

Revised 12-13-05

Program Report Format

BUILDING LEADERSHIP

Kansas State Department of Education

COVER SHEET

Institution: University of Kansas

Accredited By: KSDE NCATE

Date Submitted: March 1, 2006

Name of Preparer(s): Marc Mahlios, PhD

Unit Head Name: Rick Ginsberg, PhD

Unit Head Phone Number: 785-856-9650 **Unit Head Email:** ginsberg@ku.edu

Level of the Program: Initial Advanced

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared:

PreK-12

Is this program being offered at more than one site? Yes No

If yes, please list the sites at which the program is offered: Lawrence campus and Edwards campus

Program Report Status:

New Program Continued Program Rejoinder

Dormant Program

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:

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

1. Program of Study:

Provide the following contextual information:

- *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.*

Educational Leadership Programs University of Kansas-Lawrence Campus and the Edwards Campus in Overland Park

The University of Kansas offers a master's degree and two different doctoral degree programs in K-12 educational leadership. These three programs are housed within the Teaching and Leadership Department in the School of Education. Course work for the Masters and Ed.D. is offered at both the Lawrence and Edwards campus in Overland Park, Kansas. About eighty percent of the course work for the Ph.D. is offered at both campuses with the remainder scheduled only at the Lawrence campus. Additional information about the University of Kansas, School of Education, and the various programs offered in the Teaching and Leadership Department can be found at our web site located at www.soe.ku.edu

The Master's Degree Program

The Master of Science in Educational Administration program is designed to prepare experienced teachers for leadership roles at the building level. The program stresses fundamental knowledge and educational policy development necessary for effective leadership. It consists of a set of integrated courses and experiences that provide opportunities for participants to extend their knowledge of pedagogy and leadership, to enlarge their understanding of schooling, and to develop an appreciation of the political, economic and social forces that influence the decisions of educational leaders. Additionally, candidates must complete two field experiences; one within the program and one following completion of the program and in the first or second year of practice. The first field experience requires the candidate to participate in a broad range of specific building leadership activities and responsibilities in a school. The second field experience requires the new practitioner to assess the school according to the licensure standards and prepare and implement an improvement plan.

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.

Format

The program is divided into two separate alternatives. The first option is designed for part-time candidates who currently hold teaching positions in the schools. Candidates pursuing this option enter the program as a cohort group and attend six consecutive semesters over a two-year period. It begins during the summer session and continues through the spring semester of the following academic year. Two courses are scheduled in 16-week formats during each fall and spring semester and meet back-to-back one night each week from 4:30 PM until 10:00 PM. In the summer, courses are scheduled into 4-week blocks and generally meet three days each week.

Course work in each term is sequenced to build upon the skills and knowledge acquired in the previous terms. Candidates may start the program at the Edwards Campus in Overland Park in even numbered years (e.g., 2004, 2006) or at the Lawrence Campus in odd numbered years (e.g., 2005, 2007). All course work for the respective campus options will be offered at those locations; thus, Kansas City residents do not have to travel to Lawrence to attend classes.

The second option is designed for individuals who want to accelerate their entry into school leadership. This option requires four consecutive semesters of intensive study. Classes for this option begin each summer and continue through the following summer session. Two to four courses are taken each semester with allowances for time to complete an internship in a local school. Although the curriculum is identical to that of the part-time option, it is more compacted and results in a more expedient completion of the degree. Both programs lead to building leadership licensure.

Course of Instruction

The M.S. in Educational Administration consists of a 36-hour block of course work plus a Master's exam or project. The course work is sequenced as described below, and builds upon itself as the candidate progresses through the program. The project represents the culminating activity and is intended to allow the candidate to study and develop expertise in one aspect of administrative practice. Projects vary from literature reviews to production of training tapes and are individually tailored to the interests of the candidate and his/her advisor.

First Year-Summer

- T&L 750 Principalship
- T&L 756 History of Educational Thought

First Year-Fall

- T&L 757 Education in American Society
- T&L 715 Educational Research and Evaluation

First Year-Spring

- T&L 752 Education Law
- T&L 755 Human Resource Management

Second Year-Summer

- T&L 854 Student in Society
- T&L 852 School Resource Management

Second Year-Fall

- T&L 843 Curriculum Planning
- T&L 853 Staff Evaluation and Development

Second Year-Spring

- T&L 840 Instructional Strategies and Models
- T&L 895 Internship I

NEW-- Post Degree Administrative Employment

- T&L 893 First Year in Building Administration

- *Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program.*

Application Process

The University of Kansas' programs in educational leadership are designed for individuals with well developed academic skills and a strong potential for future leadership. Indications of high promise from all of the following categories are utilized in the admission process.

- Test Results -- a candidate's performance on the Graduate Record Exam or Miller Analogies Test.
- Previous Education -- a candidate's overall academic record (cumulative GPA of 3.0 or greater).
- Letters of Recommendation -- a candidate's potential for assuming school leadership responsibilities.
- Program Retention and Exit
- Course Work -- must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or greater.
- Internship I -- must have a cumulative GPA of 3.2 or greater to enroll in the initial internship and 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.
- Internship II -- must be in a school leadership position, in the first or second year of conditional licensure, and receive proficient marks from the university supervisor as well as the principal mentor.

