Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Goals

G 1: Increase enrollment
Increase enrollment of well-qualified students at both the Main Campus and Gadsden programs to at least eleven at each location.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Planning for continuous school improvement
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to engage the school community in developing and maintaining a shared vision; plan effectively; use critical thinking and problem-solving techniques; collect, analyze, and interpret data; allocate resources; and evaluate results for the purpose of planning for continuous school improvement.

Related Document
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 1: LiveText aggregate scores
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(a)1.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for c...

M 2: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(a)2.(i-xv), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 2: Teaching and learning
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to promote and monitor the success of all students by collaboratively aligning the curriculum; by aligning the instruction and the assessment processes; and by using a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability through teaching and learning.

Related Document
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 3: LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(b)1.(i-iii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 4: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(i-xiii)
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(i-xiii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 3: Human resources development**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to recruit, select, organize, evaluate, and mentor faculty and staff to accomplish school and system goals; work collaboratively with the school faculty and staff to plan and implement effective professional development; and initiate and nurture interpersonal relationships to facilitate teamwork and enhance student achievement through human resources development.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

M 5: 80% or more of students
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(c)1.(i-iv), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 6: 80% or more of students will score 3
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(c)2.(i-xi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 4: Diverse student needs**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to respond to and influence the larger personal, political, social, economic, legal, and culture context in the classroom, school, and the local community while addressing diverse student needs to ensure the success of all students.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

M 7: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(d)1.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 8: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher on LiveText
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(d)2.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 5: Community and stakeholder relationships.**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to identify the unique characteristics of the community in order to create and sustain mutually supportive community and stakeholder relationships.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

M 9: Knowledge of standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(e)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 10: Ability standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(e)2.(i-viii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 6: Current technologies**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to plan, implement, and evaluate the effective integration of current technologies and electronic tools in teaching, management, research, and communication.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

M 11: Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii)
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
M 12: Ability standards (2)(f)(i-vii)
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(f)(i-vii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 7: Candidates manage the organization,
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to manage the organization, facilities, and financial resources; implement operational plans; and promote collaboration to create a safe and effective learning environment
Connected Document MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map
Related Measures

M 13: LiveText aggregate scores 7
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(g)(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 14: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards 7
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(g)(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 8: Ethical standards
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to demonstrate honesty, integrity, and fairness in guiding school policies and practices consistent with current legal and ethical standards for professional educators.
Connected Document MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map
Related Measures

M 15: Knowledge of standards 8
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(h)(1)(i-v) and (2)(h) 2, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 16: Ability standards 8
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(h)(1)(i-v) and (2)(h) 3, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 12: Enrollment goals
The program coordinator will continue to effect such processes as individual meetings and group meetings with prospective students.
Related Measures

M 23: Recruitment activities
The program coordinator will provide a calendar of meetings and contacts with prospective students outlining efforts to increase enrollments.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 9: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.
Connected Document MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map
Related Measures

M 17: PRAXIS II scores
PRAXIS II
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: On average, PRAXIS II scores should exceed those attained by students in all other state approved Leadership programs

M 18: LiveText assessment system
The average composite score of program graduates in the LiveText assessment system
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Average composite score should exceed 3.

**OthOtcm 10: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Related Measures**

**M 19: complete the degree in less than two years**
Time to degree completion
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:**
80% of students admitted to a cohort will complete the degree in less than two and a half years

**M 20: Rate of attrition**
The rate of attrition.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:**
The rate of attrition will be less than 10% of those admitted into the cohort

**OthOtcm 11: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 21: Program exit assignment**
Analysis of the program exit assignment
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target:**
80% of items on the survey should indicate a positive assessment of the program.

**M 22: Survey of former graduates**
A survey of former graduates
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements
**Target:**
80% of responses to the various items on the survey should demonstrate strong positive estimation of the program and its impact on the graduates’ careers

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement**
Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for continuous improvement. However, since this is the weakest of the sixteen standards assessed, faculty will consider improvements in the teaching of knowledge and ability in for planning for continuous improvement at the September Program Retreat, and an action plan will be devised, as necessary.

As a result of faculty discussion in September 2012, the program goal for 2012-2013 to achieve an average score of 3.25 on the 15 indicators on the program rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiveText aggregate scores</td>
<td>Planning for continuous school improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Faculty members teaching the courses where the knowledge and ability standards are addressed will develop readings and assignments to deepen and broaden students’ understanding of the standards.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** Philo Hutcheson, Department Chair
**Additional Resources:** None.

