, 5-8 is Proficient and 9-10 is Exemplary. Each indicator has a possible score of 10 points with an overall total mean score of 20 points for both indicators. The overall total average mean scores for the 213 program completers for this standard is 8.47 out of a possible 10 points, with 9 -10 being Exemplary. Proficient is 5 - 8.
If submitting comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and scores/s aligned to standards, the program must use the table below and submit the Scoring Guides/Evaluation Criteria/Rubric and a Data Table. **DO NOT USE THIS TABLE FOR COURSE GRADES-BASED ASSESSMENTS!!!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Content based assessment that addresses Kansas content standards] * Required Examples of assessments include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #5</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alignment Matrix and Course Description for Course Grades-Based Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments 5.A-F for SIX courses</th>
<th>Program Standard Addressed by Course Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description of how the Course addresses and assesses the standard from an AUTHENTIC source—such as a syllabus or a course catalog. Cite the most current source. The description should provide evidence of the alignment of the course to the standard indicated on the chart in Section III. Cite your source in each description below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE: Calculus I Math 172</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Calculus of algebraic functions of one variable: limits differentiation, implicit differentiation, definite and indefinite integrals. Mean value theorem, maxima and minima, area, and volume. Vectors, polar coordinates, parametric equations, and vector valued functions and use of technology. Applications to other fields. Source: Blank University Undergraduate Catalog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.A.                              |                                               |                                                 |
| 5.B.                              |                                               |                                                 |
| 5.C.                              |                                               |                                                 |
| 5.D.                              |                                               |                                                 |
| 5.E.                              |                                               |                                                 |
### Alignment Matrix and Course Description for Course Grades-Based Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments 5.A-F for SIX courses</th>
<th>Program Standard Addressed by Course Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description of how the Course addresses and assesses the standard from an AUTHENTIC source—such as a syllabus or a course catalog. Cite the most current source. The description should provide evidence of the alignment of the course to the standard indicated on the chart in Section III. Cite your source in each description below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### #6 (Required) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Assessment of candidate abilities in organizational management and community relations. Examples of assessments include school-based strategic plans, school simulations, and school intervention plans. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment #6: Practicum Leadership Project

☐ Description

The Practicum Leadership Project (EA896 and EA897) is carried out during the final academic year of the program. Candidates are required to complete a major project within the eight-hour practicum course. The project is one that is selected within their building and candidates must provide evidence of its value/implementation within the district. Candidates are required to complete a 'project proposal' and submit it for prior approval of the field supervisor and university supervisor. The approved project requires the candidate demonstrate leadership, planning, organization, and communication. A project overview, project summary, and related supplemental materials are to be included as Section III of the portfolio. When utilizing the attached Assessment 6 Building Level Practicum Leadership Rubric, ratings are based on whether the project provides strong experiences and knowledge which demonstrate leadership skills, gives evidence of effective planning and group facilitating skills, identifies solutions and alternatives for future consideration, and requires communication with various stakeholders. Candidates receive an unsatisfactory if the project is not approved or completed, a proficient rating if the project is completed and approved in collaboration with at least two stakeholder groups, and an exemplary rating when completed and implemented within the district. Candidates’ projects are scored on a three-point scale: 0 points for Unsatisfactory, 1.0 point for Proficient, and 2.0 points for Exemplary. See Assessment 6 Rubric.

☐ Alignment with KSDE Standards #1 and #4
KSDE Standard #1 states that the building administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff in the district by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the community. The practicum project requires candidates to select a specific project that demonstrates the candidate's ability to develop, plan, organize, communicate, identify resources, and utilize leadership skills while working on and completing this activity. Specific activities relating to Standard #1 are mentioned above in the description and can also be found on the Assessment #6 Scoring Rubric which is in the attached file. The specific activities within the project contain indicators that demonstrate candidates' knowledge and skills that have the potential to promote student learning. Specifically, the indicators aligned with Standard #1 include: III A) practice effective leadership skills of decision making, problem solving, communication and conflict resolution; and III B) give evidence of effective planning and group facilitating skills necessary to meet the changing needs of 21st century schools.