Formal application should include test scores, letter of interest and statement of purpose for graduate study, resume or vita, completed application form, 3 letters of recommendation, official copies of all college or university transcripts and a \$55 check or money order (made out to the University of Kansas) for application processing.

To view this application, download a printable application at <http://www.ku.edu/~graduate/> or there is a link for an online application <http://www.applyweb.com/apply/ukansgr/menu.html> at the same site.

Applications for all three programs are reviewed in the order in which they are received beginning March 1 but will be considered after that date if space permits. For additional information please call 785-864-4435, write to the address below, access our web site at http://www.soe.ukans.edu/depts/tl/programs/ed_lead, or e-mail us at tldepartment@ku.edu.

- *Description of the relationship of the program to the unit's conceptual framework.*

Relationship of the Educational Administration Program to Unit Conceptual Framework

Introduction

The primary mission of the School of Education is to prepare educators as leaders. As stated in the School Code

Within the University, the School of Education serves Kansas, the nation, and the world by (1) preparing individuals to be leaders and practitioners in education and related human service fields, (2) expanding and deepening understanding of education as a fundamental human endeavor, and (3) helping society

define and respond to its educational responsibilities and challenges.

The components of preparing educators as leaders that frame this mission for our initial and advanced programs are Research and Best Practice, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, and Professionalism. These interlocking themes build our Conceptual Framework. Within the framework, our programs combine a strong liberal arts and sciences education tradition with field-based pedagogical experiences that together foster thoughtful inquiry about schools, classrooms, labs, studios, all student learners, and the enterprise of schooling.

It is our goal as a School of Education to provide our candidates through our graduate degree and licensure programs with the advanced knowledge and skills to be model educators who assume leadership positions in their schools, districts, community, and profession —and by so doing enhance the education of students and the lives of those students and their families.

At both the initial and the advanced levels, we believe that teaching is an honorable, dynamic, and vitally important profession. Preparing children and youth for life in a society that is distinguished by constant change, increased diversity, and difficult challenges requires educators who can serve as leaders in their profession -- individuals who will be role models in their schools and communities. With regard to our initial and advanced teacher licensure programs, state and professional standards provide the structure for the knowledge and competencies we expect candidates to demonstrate. Though the standards for each program organize the professional knowledge base into slightly different strands or domains, common themes emerge.

Research and Best Practice

We believe that knowledge and application of both formal and classroom-based research lead to effective, informed practice. The curriculum that our advanced program candidates experience in the Educational Administration program is rigorous, coherent, and organized in such a manner that research and theory is integrated with practice. Candidates develop a depth of understanding of school leadership for work at both the building (masters) and district (doctoral) levels. Our focus is on the fundamental knowledge and educational policy development necessary for effective leadership and for district leaders to enlarge their understanding of schooling, to develop an appreciation of the political, economic and social forces that influence the decisions of educational leaders and to gain extensive expertise in educational leadership. Our candidates gain this knowledge of research and best practice through coursework, field experiences, and capstone projects.

Leadership Knowledge

Educational Administration candidates possess a deep understanding of school leadership. They acquire this depth of understanding in approximately six to eight semesters of coursework taken in the School of Education (see attached program description).

Preparing school leaders requires that all candidates understand the complexities of today's schools and their students and teachers. In the Educational Administration program, our candidates acquire an in-depth understanding of the evolving body of professional knowledge in the field of school leadership. During a multi-year sequence of professional education courses with field-based experiences, candidates develop knowledge of many traditional elements of school administration (i.e., law, finance, policy) and also broad themes woven throughout the program, namely the contexts social, legal, political and economic with a special emphasis on social justice and ethics in leadership.

Professionalism

Our programs advocate the goal of initiating our candidates into a community of professionals that can be

recognized from our core beliefs and standards of practice. As such, our candidates know what it means to be a professional and exhibit these qualities as the leader of an educational community.

Our candidates in the Educational Administration program are engaged in professional learning experiences that expect a commitment to ethical and caring practice in which continued learning and professional development are paramount. As such, while the initial focus of many beginning principals often is limited to their own schools, our candidates are prepared to expand their horizons to the school districts and communities they serve, as well as to their professional associations at the state and national education levels, such as University Council for Educational Administration.

Summary

By preparing leaders and by continually working to create programs designed to further enhance all students' education, we believe these school leaders will be positioned to bring about long-term, fundamental change. Our candidates in the Educational Administration program learn to anticipate and plan for the future, construct and apply a coherent, integrated understanding of teaching and learning, engage in collaborative problem-solving and critical inquiry, strive to enable all students to reach their potential, and continually assess and improve their practice for the benefit of all students and the communities they serve.

- *Indication of the program's unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system.*²
- UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The performance-assessment system for the School of Education Unit is organized around four transition points, which vary slightly for initial and advanced programs. The system is designed to evaluate individual candidate's performance as well as overall program quality. By placing candidate and program assessments in the appropriate transition designation, the Unit-wide outcomes are apparent for similar measures.

