

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Educational Leaders

School Building Level

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Arkansas State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

01 / 30 / 2009

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Educational Leadership-Supervisor

Program Type

Other School Personnel

Award or Degree Level(s)

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

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comment:

The ASU preparation program shows a three year pass rate of 97% on the state's licensure exam.

Summary of Strengths:

Arkansas State University has invested an inordinate amount of time in preparing candidates for leadership at the building and district level. The wide range of leadership experiences, field experiences and artifacts, and the variety of internship experiences have validated the three year state licensure test pass rate of 97% and comprehensiveness of the ASU preparation program.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

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

1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment:

1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment:

1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment:

1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

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

2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

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

3.1 Manage the Organization.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

3.2 Manage the Operations.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

3.3 Manage the Resources.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

5.1 Acts with Integrity.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

5.2 Acts Fairly.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

5.3 Acts Ethically.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

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

7.1 Substantial.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

7.2 Sustained.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

7.3 Standards-based.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

7.4 Real Settings.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

7.5 Planned and Guided Cooperatively.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

7.6 Credit.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidate knowledge of content

Assessment #1, state licensure exam, The School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), measures candidate content knowledge. The exam is divided into three modules that reflect the six ISLLC/ELCC Standards. Candidates' are required to evaluate actions, synthesize information and problem-solve, analyze information and make decisions. The modules are aligned to ELCC standard elements and the pass rate over a 3-year period, 2004-2007 is 97%. Data results, for academic years 2004-2007, show that 97% of candidates, 32 of the (N=33) earned passing scores on the SLLA, the state licensure exam.

Assessment #2, Case Studies and Vignettes, measures content knowledge. The assessment description stipulates that candidates are required to respond to focused questions with specific details considering the information provided or to propose courses of action to address the problems relevant to the situation. The case studies and vignettes measured not only the candidate's understanding of the ELCC standards, but how the candidate actually incorporated the ELCC standard elements when carrying out school leadership functions.

The scoring guide for Assessment #2, Case Studies, is aligned to the ELCC standard elements. Data results reported a mean score range of 2.15-2.79 on a 3.00 scale during the three-year review period. Candidate performance indicated high levels of achievement in applying knowledge acquired from coursework.

Assessment #6, Portfolio Content Artifacts, measures candidates' ability to generate artifacts that validate their acquisition of content knowledge through developing a vision, creating an action research project, and preparing a Sociological Inventory.

The scoring guide for Assessment #6, Portfolio Content Artifacts, is aligned to the ELCC standard

elements. Data results report a mean score range of 2.59-2.89 on a scale of 3.00 during the three-year review period. Candidate performance indicates high levels of achievement in applying knowledge acquired from coursework.

C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Arkansas State University validates candidates' pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions through Assessment #3, Needs Assessment & Curriculum Improvement Plan; Assessment #4, Internship Evaluation by Site Supervisor; and Assessment #7, School-Based Leadership Project.

Assessment #3, Needs Assessment & Curriculum Improvement Plan, requires candidate to choose an existing curriculum area or a school practice and redesign it to be responsive to the community's needs. Additionally, candidates determine which educational perspective (i.e., behavioral, cognitive, constructive, progressive, etc.) guides the newly designed curriculum/practice as supported by the literature. Assessment #3 assesses candidates' professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in elements within five of the six ELCC standards.

The scoring guide for Assessment #3, Needs Assessment & Curriculum Improvement Plan is aligned to the ELCC standard elements. Data results report a mean score range of 2.29-2.36 on a scale of 3.00 during the three-year review period. Candidate performance indicated high levels of achievement in applying knowledge acquired from coursework.

Assessment #4, Internship/Clinical Field Experiences Evaluation by Site Supervisor, requires the candidates to implement leadership activities developed cooperatively by the candidate, site supervisor, and university supervisor; to maintain detailed logs of time devoted to the internship activities; and to submit weekly reflective writings to the university supervisor during the capstone internship. Assessment #4 assessed candidates' knowledge in the six ELCC standards.

The scoring guide for Assessment #4 is aligned to the ELCC standard elements. Data results showed mean scores for candidates on the internship/clinical field experiences assessment for the 3-year period range from 58.78-60.00 out of 63 possible points.

Assessment #7, School-Based Leadership Project, required candidates to engage in hands-on clinical experiences in the field of educational leadership. Candidates demonstrated their abilities in organizational management and their skills in faculty and community relations through involving faculty, students, and/or community in the school based project. The project assesses candidates' abilities in organizational management and community relations in five of the six ELCC standards.

