## COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT CROSSWALK

**Master of Education/Educational Leadership**

Aligned with ELCC 2011, PADEPP 2010, and CAEP Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Required Classes (Syllabi Linked to Class Number)</th>
<th>Key Assessment(s) Aligned with Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)</th>
<th>Benchmarks Aligned to Key Assessments and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)</th>
<th>Program Adjustments/Improvements Based on Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEAL: Goal 1: Educational Leadership candidates will demonstrate content knowledge of the ELCC building-level standards upon completion of the program</td>
<td>Internship Requirement</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>100% of Educational Leadership candidates will attain passing scores on the PRAXIS II exam as required by the South Carolina State Department of Education.</td>
<td>Thirty-two candidates have taken the PRAXIS II Educational Leadership: Administration/Supervision exam. Data from 2013-2014 program completers shows that 100% of the candidates who took the assessment exceeded this score and passed the exam. Qualifying score on this exam (Test 411 Educational Leadership: Administration/Supervision) is 145. Praxis II Results: Qualifying Score: 145 Number Taking Test: 41 Percent Pass-rate: 100% Highest Score: 187 Range of Scores: 145-187 Mean: 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standards 1.1-7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADEPP: Standards 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.5, 2.1, 3.2,3.5,4.2,4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAL Goal 2: Educational Leadership candidates will be able to demonstrate content knowledge of the ELCC building-level standards upon completion of the program.</td>
<td>EDAD 694</td>
<td>EDAD 695</td>
<td>EDAD 694/EDAD 695 Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>90% of Educational Leadership candidates will attain a passing score on the program’s comprehensive exit exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standards 1.1-7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADEPP: Standards 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.5, 2.1, 3.2,3.5,4.2,4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCU 5/CCU 6 Cohort:**
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 2.85 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program (2.2).
- 2.85 Understands and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment (4.1).
- 2.88 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3).
- 2.85 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners (4.4).
- 2.88 Understands and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success (5.1).
- 2.85 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers (6.1)

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:
• 2.51 Understands and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school (5.4)
• 2.55 Understands and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling (5.5)

26 CCU 5/CCU 6 candidates received at least a proficient score of 2 (Satisfactory – Acceptable) on all proficiencies as measured by the university supervisor’s evaluation of the intern. The proficiencies on which the largest number of candidates received at least a score of 2: (Acceptable/Satisfactory) were as follows:

CCU 5/CCU 6 Project Component Breakdown of Data (T=Target score of 3; A=Acceptable score of 2)

Question 1 – Plan of Action: Curriculum and Instruction

• ELCC 2.1: 21 (77% T) 6 (22% A)
• ELCC 2.2: 23 (85% T) 4 (14% A)
• ELCC 2.3: 22 (81% T) 5 (18% A)
• ELCC 2.4: 19 (70% T) 8 (29% A)

Question 5 – School Family Relations Act Plan

• ELCC 4.1: 23 (85% T) 4 (14% A)
• ELCC 4.2: 22 (81% T) 5 (18% A)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAL Goal 3:</th>
<th>EDAD 660</th>
<th>EDAD 660 Observation and Conference Project</th>
<th>90% of M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will be able to identify principles of clinical supervision and the developmental approach to supervision in an instructional context.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership candidates will be able to plan for effective instruction and demonstrate application of building-level leadership skills in instructional leadership. ELCC: Standards 2.1-2.4 PADEPP: Standard 2 CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.4, 2.3, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 4.2, 4.3</td>
<td><strong>EDAD 660</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDAD 660 Observation and Conference Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>90% of M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will be able to identify principles of clinical supervision and the developmental approach to supervision in an instructional context.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU 7/CCU8 Cohort PART I: Pre-Planned Question and Reflection</td>
<td>A total of 26 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies for each part of the FIVE components that make up the Observation and Conference Project. The rating scale for ALL FIVE parts is as follows: 4 = Exemplary (E) 3 = Proficient (P) 2 = Developing (D) 1 = Unacceptable (U) The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies: 3.4 Understands instructional program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1) The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies: No low score All 26 candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project. The proficiencies on which the largest number of candidates received a score of 3 (Proficient) were as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: Data Collection and Reflection
A total of 26 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies in Part II.