Candidates are assessed in all programs using criteria aligned with state and national standards. The Unit uses multiple sources of data to assess an individual candidate's proficiencies. This collection of data is then used to make admission decisions, to track candidates' academic progress, and to make licensure decisions. The unique assessments used in the master's program in educational administration include the eight assessments listed in section II.

ADMISSION IS THE FIRST TRANSITION POINT and occurs when a candidate expresses interest in a program, applies for formal acceptance into the program and may begin to take course work. Candidates must meet each of the admission criteria and GPA requirements, successful coursework completion (whether specified courses or degrees), and a formal declaration (application) of interest and intent. These requirements are part of every program in the Unit. For the initial programs, all deferred candidates are provided opportunities to be counseled about choices and future plans.

The unique assessment for the first transition point in the master's program in educational administration is

A KNOWLEDGE COMPONENT IS THE SECOND TRANSITION point and covers the period of time which the candidate gains the professional knowledge and co-requisite field-based experiences. In each program there are multiple data sources used to track candidate academic progress.

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.

Each program has identified and requires assessments that are designated as benchmark assignments. These are performance-based assessments that typically address multiple teaching standards, require candidates to synthesize knowledge, and often involve authentic practice. The faculty is committed to supporting each candidate in reaching an acceptable performance level on each of these benchmark assignments. All candidates are normally provided with specific feedback and are ensured they have the opportunity to revise sub-standard work until it meets an acceptable level. If a candidate does not complete a benchmark assignment at a passing level that candidate will be advised or required to retake the course; or in some cases, not advance in the program.

The faculty advisor, along with the Undergraduate Records office, reviews each candidate's Academic Records Tracking System (ARTS) form each semester to monitor performance in education courses and progress toward completing academic content requirements. A passing grade (C or better) in education courses ensures the candidate has completed benchmark assignments at an appropriate level and the candidate has passed all co-requisite field-based experiences.

A FIELD BASED COMPONENT IS THE THIRD TRANSITION point and refers to the period in which candidates are immersed in the field in a supervised experience. This may be a semester or two semester long experience of student teaching, internship, practicum, or clinical experience – depending upon the program of study. Often this field-component serves as a candidate's capstone experience. During this experience, multiple assessments are used to ensure candidates can demonstrate proficiency and satisfy each standard associated with this experience.

Depending upon the capstone experience, each candidate is formally observed by a University supervisor and in an ongoing manner by the clinical supervisor. After each observation, all candidates meet with their University supervisor and clinical supervisor to discuss the strengths and areas needing improvement.

PROGRAM COMPLETION IS THE FOURTH TRANSITION point and occurs at the completion of the candidate's professional program. Concerted efforts are made to maintain an accurate database of program completers. All candidates are required to have a graduation check – which confirms that grade point averages, course work and associated assessment requirements have been met. Surveys are sent out annually to the previous year's program completers and their employers. In the fall 2005 semester, surveys were sent to all KU School of Education and Fine Arts Education graduates over the past three years in the state of Kansas.

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, alternate routes, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

Program (initial):		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program³	# of Program Completers⁴
20 -20		
20 -20		
20 -20		

Program (alternative):		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers
20 -20		
20 -20		
20 -20		

Program (Post-baccalaureate – Added Endorsement):			
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers	Master’s/Ed. Specialist/Doctoral
2002-2003	30	9	MSE
2003-2004	32	20	MSE
2004-2005	28	12	MSE

³ An enrolled candidate is officially admitted to the program.

⁴KSDE 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.

3. Chart with Faculty Information:

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

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁵	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁶	Faculty Rank ⁷	Tenure Track (Yes/ No)	Scholarship, ⁸ Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: ⁹ List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ¹⁰	Teaching or other professional experience in PreK-12 schools in the past 3 years ¹¹
Crawford, George	<i>Ph.D. Education Administration, Ohio State University</i>	Faculty/clinical supervisor	Associate Professor	Yes	NCLB/T2T Mentor training grant, 150K; Project Director, T2T/NCLB USDOE grant; ISEP Conference Paper on NCLB.	Taught a professional development course on leadership at J.C. Harmon, continued regular service as KUPDS Liaison to J.C. Harmon; Make 25+ superviory visits to administrative interns in schools per year.