**Alumni/alumnae survey**
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Online survey administered by outside agency.
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** College of Education Dean's Office.
**Additional Resources:** None

**Graduates survey**
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Planned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Online survey administered by outside agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>College of Education Dean's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section review**

Instructors whose course content covers the section will focus on that specific content.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** The program coordinator will work with the instructors whose course content covers the specific information to develop instructional approaches to highlight that content.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program coordinator

**Additional Resources:** None
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Planning for continuous school improvement
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to engage the school community in developing and maintaining a shared vision; plan effectively; use critical thinking and problem-solving techniques; collect, analyze, and interpret data; allocate resources; and evaluate results for the purpose of planning for continuous school improvement.

Connected Document: MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 1: LiveText aggregate scores
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(a)1.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Eighty percent of the scores on 15 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) on the program rubric. The average score was 3.25.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for continuous improvement.

M 2: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(a)2.(i-xv), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
On the 15 indicators, 85 percent of the students scored 3 or higher on a 4.0 scale.

SLO 2: Teaching and learning
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to promote and monitor the success of all students by collaboratively aligning the curriculum; by aligning the instruction and the assessment processes; and by using a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability through teaching and learning.

Connected Document: MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 3: LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(b)1.(i-iii), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
There were three indicators for this measure, and 95% of the students scored at 3 or higher.

M 4: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(i-xiii)
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(i-xiii), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Ninety percent of the students scored at 3 or higher on the Ability standards.

**SLO 3: Human resources development**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to recruit, select, organize, evaluate, and mentor faculty and staff to accomplish school and system goals; work collaboratively with the school faculty and staff to plan and implement effective professional development; and initiate and nurture interpersonal relationships to facilitate teamwork and enhance student achievement through human resources development.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 5: 80% or more of students**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(c)1.(i-iv), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All students scored at 3 or higher on human resources development.

**M 6: 80% or more of students will score 3**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(c)2.(i-xi), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
There are 11 indicators for this standard, and all students scored at 3 or higher.

**SLO 4: Diverse student needs**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to respond to and influence the larger personal, political, social, economic, legal, and culture context in the classroom, school, and the local community while addressing diverse student needs to ensure the success of all students.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 7: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(d)1.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Ninety-five percent of the students scored at 3 or higher on this standard.

**M 8: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher on LiveText**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(d)2.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Ninety-five percent of the students scored 3 or higher on Diverse Student Needs.

**SLO 5: Community and stakeholder relationships.**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to identify the unique characteristics of the community in order to create and sustain mutually supportive community and stakeholder relationships.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 9: Knowledge of standards**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(e)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**M 10: Ability standards**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(e)2.(i-viii), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Eighty-five percent of the students scored at 3 or higher on these indicators.

**SLO 6: Current technologies**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to plan, implement, and evaluate the effective integration of current technologies and electronic tools in teaching, management, research, and communication.

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map]

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii)**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
On the 2 indicators, 95% of the students scored 3 or higher.

**M 12: Ability standards (2)(f)2.(i-vii)**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(f)2.(i-vii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 7: Candidates manage the organization**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to manage the organization, facilities, and financial resources; implement operational plans; and promote collaboration to create a safe and effective learning environment.

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map]

**Related Measures**

**M 13: LiveText aggregate scores 7**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(g)1.(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Ninety-five percent of the students scored at 3 or higher.

**M 14: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards 7**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(g)2.(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
There are 6 indicators, and 95% of the students scored at 3 or higher.

**SLO 8: Ethical standards**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to demonstrate honesty, integrity, and fairness in guiding school policies and practices consistent with current legal and ethical standards for professional educators.

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map]

**Related Measures**

**M 15: Knowledge of standards 8**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(h)1.(i-v) and (2)(h) 2, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
On these standards, 95% of the students scored 3 or higher.

**M 16: Ability standards 8**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(h)1.(i-v) and (2)(h) 3, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Ninety percent of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 9: Recognized quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 17: PRAXIS II scores**

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
On average, PRAXIS II scores should exceed those attained by students in all other state approved Leadership programs

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
Praxis II scores exceeded, on average, the scores of students at other institutions with the exception of one section.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Section review**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Instructors whose course content covers the section will focus on that specific content.

*For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.*

**M 18: LiveText assessment system**

The average composite score of program graduates in the LiveText assessment system

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Average composite score should exceed 3.

**OthOtcn 10: Optimal level**

The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 19: complete the degree in less than two years**
Time to degree completion

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of students admitted to a cohort will complete the degree in less than two and a half years

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Graduating classes are taking less than two years on average to complete their degrees, as expected with the cohort model.