The scoring guide for Assessment #7 is aligned to ELCC standard elements. Data results showed the mean score range of 2.69-2.91 on a scale of 3.00 for the elements assessed in the three-year review period. Results indicate a high level of achievement for the candidates in demonstrating their skills in organizational management and community relations.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

A review of Assessment #5, Graduate Survey, requires candidates to respond to twenty items on the survey according to the level of preparation (unacceptable, acceptable, or exemplary) received in the licensure program for building level administrator. The graduate survey is completed by all program

completers immediately upon exit from the educational leadership program and a follow-up survey is mailed to all program completers three years following their exit from the program. Graduates are asked to provide written feedback on any standard or element rated as “unacceptable.” Results of the exit and follow-up graduate surveys demonstrate our graduates are well prepared by the university to assume the responsibilities of leadership in their schools.

The scoring guide/rubric criteria are aligned to the ELCC Standard Elements. Data results show over a three-year period, 31 respondents indicated a very high level of preparation by the university to support student learning and development. The number of standards with 80% or fewer respondents rating their level of preparation as “exemplary” decreased significantly from ten elements identified in 2005-2006 to only two elements receiving less than an 80% exemplary rating in 2007-2008. Only two elements (ELCC 3.3, 75% exemplary and ELCC 4.3, 77% exemplary) for the combined total of the three-year period 2005-2008 received less than an 80% overall exemplary rating.

In Assessment #8 Portfolio, program artifacts serve as evidence of application of content knowledge in Educational Leadership aligned with the ELCC Standards. The program artifacts are reflective of each of the ELCC standards and are scored by professors in accordance with the ELCC standards. The artifacts included in the portfolio and the summative matrix give a clear indication of the candidates’ progress in acquiring knowledge of educational leadership functions and the ELCC standards through content assignments aligned with the standards.

The scoring guide/rubric criteria are aligned to the ELCC Standard Elements. Data results for portfolio artifacts indicate the program has been effective in preparing candidates with the content knowledge in the ELCC standards. The mean score range of 2.66-2.74 on a scale of 3.00 for candidates for the elements assessed in the three-year period under review indicate a high level of achievement for the candidates in content knowledge and application of the knowledge acquired in coursework. The mean score for candidates has improved each year.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Content Knowledge: Data from the licensure test and the other content assessments indicate that additional opportunities were needed for candidates to analyze information and make decisions based on knowledge of the ELCC standards. As of fall 2006, additional case studies and vignettes based on the ELCC standards were incorporated into core content courses to provide opportunities for students to process information and apply content knowledge in real world situations that a school leader would experience. Data results showed Standards 2 and 5 had the lowest means across several of the content assessments. Additional content and experiences have been incorporated in appropriate courses to improve the knowledge in Standards 2 and 5.

A major change in field experiences was in defining specific activities for all candidates. Faculty compiled a comprehensive series of required field and internship to ensure diverse experiences for candidates in multiple settings. Modifications were made to require candidates and site supervisors to plan experiences in settings other than the primary settings, including a community agency that works in partnership with the schools. The grading scale utilized by the site supervisors to assess the internship and field activities was revised in 2007 to ensure better alignment with the ELCC standards. In addition, a 3-point scoring rubric with common descriptors was developed for use in assessing all assignments in coursework within the department. The common language has resulted in improved communication between and among faculty and students relative to student performance.

Professional and Pedagogical Skills and Dispositions: A major change in field experiences was in defining specific activities for all candidates. Faculty compiled a comprehensive series of required field and internship experiences (in addition to the field experiences embedded in coursework) to ensure diverse experiences for candidates in multiple settings.

Student Learning: Student learning and development has been assessed through a graduate survey. Changes in coursework to address Standard 3, which was identified in 2005-2006 as an area of concern by the program faculty, gave candidates a deeper knowledge of the skills required in this area and opportunities to apply the knowledge in real situations. The data from the 2006-2007 and the 2007-2008 surveys indicate improvement in addressing Standard 3 concerns. Standards 4 and 6 were also identified in 2005-2006 as areas of concern. Subsequent changes in the coursework and activities to address Standard 4 were incorporated into the School and Community Relations course and the data from the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 assessments indicate that the changes resulted in improvements in these areas over the 2005-2006 data.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit a revised report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns.*

Please click "Next"

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