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

⁶ e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair

⁷ e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor, administrator

⁸ *Scholarship* is defined as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

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

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

¹¹ Briefly describe the nature of recent experience (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current PreK-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁵	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁶	Faculty Rank ⁷	Tenure Track (Yes/ No)	Scholarship, ⁸ Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: ⁹ List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ¹⁰	Teaching or other professional experience in PreK-12 schools in the past 3 years ¹¹
Mahlios, Marc	<i>PhD, C&I, Arizona State University</i>	Faculty	Professor	Yes	<p>Wolf-Wendel, L., Baker, B. D., Tollefson, N., Mahlios, M. "Who's teaching the teachers? Evidence from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty and Survey of Earned doctorates," to appear in the American Journal of Education.</p> <p>Massengill, Donita, J., Mahlios, Marc, Barry, Arlene. "Metaphors and sense of teaching: How these constructs influence novice teachers," to appear in Teaching Education, Vol. 16, No. 3, September, 2005.</p> <p>Adcock, Phyllis, K. and Mahlios, Marc. "Nontraditional alternative teacher certification programs: Their purpose, design and participants," Essays in Education, Vol. 15, Fall 2005.</p>	
Baker, Bruce	<i>ED.D, Education Administration, Columbia University</i>	Faculty	Associate Professor	Yes	<p>Baker, B.D., Green, P.C., Richards, C.E. (in press - 2005) Financing Education Systems. Merrill/Prentice-Hall</p> <p>Wolf-Wendel, L, Baker, B.D., Twombly, S., Tollefson, N., & Mahlios, M. (accepted for publication). Who's Teaching the Teachers? Evidence from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty and Survey of Earned Doctorates. American Journal of Education</p>	Kansas City, Kansas – Development of urban teacher interview system for Transition to Teaching program, 2005

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁵	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁶	Faculty Rank ⁷	Tenure Track (Yes/ No)	Scholarship, ⁸ Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: ⁹ List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ¹⁰	Teaching or other professional experience in PreK-12 schools in the past 3 years ¹¹
					Fall, 2005: Nominating Committee for candidates for the Executive Committee of University Council on Educational Administration.	
Ebmeier, Howard	<i>PhD, C&I, University of Missouri Columbia</i>	Faculty	Associate Professor	Yes	<p>Ebmeier, H., (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model, <i>Journal of Curriculum and Supervision</i>, 18(2), 110-141.</p> <p>Alaka, Aida and Ebmeier, H., (2005). Employment background investigations: Possible Consequences, <i>AAPSA Perspective</i>, Fall.</p> <p>AASPA’s Personnel Administrators Boot Camp- Session presentations (Mentoring Programs that Work) at a national training workshop for the organization, Kansas City, MO, 2005</p> <p>Kansas City, Kansas – Development of urban teacher interview system for Transition to Teaching program, 2005</p>	
Imber, Michael	<i>PhD, Education, Stanford University</i>	Faculty	Professor	Yes	<p>A Teacher’s Guide to Education Law (3d edition), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.</p> <p>“Adequacy’ in School Funding,” <i>American School Board Journal</i>, 191:11 (November 2004) 46-47.</p>	

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 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.

	Name of Assessment ¹²	Type or Form of Assessment ¹³	When the Assessment Is Required/ Administered ¹⁴
1	[Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment]¹⁵ * (Required) Praxis II	Standardized	School of Education Provided
2	[Assessment of candidate ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction] * (Required) Professional knowledge and skills	Performance on exams and projects	TL 840-Second Year, Spring Semester; TL 843-Second Year, Fall Semester
3	[Assessment of clinical experience]¹⁶ * (Required) Field experience	Candidate logs and journal; field mentor and university supervisor evaluation.	During second year of the program
4	[Assessment of candidate leadership and management skills to promote success for all students] * (Required) Program effectiveness measured by candidate outcomes	Follow-up study	Yearly
5	[Licensure performance assessment—Supervised internship] * (Required) Internship II	Candidate Improvement Plan; Principal Mentor and University Supervisor Evaluations	During first or second year of employment as building administrator

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

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

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

¹⁵ If licensure test data is submitted as Assessment #1, the assessment and scoring guide attachments are not required. If the state does not require a licensure test, another content based assessment must be submitted (including the assessment and scoring guide).

¹⁶ Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships within the program.

	Name of Assessment ¹²	Type or Form of Assessment ¹³	When the Assessment Is Required/ Administered ¹⁴
6	<p>[Content-based assessment] Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, case studies involving many content standards, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s, and follow-up studies related to content knowledge. * (Required) Comprehensive exam</p>	Written Exam	Second year, spring semester
7	<p>[Assessment of candidate abilities in organizational management and community relations] * (Required) Organizational management and community relations</p>	Course grades	Cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above in TL 750, 755, 853, and 854 when completed
8	<p>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards] Legal, political, and economic context of the school</p>	Course grades	Cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above in TL 752, 756, 757, and 852 when completed
9	<p>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]</p>		
10	<p>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]</p>		
11	<p>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]</p>		
12	<p>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]</p>		

*Required Assessments

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 by [clicking here](#). 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.**

KANSAS STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
1. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
2. The building level administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a building climate and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
3. 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
4. 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
5. 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
6. The 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12
7. The building level administrator must complete an internship supervised by the recommending institution as part of the performance assessment for this license. The candidate must enroll in 2-3 hours a semester during the first year under the conditional license as a full-time employee. If the employee is working only half time, the internship can be spread out over two years. A mentor should be provided by the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 <input type="checkbox"/> #9 <input type="checkbox"/> #10 <input type="checkbox"/> #11 <input type="checkbox"/> #12

KANSAS STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>employing district from the same endorsement field and under conditions described in 91-41-1 through 91-41-4. The university must supply a supervisor who makes a minimum of two visits per semester with additional communications between visits. The university will then make the recommendation for licensure after the internship has been completed successfully.</p>	

SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the multiple assessments listed in Section II and their 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.