KSDE Standard #4 states that the building administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community needs and interests, and mobilizing community resources. The practicum leadership project requires candidates to select indicators that demonstrate the candidate's knowledge and skills align with Standard #4. Specific activities relating to Standard #4 are mentioned above in the description and can also be found on the Assessment #6 Scoring Rubric which is in the attached file. The specific activities within the project contain indicators that demonstrate candidates’ knowledge and skills that have the potential to impact student learning. Practicum project indicators aligned with Standard #4 are: III C) show the ability to facilitate needed curricular and co-curricular development; and III D) exhibit the interpersonal skills necessary to build exemplary trusting relationships between and among faculty, staff, and students within an appropriate school climate.

**Summary of Data**

Standard #1: Of the 215 program completers for 2007-2010, the average mean score on Indicator IIIA is 1.94 on practice effective leadership and 1.94 for Indicator IIIB, effective planning and group facilitating out of a possible 2 points on each indicator. The average total mean score for the three years of obtained data is 3.88 out of a possible 4 points. Individual completer scores range from 2 (Proficient) to 4 (Exemplary) on this assessment.

Standard #4: Of the 215 program completers, the mean score on Indicator IIIC is 1.90 for facilitate curricular and co-curricular development and 1.93 on Indicator IIID for interpersonal skills necessary to build trusting relationships out of a possible 2 points on each indicator. The average total mean score for the three years of obtained data is 3.83 out of a possible 4 points. Individual completer scores range from 2 (Proficient) to 4 (Exemplary) on this assessment.

**An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.**

Standard #1:
All of the candidates scored above the 1.0 proficient level for the two indicators, with the 100% majority scoring at 2.0 or the Exemplary level on each of the two indicators. The total average mean score for the 215 program completers is 3.88 out of a possible 4 points when averaging the mean scores for both indicators. One hundred percent of the 215 candidates scored at the proficient level of 2.0 and/or the exemplary level of 4.0. The data derived from this assessment indicate that all candidates have successfully completed the project and met Standard #1. Evidence indicates Standard #1 as being met successfully.

Standard #4: The data demonstrates Standard #4 as being met successfully.

All of the candidates scored above the 1.0 proficient level for the two indicators, with the 100% majority scoring at 2.0 or the Exemplary level on each of the two indicators. The total average mean score for the 215 program completers is 3.83 out of a possible 4 points when averaging the mean scores for both indicators. One hundred percent of the 215 candidates scored at the proficient level of 2.0 or the exemplary level of 4.0. The data derived from this assessment indicate that all candidates have successfully completed the project and met Standard #4. Evidence indicates Standard #1 as being met successfully.

### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #6</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Assessment of candidate abilities in organizational management and community relations] * (Required)</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Leadership Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#7 (Optional) Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 7: Practicum Knowledge – Section I

☐ Description
The eight credit hour practicum (EA896 Practicum I, fall 4 credit hours and EA897 Practicum II, spring 4 credit hours) is to be fulfilled during the final academic year of the program. Candidates are required to complete activities that demonstrate an application of program knowledge which includes articulating a personal philosophy based school leadership in the 21st Century. Specific activities include working with classified and certified staff, organizational structure, curricular scope and sequence, staff development, grading, personnel interviews, recruitment, purchasing, budgets, activity funds, transportation, due process, special education, diversity, and assessment. Proficient candidates complete, for each task, a written essay describing information gained, observations, and actions taken in completing each of the required activities. Exemplary candidates provide additional insights and implications for current or future practice. The descriptive reflections are included in the candidate's portfolio and submitted to the university supervisor toward the end of the academic year. The university supervisor uses the scoring guide for the practicum portfolio to determine whether or not the candidates have satisfactorily completed each activity and to assess the quality of performance on each activity. Candidates are required to redo activities that do not meet proficiency in order to successfully complete the program. Each candidate must complete all practicum activities. Candidates’ portfolio entries are scored on a three-point scale: 0 points for Needs Improvement, 1.0 point for Proficient, and 2.0 points for Exemplary.

A candidate achieves a rating of Needs Improvement if a written reflection is not provided or does not demonstrate completion on each of the required activities, i.e. candidate fails to complete 1 of 2 (50%) activities of element one, fails to complete 6 of 8 (75%) activities for element two, fails to complete 5 of 6 (83%) activities for element three, fails to complete 2 of 3 (67%) activities for elements four and five of activities listed on Assessment 7 Rubric.