**M 20: Rate of attrition**
The rate of attrition.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
The rate of attrition will be less than 10% of those admitted into the cohort

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Of the total of 18 students in the master's program, 1 has left the program for an attrition rate of .06%.

**OthOtcn 11: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Connected Document**
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

**Related Measures**

**M 21: Program exit assignment**
Analysis of the program exit assignment

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of items on the survey should indicate a positive assessment of the program.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
We are awaiting the results of an alumni and alumnae survey to be administered in December 2013.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Graduates survey**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

*For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.*

**M 22: Survey of former graduates**
A survey of former graduates
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
80% of responses to the various items on the survey should demonstrate strong positive estimation of the program and its impact on the graduates’ careers

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of an alumni and alumnae survey to be administered in December 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Alumni/alumnae survey
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement
Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for continuous improvement. However, since this is the weakest of the sixteen standards assessed, faculty will consider improvements in the teaching of knowledge and ability in for planning for continuous improvement at the September Program Retreat, and an action plan will be devised, as necessary.

As a result of faculty discussion in September 2012, the program goal for 2012-2013 to achieve an average score of 3.25 on the 15 indicators on the program rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: LiveText aggregate scores | Outcome/Objective: Planning for continuous school improvement

Implementation Description: Faculty members teaching the courses where the knowledge and ability standards are addressed will develop readings and assignments to deepen and broaden students’ understanding of the standards.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Philo Hutcheson, Department Chair
Additional Resources: None.

Alumni/alumnae survey
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Survey of former graduates | Outcome/Objective: Program Value

Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean’s Office.
Additional Resources: None

Graduates survey
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Program exit assignment | Outcome/Objective: Program Value

Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean’s Office.
Additional Resources: None

Section review
Instructors whose course content covers the section will focus on that specific content.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PRAXIS II scores | Outcome/Objective: Recognized quality

Implementation Description: The program coordinator will work with the instructors whose course content covers the specific information to develop instructional approaches to highlight that content.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator
Additional Resources: None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Planning for continuous school improvement
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to engage the school community in developing and maintaining a shared vision; plan effectively; use critical thinking and problem-solving techniques; collect, analyze, and interpret data; allocate resources; and evaluate results for the purpose of planning for continuous school improvement.

Connected Document
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 1: LiveText aggregate scores
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(a)1.(i-v), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
83% off 507 recorded scores on 15 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) on the program rubric. The average score was 3.19 with approximately 41% at the advanced level.

Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for continuous improvement. However, since this is the weakest of the sixteen standards assessed, faculty will consider improvements in the teaching of knowledge and ability in for planning for continuous improvement at the September Program Retreat, and an action plan will be devised, as necessary.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for c...

M 2: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(a)2.(i-xv), as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
83% off 507 recorded scores on 15 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) on the program rubric. The average score was 3.19 with approximately 41% at the advanced level.

SLO 2: Teaching and learning
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to promote and monitor the success of all students by collaboratively aligning the curriculum; by aligning the instruction and the assessment processes; and by using a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability through teaching and learning.

Connected Document
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 3: LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(b)1.(i-iii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

94% of 87 recorded scores on 3 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.57 with approximately 63% at the advanced level.

**M 4: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(I-xiii)**

LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(b)2.(I-xiii), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

97% of 500 recorded scores on 15 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.64 with approximately 70% at the advanced level.

**SLO 3: Human resources development**

Candidates have the knowledge and ability to recruit, select, organize, evaluate, and mentor faculty and staff to accomplish school and system goals; work collaboratively with the school faculty and staff to plan and implement effective professional development; and initiate and nurture interpersonal relationships to facilitate teamwork and enhance student achievement through human resources development.

Connected Document [MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 5: 80% or more of students**

LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(c)1.(I-iv), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

100% of 80 recorded scores on 4 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.64 with 64% at the advanced level.

**M 6: 80% or more of students will score 3**

LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(c)2.(I-xi), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

100% of 219 recorded scores on 11 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.57 with approximately 57% at the advanced level.

**SLO 4: Diverse student needs**

Candidates have the knowledge and ability to respond to and influence the larger personal, political, social, economic, legal, and culture context in the classroom, school, and the local community while addressing diverse student needs to ensure the success of all students.

Connected Document [MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 7: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher**

LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(d)1.(I-v), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

97% of 186 recorded scores on 7 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.45 with 51% at the advanced level.

**M 8: 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher on LiveText**

LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(d)2.(I-v), as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding** (2011-2012) - **Target:** **Met**

100% of 120 recorded scores on 5 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.56 with approximately 57% at the advanced level.