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

Description: Praxis II

PRAXIS II is the required licensure exam that all Building level candidates must take as part of their application for the Building level license.

Alignment with Standards:

The PRAXIS II Exam aligns with all standards 1-6.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standards:

The Kansas State Department of Education validated this assessment based upon the building level program standards and a cut score of 165 was set in the spring of 2005 which became effective in the fall of 2005. As of the submission of this report, only 21 of 41 programs completors for the building license have taken the exam, and these were all taken prior to the cut score requirement. Of the 21 who took the exam prior to the cut score requirement, 15 received what eventually was established as a passing score. Unofficial results from those who have taken the exam in the current year are that over 90 percent passed the exam. These results should be available by May of 2006.

Assessment 1 Data Table attached

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #1	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table¹⁷
Praxis II	NA	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹⁷ NCATE requires that 80% of program completors in the most recent academic year must pass the required state licensure test in the content area in order to be eligible for program recognition. Programs are exempt from this requirement when the state does not have a required test, or if the program does not have a total of ten completors over the past three years. The Title II definition of "program completors" is used, i.e. persons who have met all the requirements of a degree program or a state-approved preparation program.

Licensure test data must reflect the percentage of candidates who have passed the state licensure test for each year over the past three academic years, including the most recent year. The most recent year of data must include the mean and range of total scores and subscores on the licensure test. Data must be presented for all program completors, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers in a given year. A Title II, state, or test agency report may be submitted as long as those reports present data as specified above.

#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.

Description: Professional Knowledge and Skills

All candidates for the building level license are required to take T&L 840 Instructional Strategies and Models and TL 843 Curriculum Planning. The T&L 840 focuses on instructional theory and practice. The course provides candidates with the conceptual framework supporting various models of teaching that can be applied to the design and evaluation of teaching to the supervision of instruction broadly. The focus of T&L 843 course is on curriculum theory as applied to planning and development work and the supervision of curriculum work of teachers. In both courses assessments consist of exams, individual and group projects and various papers and small group activities.

Alignment with standard:

Alignment with Standard #2: This assessment is designed to evaluate student's content knowledge across the areas of curriculum and teaching broadly. The specific activities and products are academically and professionally rigorous and challenging.

Data summary and Evidence of meeting these Standards:

The scoring guides for evaluating both course requirements are attached. Each activity and/or product is evaluated for focus, content and mechanics. As shown in the attached table (percent at or above "Above Average") all candidates in the reporting period met the criterion for "above average" on all activities and products, save the "individual project" in T&L 843. Here only about 60% of the candidates elected to undertake an individual curriculum study project and of these most met the criterion.

Assessment 2, Rubric and Data Table, attached.

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #2	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Assessment of candidate ability to develop supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction] * (Required) Professional knowledge and skills	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#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.

Description: Field Experience

Candidates for building licensure demonstrate their clinical ability to apply their knowledge of curriculum design, alignment and evaluation and staff development in two field experiences, T&L 895, Field Experience in Building Level Administration, and T&L 893, Advanced Building Leadership Internship (A numbering anomaly in our numbering system accounts for the non-sequential numbering). In the first of these field experiences, T&L 895, candidates for licensure are given initial exposure to “the process by which educational programs are designed, implemented and evaluated. . . and the evaluation of the outcomes, both of curriculum development processes and actual program achievements.” Alignment with standard:

Alignment with Standards 1-6: This field experience is designed to assess the candidate's knowledge of each standard as it occurs in a school setting. The required areas of focus that the candidate must experience and reflect on help ensure that the candidate has a thorough knowledge and understanding of the varied roles and issues that principals must deal with and to gain an understanding of how a vision for learning is created and sustained in a school context. Further, the interpersonal skills of the candidates are assessed as are their ability to assume administrative duties.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standards:

The candidate's initial clinical experience with curriculum design, evaluation and staff development is evaluated on the “Building Level Field Experience Mentor's Evaluation of Supervisee” form. The candidate's performance is rated on a five point Likert type scale ranging from Excellent to Poor. Copies of the evaluation form and related performance assessment data are attached. During the period covered by this evaluation 37 candidates completed the building level initial field experience. The average performance of candidates was “Very Good”. No

candidate was rated “Poor”. Candidates in the initial field experience are also required to document their record of related activity in a field experience log.

Assessment 3, Field Experience Scoring Form and Data Table, attached.

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #3	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Assessment of clinical experience] ¹⁸ * (Required) Field experience	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#4 (Required) EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING:¹⁹ 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.

Description: Program Effectiveness Measured by Candidate Outcomes

This assessment has been designed to look at the performance of students in the buildings where our graduates are serving as building principals.