A candidate achieves a rating of Proficient by providing a written reflection describing information gained, observations, and actions taken in completing each of the activities, i.e. complete 1 of 2 (50%) activities of element one, completes 6 of 8 (75%) activities for element two, completes 5 of 6 (83%) activities for element three, completes 2 of 3 (67%) activities for element four; and completes 2 of 3 (67%) activities for element five of activities listed on Assessment 7 Rubric.

A candidate achieves a rating of Exemplary by providing a written reflection describing information gained, observations, and actions taken in completing 2 of 2 (100%) of the required activities on element one, 7 or more of 8 (88%) the activities on element two, 5 or more activities for element three, and all activities for elements four, and five. Additionally, the candidate provides evidence that experiences gained will benefit and be used in the future as listed in Appendix 7 Rubric.

Alignment with KSDE Standard 6.

KSDE Standard #6 states building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, and cultural context. Within the practicum portfolio assessment, Section I – Practicum Performance, there are those specific activities that promote the success of all students by 1) understanding, 2) responding to, and 3) influencing the larger political, social, economic, and legal, and cultural context. Specific activities include items such as working with building staff and field supervisors while shadowing administrators at the elementary, middle and high school. Additional information can be found in the
previous description and can also be found on the Assessment 7 Rubric. The specific activities within the practicum experience contain indicators that demonstrate candidates’ knowledge and skills that have the potential to promote the success of all. The practicum portfolio indicators aligned with Standard #6 are: 1) political, 2) social, 3) economic, 4) legal, and 5) cultural contexts that demonstrate knowledge and understanding within the areas.

☐ Summary of Data

Standard #6: Data demonstrates Standard #6 as being met successfully. The mean scores for each of the five indicators (elements) aligned with Standard #6 and all candidates scored at 1.0 (proficient) or higher on each indicator. The mean score for each indicator exceeds the minimum of 1.0 or “Proficiency.” The highest possible indicator score is 2 points with a total overall of 10 points for the five indicators. Total mean scores for each indicator for the three year period is at 1.62 or higher out of 2.0 points. The total average mean score is 9.16 out of a possible 10 which demonstrates that 100% of the candidates were at the proficient level with 80% scoring at the Exemplary level within the 2007-2010 reporting period. As the data tables demonstrate, 100% of the candidates have successfully met this standard assessment. The data derived from this assessment indicate that candidates are successfully completing the course Practicum Knowledge piece and are meeting the expectations of Standard #6.

☐ Interpretation of Data

As shown in the Assessment 7 Data Table, all 215 candidates (100%) in the reporting period met the criterion for either “proficient” or “exemplary” on this activity, i.e. of the 215 candidates 187 (87%) scored at the exemplary (8-10 point range) level, with 28 (13%) program candidates scoring at the proficient level (5-7 point range). To date, 215 candidates have completed the practicum knowledge activities since 2007. Of those 215 candidates, the data reflects a 100% pass rate with all at a Proficient or Exemplary levels. Candidate scores on the specific indicators ranged from 1-2 points with an overall individual total mean scores ranging from 5-10 points for the five indicators. Eighty percent of the candidates scored at the Exemplary level during the three year reporting period. Standard #6 is met.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards ] * Optional Practicum Knowledge (Section I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#8 (Optional) Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field
experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Details</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards] * Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 major 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 have taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program.

USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys; the following changes have been made to the Building Level Leadership program. Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements.

1) EA773 & ER752 were revised and course changes made to address student concerns expressed during the EA building level focus review and exit survey during the 2007-2008 academic year.

2) Revisions in Practicum were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity. These changes were made to better prepare candidates to successfully complete scenarios presented on the Praxis exam. Feedback from candidates indicated a need for this change.

3) Comprehensive Exam was implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates. This assessment was added to assess whether candidates completing the building level program leave with the skills necessary to work with student and staff in the current century.

4) Courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Feedback during Focus reviews, dialogue with students during the practicum experience, and exit surveys keeps the emphasis on current skills necessary for success in the field.

5) Revised the Comprehensive Exam
6) Realigned and revised Practicum activities
7) Revised EA896 and EA897 to specifically address non-English speaking programs within the area of diversity. Feedback from candidates who took the revised Praxis exam expressed a need for more exposure in this area to better equip future candidates in the completion of scenarios presented in the exam.
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