**SLO 5: Community and stakeholder relationships.**

Candidates have the knowledge and ability to identify the unique characteristics of the community in order to create and sustain mutually supportive community and stakeholder relationships.

Connected Document [MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 9: Knowledge of standards**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(e)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
88% of 56 recorded scores on 2 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.29 with approximately 45 % at the advanced level.

**M 10: Ability standards**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(e)2.(i-viii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
88% of 257 recorded scores on 9 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.33 with approximately 49% at the advanced level.

**SLO 6: Current technologies**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to plan, implement, and evaluate the effective integration of current
technologies and electronic tools in teaching, management, research, and communication.

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii)**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(f)1.(i-ii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
100% of 42 recorded scores on 2 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.31 with approximately 31 % at the advanced level.

**M 12: Ability standards (2)(f)2.(i-vii)**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(f)2.(i-vii), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
95% of 231 recorded scores on 9 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.39 with approximately 43 % at the advanced level.

**SLO 7: Candidates manage the organization,**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to manage the organization, facilities, and financial resources; implement
operational plans; and promote collaboration to create a safe and effective learning environment

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**

**M 13: LiveText aggregate scores 7**
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(g)1.(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
100% of 134 recorded scores on 6 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.45 with approximately 42 % at the advanced level.

**M 14: LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards 7**
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(g)2.(i-vi), as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2011-2012)** - **Target: Met**
100% of 126 recorded scores on 6 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric.
The average score was 3.83 with approximately 83 % at the advanced level.

**SLO 8: Ethical standards**
Candidates have the knowledge and ability to demonstrate honesty, integrity, and fairness in guiding school policies and
practices consistent with current legal and ethical standards for professional educators.

**Connected Document**
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)

**Related Measures**
M 15: **Knowledge of standards 8**  
LiveText aggregate scores for Knowledge of standards (2)(h)1.(i-v) and (2)(h) 2, as assessed by the program rubric  
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other  
Target:  
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
100% of 174 recorded scores on 5 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.03 with approximately 3 % at the advanced level.

M 16: **Ability standards 8**  
LiveText aggregate scores for Ability standards (2)(h)1.(i-v) and (2)(h) 3, as assessed by the program rubric  
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other  
Target:  
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
100% of 174 recorded scores on 5 indicators were 3 or greater (out of 4) when measured by the program rubric. The average score was 3.02 with approximately 2 % at the advanced level.

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

OthOtcm 9: **Recognized quality**  
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.  
**Connected Document**  
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)  
**Related Measures**

M 17: **PRAXIS II scores**  
PRAXIS II  
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other  
Target:  
On average, PRAXIS II scores should exceed those attained by students in all other state approved Leadership programs  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
The results for PRAXIS II will be entered at the beginning of the fall semester.

M 18: **LiveText assessment system**  
The average composite score of program graduates in the LiveText assessment system  
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other  
Target:  
Average composite score should exceed 3.  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
The average composite score for the eight standards recorded in the LiveText system was **(to be reported at the beginning of the fall semester).**

OthOtcm 10: **Optimal level**  
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.  
**Connected Document**  
[MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map](#)  
**Related Measures**

M 19: **complete the degree in less than two years**  
Time to degree completion  
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
Target:  
80% of students admitted to a cohort will complete the degree in less than two and a half years  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
Analysis of graduating class demonstrates an average time to completion of degree as 1.89 years for 11 students  
Two students took longer than three years.

M 20: **Rate of attrition**  
The rate of attrition.  
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
Target:  
The rate of attrition will be less than 10% of those admitted into the cohort  
**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
Of the ** students who began the program in the summer of 2009, ** have dropped out of the program. This is a **% rate of attrition. (To be reported at the beginning of the fall semester).**

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
Of the ** students who began the program in the summer of 2009, ** have dropped out of the program. This is a **% rate of attrition. (To be reported at the beginning of the fall semester).**
OthOtm 11: Program Value
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Connected Document
MA Educational Leadership Curriculum Map

Related Measures

M 21: Program exit assignment
Analysis of the program exit assignment

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of items on the survey should indicate a positive assessment of the program.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met

The eight graduates that responded to the exit survey expressed positive opinions on the quality of the academic program and its positive influence on their professional development.

All things considered, how would you rate the intellectual environment at UA compared to other academic institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Masters in Educational Leadership (ILP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All things considered, how would you evaluate the overall graduate education that you received at UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Masters in Educational Leadership (ILP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has your degree at UA contributed to your professional advancement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Masters in Educational Leadership (ILP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you think your graduate education at UA contributed to your knowledge, skills, and/or personal development in each of the following areas?