Alignment with standard:

Alignment with Standards 1-6: Although the focus of this assessment is specifically on student achievement, it reflects the ability of our graduates to effectively lead learning communities to improve student outcomes. This includes a vision for learning, a focus on the instructional program, the safe and efficient management of the school, the effective development of support for the school, the ethics and integrity of the leader, and the ability of the leader to influence the community in support of the school. The clear intent of a set of standards for preparation is not only the development of leaders but those who are effective in improving the mission of the school - learning for all.

¹⁸ Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships within the program.

¹⁹ Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standards:

Table 1 summarizes the current placements of University of Kansas Masters Degree recipients and others receiving building level certification from the University of Kansas from 2002 through 2004. Among those, 16 currently hold positions as building principals, 14 as assistant principals and others in a variety of classroom or administrative/supervisory positions. In this report, we focus specifically on the student outcomes of K-12 students in schools under the leadership of our recent graduates.

A reasonable baseline for comparison would be to suggest that on average, Kansas principals across education and experience levels are doing an adequate job of producing educational outcomes. This is certainly not to suggest that all Kansas school principals are doing an adequate job, but rather, given that all Kansas schools have historically met state accreditation standards, the average Kansas school principal with average experience and average education level among Kansas school principals is likely performing adequately. That in mind, we set out to compare our recent program graduates, and the performance of the students in their schools, to that of all other schools in Kansas.

One might expect that less experienced principals who have only recently completed masters degrees (in a labor market where post-masters specialist degrees and doctoral degrees have become much more common), would not compare favorably. Figure 1 uses data from state assessments in mathematics from 2000 to 2004 to compare the average percentages of students scoring proficient or higher in the 15 schools currently headed by our graduates and all other schools in the state. In math performance, in the most recent year of the assessments, schools run by our recent masters' degree graduates overtook the state average among all schools statewide including those run by far more experienced principals and those with doctoral and/or specialist degrees (including our own high quality doctoral recipients).

Assessment 4, Data Tables and Summaries, attached.

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #4	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Assessment of candidate leadership and management skills to promote success of all students] * (Required) Program Effectiveness Measured by Candidate Outcomes	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#5 (Required) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: Data from licensure performance assessment. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Description: Internship II

In the first or second year of initial practice as a building administrator, candidates participate in their second clinical experience. They receive support from a university supervisor and a mentor that is in a similar role which must be approved by the university supervisor. Candidates must assess their school based on the standards of practice and develop and implement an improvement plan.

Alignment with standard:

Alignment with Standard #7: The internship that students must take during their first building leadership position focuses specifically on the first six standards of preparation and the requirement for an internship. In it the student is required to do a self-assessment on each of the standards in their respective building and develop an improvement plan for areas that need to be specifically addressed.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standard:

In T&L 893, Advanced Building Leadership Internship, the former “candidate” (for the conditional license) is now found in his or her first position requiring a building level license. The Educational Administration emphasis at KU currently has its first candidates enrolled in the “Advanced Internship”. Consequently, no summative performance data are available. However, the examiner will note that the “Field Experience Evaluation Rubric: Building Level” shows a clear, direct correspondence between the seven areas of performance it is used to evaluate and the seven standards specified in the Building Leadership regulations. Hence, each of those standards (slightly reworded for brevity) appears on the evaluation rubric, and each of the first six standards is followed by three descriptions of performance. These descriptions are worded in ways intended to conform to a performance range spanning “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, and “Does Not Meet Expectations”. Each of these six standards is scored either 2 (exceeds), 1 (meets) or 0 (does not meet). The seventh standard relating to supervision is rated dichotomously. If the supervision complies with the requirements of the standard it is answered affirmatively and assigned two points. If the supervision standard is not met, zero points are awarded. The possible range of scores on the advanced field experience scoring rubric is from 14 to 0. As noted on the scoring guidelines (see attached form), the candidate must receive at-least “meets expectations” on the first six standards to be recommended for the professional license.

Assessment 5, Rubric; There is no data currently available for this assessment since it was implemented in the Fall of 2005. Data will be available in Spring, 2006.

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments

Assessment #5	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
Licensure performance assessment— Supervised internship] * (Required) Internship II	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#6 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, action research projects, case studies involving many content standards, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s²⁰, and follow-up studies related to content knowledge. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Description: Comprehensive Exam

Candidates are required to take a comprehensive written examination over all courses in the program. Courses are grouped for the written exam and a rubric is used to evaluate student responses to each of the written questions. Candidates write over a two and a half day period.

Alignment with standard:

Alignment with Standards 1-6: The student must respond in depth to questions relative to each of the program areas of study which are aligned to the standards.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standards:

The pass rates for the previous five years are attached. As indicated on the data table, candidates do not necessarily pass all sections on their initial exam. In those instances, candidates are given time to study and, if needed, additional coursework to assist them in successfully completing that portion(s) of the exam that they did not initially pass. As evidenced in the data table, most candidates pass all sections of the exam on the first administration.

Assessment 6, Data Table and Rubric, attached.

(No more than 2 pages)

²⁰ For program review purposes, the program may list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment.

Attachments		
Assessment #6	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
<p>[Content-based assessment] Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, action research projects, case studies involving many content standards, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s, and follow-up studies related to content knowledge.</p> <p>* (Required)</p> <p>Comprehensive exam</p>	<p>Click the box if attached.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Click the box if attached.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>

#7 (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.

Description: Organizational Management and Community Relations

The building-level educational leadership program seeks to help candidates understand how to effectively organize and manage a school and communicate the school’s vision and mission in the broader social context. The cumulative grade point average of candidates is used to assess proficiency in the courses specifically designed to address these areas. The courses include TL 750 – Principalship, TL 755 – Human Resource Management, TL 853 – Staff Evaluation and Development, and TL 854 – Student in Society. The Principalship course provides prospective building administrators with an overview of the management and operation of a school and engages students in simulated experiences and opportunities for reflection. Additionally, prospective leaders learn the various forms of communication with parents and the community and the skills needed to gain the support needed to help the school be successful. The Human Resource Management course helps prospective building leaders develop skills in recruitment, selection, compensation, mentoring, and induction of employees as well as skills in working with employee issues. The Staff Evaluation and Development course develops the skills of future building administrators in the supervision and evaluation of staff as well as their ongoing professional development. The Student in Society courses offers prospective principals opportunities to more fully understand demographic characteristics of students being served in schools and the implications for organizing and managing schools as well as for effectively communicating to the public the needs of the schools.

ALIGNMENT WITH STANDARDS

The cumulative grade point average of prospective building-level leaders in these courses ensures their understanding of the following standards:

Standard One – Candidates must demonstrate a knowledge of the correlates of effective schools and explain how these should be applied in the school context. Performance of candidates in these courses reflects an understanding of the need for a clear and focused vision and mission that must be articulated to the broader community. Also, candidates must indicate relations with parents and the broader community should be formed and nurtured.

Standard Two – Candidates in these courses learn that building an effective and professional building climate is dependent on recruiting, selecting, mentoring, inducting, supervising, and evaluating highly qualified teachers and providing for their ongoing professional development. They conduct observations of teaching, simulated conferences, and assess the effectiveness of various evaluating instruments. They also have to distinguish between supervision and evaluation so that teachers clearly see the distinction between formative and summative processes. Additionally, candidates have to develop a framework for recruiting highly qualified teachers, provide for mentoring and induction, and collaboratively develop a learning community culture which helps teacher become reflective practitioners and become responsible for directing their learning needs based on the needs of their students.

Standard Three – Candidates in these courses learn that the effective management and operation of the school is foundational to creating a climate and culture conducive to learning for all. They learn from clinical experiences with practitioners. Their work has to reflect an understanding of the many and varied facets of the operations of the school from human resource management to facility maintenance and planning to accommodation of varied student emotional, social, and learning needs to the aspects of safety that are so critical in building esteem and confidence.

Data summary and evidence of meeting standards:

The measure of candidate competence for this assessment is the cumulative grade point average of candidates in the courses referenced above. Proficiency in meeting the standards requires a grade point average of at least 3.0. The following data table reflects the cumulative grade point averages of candidates across the courses used in this assessment for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005:

Summary of Cumulative GPA Per Course with Cumulative GPA Across All Courses
For 2003-05

	TL 750	TL 755	TL 853	TL 854	Cum. GPA
2003	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
2004	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.95
2005	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.975

Candidates far exceeded the minimum proficiency level identified in each of the courses that comprise this assessment. This indicates that candidate performance was outstanding in these courses which included the standards on articulating a vision, developing a building climate by recruiting and developing staff, and organizing and managing a school to ensure a productive and safe learning environment

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #7	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Assessment of candidate abilities in organizational management and community relations] * (Required)	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#8 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.

Description: Legal, Political, and Economic Context of the School

The building-level educational leadership program seeks to help candidates gain the knowledge and skills necessary to lead a school within the appropriate legal, political, and economic parameters. The cumulative grade point average of candidates is used to assess proficiency in the courses specifically designed to address these areas. The courses include TL 752 – Education Law, TL 756 – History of Educational Thought, TL 757 – Education in American Society, and TL 852 – School Resource Management. The Education Law course provides prospective building administrators with an introduction to legal principles, cases specifically related to building level issues, and case studies that challenge students to utilize the knowledge gained. The History of Education Thought course provides an overview of the history of education in the United States and helps students understand shifts in thought regarding educational practice as well as the political processes that cause these shifts. Education in American Society provides future building leaders with a perspective on the trends in education, the roles and responsibilities of various levels of government, and the evolving aspirations of American education to help all students learn. The School Resource Management class is designed to introduce prospective school leaders to the structure of financing school districts and the responsibilities that they will have in managing a building budget.

ALIGNMENT WITH STANDARDS

The cumulative grade point average of prospective building-level leaders in these courses provides an assessment of their understanding of the following standards:

Standard One – One of the ways a school leader begins to develop a vision of learning is through an understanding of the various contexts in which a school exists. In these courses candidates learn how laws and regulations impact the school setting, how the history of education has led us to the current context, how external influences at the local, state, and national level impact the school, and how financial resources can and should be used to ensure learning for all. Candidates are engaged in assessments of knowledge, case studies and simulations, and reading and writing assignments used to broaden their perspective. An understanding of these contexts provides a foundation for the development of a strong vision for learning.