Masters in Educational Leadership (ILP)
### Please assess program faculty on each of the following questions:

#### Masters in Educational Leadership (ILP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Were you encouraged to express your ideas?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did at least one faculty member in your program demonstrate interest in your academic progress?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Did faculty encourage you to be an actively involved learner?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did faculty provide prompt and informative feedback on your submitted work?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Planning for Improvement of Continuous Improvement

Faculty members were pleased that candidates met the program goal on both the knowledge and ability standards for planning for continuous improvement. However, since this is the weakest of the sixteen standards assessed, faculty will consider improvements in the teaching of knowledge and ability in for planning for continuous improvement at the September Program Retreat, and an action plan will be devised, as necessary.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** LiveText aggregate scores | **Outcome/Objective:** Planning for continuous school improvement
### Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to engage the school community in developing and maintaining a shared vision; plan effectively; use critical thinking and problem-solving techniques; collect, analyze, and interpret data; allocate resources; and evaluate results for the purpose of planning for continuous school improvement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to promote and monitor the success of all students by collaboratively aligning the curriculum; by aligning the instruction and the assessment processes; and by using a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability through teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to recruit, select, organize, evaluate, and mentor faculty and staff to accomplish school and system goals; work collaboratively with the school faculty and staff to plan and implement effective professional development; and initiate and nurture interpersonal relationships to facilitate teamwork and enhance student achievement through human resources development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to respond to and influence the larger personal, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context in the classroom, school, and the local community while addressing diverse student needs to ensure the success of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to identify the unique characteristics of the community in order to create and sustain mutually supportive community and stakeholder relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to plan, implement, and evaluate the effective integration of current technologies and electronic tools in teaching, management, research, and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to manage the organization, facilities, and financial resources; implement operational plans; and promote collaboration to create a safe and effective learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8: Candidates have the knowledge and ability to demonstrate honesty, integrity, and fairness in guiding school policies and practices consistent with current legal and ethical standards for professional educators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Course 1 | AEL 520 | X | X |
| Course 2 | AEL 521 | X | | X |
| Course 3 | AEL 522 | X | X | X |
| Course 4 | AEL 523 | X | X | |
| Course 5 | AEL 524 | X | X | X |
| Course 6 | AEL 525 | X | X | X |
| Course 7 | AEL 526 | X | X | X |
| Course 8 | AEL 527 | X | X | |

### Curriculum Map II (Assessment Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 6 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 7 Candidates</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 8 Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Livetext Aggregate</td>
<td>(2)(a)1.(i-v).</td>
<td>(2)(b)1.(i-iii).</td>
<td>(2)(c)1.(i-iv).</td>
<td>(2)(d)1.(i-v).</td>
<td>(2)(e)1.(i-ii).</td>
<td>(2)(f)1.(i-ii).</td>
<td>(2)(g)1.(i-vi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (2)(h)1.(i-v) and (2)(h)2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional Additional Narrative

Please note that each of the state standards (student learning outcomes) has both a Knowledge and Ability component.

Here is an example of the kind of printout that will be produced for each of the standards in the Educational Leadership Master’s program using LiveText. (This is just a dummy run with phony numbers). Please note the program rubric employed—advanced, target, acceptable and unacceptable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Standard Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Knowledge</td>
<td>AL-IL-2008-48.2.d.1.2</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Knowledge</td>
<td>AL-IL-2008-48.2.d.1.4</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Knowledge</td>
<td>AL-IL-2008-48.2.d.1.5</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Knowledge AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.1.1</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Knowledge AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.1.2</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.1</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.2</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.3</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.4</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.5</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Relationships Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.6</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Relationships Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.7</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Relationships Ability AL-IL-2008-48.2.e.2.8</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Ability</td>
<td>AL-IL-2008-48.2.f.2.3</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced:** The candidate demonstrates exceptional understanding and/or skill expected of teaching

**Target:** The candidate demonstrates acceptable understanding and/or skill expected of teaching

**Developing:** The candidate demonstrates growing understanding and/or skill expected of teaching

**Unacceptable:** The candidate does not demonstrate minimal understanding and/or skill expected of teaching
professionals at B or Alt. A certification; at a level far beyond peers.

professionals at B or Alt. A certification; at a level that is consistent with effective preservice teachers.

professionals at B or Alt. A certification; at a level that is consistent with preservice teachers' initial understanding and performance.