Standard Six – The content of these courses and the expectations for learning ensure that the candidate can understand, respond to, and influence the legal, political, and economic context of the school. Candidates must reflect knowledge of laws that impact their practice, the political environment that has shaped education in the United States, and the system of financing school districts and schools. Additionally, candidates must reflect through a variety of classroom assessments, presentations, and discussions the ability to translate the knowledge they have gained into actual practice.

DATA SUMMARY AND EVIDENCED OF MEETING STANDARDS

The measure of candidate competence for this assessment is the cumulative grade point average of candidates in the courses referenced above. Proficiency in meeting the standards requires a grade point average of at least 3.0. The following data table reflects the cumulative grade point averages of candidates across the courses used in this assessment for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005:

Summary of Cumulative GPA Per Course with Cumulative GPA Across All Courses
For 2003-05

	TL 752	TL 756	TL 757	TL 852	Cum. GPA
2003	3.44	4.0	3.11	4.0	3.64
2004	3.33	4.0	3.5	3.9	3.67
2005	3.55	4.0	3.36	4.0	3.73

Candidates exceeded the minimum proficiency level identified in each of the courses that comprise this assessment. This indicates that candidate performance was clearly above proficiency in these courses which included the standards on articulating a vision and understanding the larger legal, political, and economic context.

(No more than 2 pages)

Attachments		
Assessment #8	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#9 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)

Attachments		
Assessment #9	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#10 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)

Attachments		
Assessment #10	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#11 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)

Attachments		
Assessment #11	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

#12 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)

Attachments

Assessment #12	Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric	Data Table
[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards]	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	Click the box if attached. <input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

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.

A. The introduction of the "Kansas Standards" for administrative preparation and licensure along with related program evaluations have directly influenced the reframing of principal preparation. For example, T&L 750, "The Principalship" is now framed and organized around Kansas Standards one through six: 1) Vision of learning; 2) Promoting success for all; 3) Effective management of operations, resources, etc.; 4) Responding to diversity; 5) Ethical behavior; and 6) "Ecological", i.e., legal, cultural, political sensitivity/effectiveness. These six standards (along with NASSP's twelve "assessment dimensions") comprise the contextual framework around and against which every piece of the professional knowledge and skill addressed in the course is learned and evaluated. In the initial session of the course students are introduced to the standards and informed that they are "light houses" to guide their acquisition of knowledge and skill, and their reflection on that acquisition in the course and throughout the entirety of their preparation, including the "in program" and conditional license internships. Similarly, both the "in program" and conditional license internships have been restructured/planned around the six Kansas Standards and performance evaluations during both internships directly address students' success in demonstrating mastery of said standards (See evaluative Rubric for conditional licensure internship, for example). Ultimately, candidates for building-level licensure must provide compelling evidence of their mastery of the standards-based leadership knowledge base in a written comprehensive examination. Information is provided elsewhere in this report regarding success rates and (where needed) opportunities for correcting deficiencies.

B. Two years ago we noted that a number of candidate papers were not as well reasoned and written as expected and required. As a result, in some classes, we now ask candidate to turn in a first draft of their papers and provide a detailed critique of the draft after which the students are required to prepare a final version of their papers.

C. Each year we analyze patterns of candidate performance on the comprehensive examinations. If any general area(s) of deficiency are noted we modify relevant courses in subsequent years to give greater emphasis and more clarification of the deficient areas. An example of an area that has received greater emphasis in education law courses in recent years is discipline of students with disabilities.

D. Over the last three years, evaluations of candidate work in the C&I courses have revealed that many candidates enter their respective programs with limited understanding of curriculum theory, planning and development, and evaluation skills. As a result the C&I courses have been substantially revised and greater linkages made between them to assist students in seeing how curriculum and teaching can be better conceptualized and supervised at both the building and district levels.

E. Initial results of candidate performance on the Praxis II assessment prior to the establishment of a cut score has resulted in an increased focus on standards based instruction. It is anticipated that the results of candidates taking this exam in 2005-06 will reflect this change in focus.

F. Additional Changes in Educational Administration Program

- Increased emphasis on having candidates write longer documents and better link research into these efforts because of observations on the comp exams
- Increased attention paid to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards when preparing candidates for job interviews based on feedback from candidates and employers plus a movement in the program to incorporate standards into the design of the program and the requirement that candidates take the ETS Praxis Exam
- Based on the analysis of dissertations completed and proposals accepted a greater emphasis in the research courses on application of skills rather than just a conceptual understanding without practice.
- Based on analysis of candidate papers in the various courses, an increased emphasis on locating information (existing data bases and in the electronic library systems) and organizing that information in meaningful ways.
- Because of a change in the way the GRE is formulated, a more careful consideration of the meaning of the various scores and their relationship to probable success in the Ed. Administration program.

(No more than 3 pages)

T:\Teacher Education\Program Review\Institutional Templates\Building Leadership Template.doc