The overall mean was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.34 Understands instructional program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)
  10 or 38% Exemplary, 15 or 58% Proficient, 1 or 3% Developing

The overall mean was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.33 Understands and can develop the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)
  11 or 42% Exemplary, 14 or 54% Proficient, 1 or 4% Developing

Twenty-five candidates (96%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

Part III: Interpreting/Analyzing Data and Reflection
A total of 26 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies in Part III.
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.33 Understands instructional program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)  
  8 or 31% Exemplary, 18 or 69% Proficient
- 3.33 Understands and can develop instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)  
  8 or 31% Exemplary, 17 or 65% Proficient

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.32 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent instructional school program (ELCC 2.2)  
  8 or 31% Exemplary, 18 or 69% Proficient
- 3.32 Understands effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment (ELCC 2.4)  
  8 or 31% Exemplary, 18 or 69% Proficient

Twenty-five candidates (96%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

**PART IV: Post Conference with Teacher and Professional Growth Plan**  
A total of 26 candidates were assessed by
the college supervisor on proficiencies in Part IV.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.1 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent instructional school program (ELCC 2.3)
  6 or 23% Exemplary, 19 or 73% Proficient, 1 or 4% Developing
- 3.1 Understands and can develop the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.2)
  6 or 23% Exemplary, 18 or 73% Proficient, 2 or 4% Developing

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- No low score

Twenty-five candidates (96%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part IV of the project.

Part V: Candidate Professional Growth Plan
A total of 13 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies in Part V.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.6 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program (ELCC 2.2)
  17 or 65% Exemplary, 9 or 35%
3.6 Understands the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)
18 or 69% Exemplary, 8 or 31% Proficient

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- No low score

Twenty-six candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part V of the project:

Georgetown/Williamsburg Cohort

PART I: Pre-Planned Question and Reflection

A total of 8 Georgetown Williamsburg candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies for each part of the FIVE components that make up the Observation and Conference Project. The rating scale for all FIVE parts is as follows:

4 = Exemplary (E)
3 = Proficient (P)
2 = Developing (D)
1 = Unacceptable (U)

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 4.00 Understands instructional
program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)

All eight Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.

PART II: Data Collection and Reflection
The overall mean was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 4.00 Understands instructional program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)
- 4.00 Understands and can develop the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)

All eight Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

Part III: Interpreting/Analyzing Data and Reflection
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 4.00 Understands instructional program conducive to student learning (ELCC 2.1)
- 4.00 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent instructional school program (ELCC 2.2)
- 4.00 Understands and can develop instructional leadership capacity of
4.00 Understands effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment (ELCC 2.4)

All eight Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

PART IV: Post Conference with Teacher and Professional Growth Plan
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 4.00 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program (ELCC 2.2)
- 4.00 Understands the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)

All eight Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part IV of the project.

Part V: Candidate Professional Growth Plan
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 4.00 Understands a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program (ELCC 2.2)
- 4.00 Understands the instructional
leadership capacity of school staff (ELCC 2.3)

All eight Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates (100%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part V of the project

Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement:
CCU 7/CCU8 Cohort
Twenty-five candidates are exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Parts I-Part V. One candidate is developing in Part II (2.1 and 2.3); Part III (2.3) and Part IV (2.2). The one candidate is proficient in all elements 2.1-2.4 on various sections of the parts. The faculty decided to revise the assessment for fall 2014 and include only four parts and not five. After that time, we will compare the assessments and rubrics for both spring 2013 and fall 2014. We will continue to evaluate the new assessment and rubric and make appropriate changes.

Georgetown/Williamsburg Cohort
Eight candidates are exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part I, Part II, Part III, Part IV and Part V project components. Additionally, eight candidates are exemplary or proficient in ELCC Standard 2. This is the first application of this assessment using ELCC 2011 Standards. Our second application of this assessment will be in fall 2014. After that time, we will compare the assessments and rubrics for both spring 2013 and fall 2014. We will continue to evaluate the next phase of programming.

| TEAL Goal 4: Educational Leadership candidates will successfully | EDAD Internship | EDAD Internships - Internship Supervisor Evaluations | 90% of M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will demonstrate the ability to | CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort – Internship |
complete the internship experience and demonstrate application of building-level leadership skills in a school level internship practice setting.

ELCC: Standards 1.1-7.3
PADEPP: Standards 1-9
CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.4, 2.1-2.3, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 4.2, 4.3

lead, facilitate, and make educational decisions typical of those made by educational leaders.

A total of 24 candidates from the **CCU 5 and 6 Cohorts** Fall 2013 Semester I Internship were assessed by the site supervisor on the ELCC Standards (2011) 1-7 Elements. The rating scale is the following:

- 3 = Target (demonstrates exemplary ability)
- 2 = Acceptable (demonstrates satisfactory ability)
- 1 = Unacceptable (demonstrates unsatisfactory ability)

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.00 Understands and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement and steward a shared vision for the school (1.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness and implement plans to achieve school goals (1.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement (1.3)
- 3.00 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program conducive to student learning (2.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning (2.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can promote school-based policies, procedures that protect welfare and safety of students and staff
• 3.00 Understands and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality instruction and student learning (3.5)
• 3.00 Understands and can collaborate with faculty and community by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment (4.1)
• 3.00 Understands and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success (5.1)
• 3.00 Understands and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school (5.2)
• 3.00 Understands and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity and diversity within the school (5.3)
• 3.00 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers (6.1)

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

• 2.91 Understands and can develop and supervise the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (2.3)
• 2.91 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management
2.91 Understands and can use efficiently human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations (3.2)
2.91 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment (6.2)

All 24 CCU 5/CCU 6 candidates received at least a proficient score of 2 (Acceptable - Satisfactory) on all proficiencies as measured by the site supervisor’s evaluation of the intern.

CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort – Internship II
A total of 28 candidates from the CCU 5 and 6 Cohorts Spring 2014 Semester II Internship were assessed by the site supervisor on the ELCC Standards (2011) 1-6. The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 2.96 Understands and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement and steward a shared vision for the school (1.1)
- 2.96 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning (2.1)
- 2.96 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program (2.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can develop school capacity for distributed
leadership (3.4)
• 3.00 Understands and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality instruction and student learning (3.5)
• 2.96 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners (4.4)
• 2.96 Understands and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success (5.1)
• 2.96 Understands and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school (5.2)
• 3.00 Understands and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity and diversity within the school (5.3)
• 3.00 Understands and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school (5.4)
• 3.00 Understands and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling (5.5)

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

• 2.82 Understands and can
promote continual and sustainable school improvement (1.3)

- 2.78 Understands and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understand, appreciation and use of diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within the school community (4.2)
- 2.81 Understands and can respond to community interests, needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3)

28 candidates received at least a proficient score of 2 (Acceptable - Satisfactory) on all proficiencies as measured by the site supervisor’s evaluation of the intern.

Marion/Florence Cohort – Internship I
A total of 10 candidates from the Marion/Florence cohort in Fall 2013 Semester I Internship were assessed by the site supervisor on the ELCC Standard (2011) 1-7 Elements. The rating scale is the following:

3 = Target (demonstrates exemplary ability)
2 = Acceptable (demonstrates satisfactory ability)
1 = Unacceptable (demonstrates unsatisfactory ability)

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.00 Understands and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared
| 3.00 Understands and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals (1.2) |
| 3.00 Understands and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders (1.4) |
| 3.00 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program (2.2). |
| 3.00 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems (3.1) |
| 3.00 Understands and can efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations (3.2) |
| 3.00 Understands and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school (3.3) |
| 3.00 Understands and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning (3.5) |
| 3.00 Understands and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment (4.1) |
• 3.00 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3)

• 3.00 Understands and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success (5.1)

• 3.00 Understands and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the schools (5.2)

• 3.00 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers (6.1)

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiency:

• 2.80 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment (6.2)

All 10 candidates from the Marion/Florence cohort received at least a proficient score of 2 (Acceptable - Satisfactory) on all proficiencies as measured by the site supervisor’s evaluation of the intern.

Marion/Florence Cohort – Internship II
A total of 9 candidates from the Marion/Florence cohort in Spring 2014 Semester II Internship were assessed by the
The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.00 Understands and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders (1.4)
- 3.00 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students (2.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program (2.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can use develop and supervise the instructional leadership capacity of school staff (2.3)
- 3.00 Understands and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment (2.4)
- 3.00 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems (3.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations (3.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can promote school-based policies and
procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school (3.3)

- 3.00 Understands and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school (3.4)
- 3.00 Understands and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning (3.5)
- 3.00 Understands and can mobilize community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive relationships with community partners (4.4)
- 3.00 Understands and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success (5.1)
- 3.00 Understands and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the schools (5.2)
- 3.00 Understands and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity and diversity within the school (5.3)
- 3.00 Understands and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school (5.4)
• 3.00 Understands and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling (5.5)
• 3.00 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers (6.1)
• 3.00 Understands and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies (6.3)

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

• 2.88 Understands and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment (4.1)
• 2.88 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3)
• 2.88 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment (6.2)

All 9 candidates from the Marion/Florence cohort received at least a proficient score of 2 (Acceptable - Satisfactory) on all proficiencies as measured by the site supervisor’s evaluation of the
Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement:

Internship I

All candidates were on target or acceptable as rated by the Internship Supervisor for CCU 5 and 6 Cohorts for Semester I Internship. The areas that were not as strong were understanding the development and supervision of the instructional leadership capacity of staff, monitoring and evaluating school management and operational systems, using human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations and influencing the local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. The faculty determined that these elements could be weaker because they may have not had an opportunity to be as actively involved in their first semester of internship. The faculty will address these standard elements with Site Supervisors for Semester II internship. However, all students in the CCU 5 and 6 cohort are proficient in the ELCC Standard elements.

All students were on target or acceptable as rated by the Internship Supervisor for Marion/Florence cohort for Semester I Internship. The area that was not as strong is understanding the influence the local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. The faculty determined that this element could be weak because they may not have had an opportunity to be as actively involved in this area in their first semester of internship. However, all students in the Marion/Florence cohort are proficient in the ELCC Standard elements.
The faculty noted that in all cohorts that two students in each are weak in the same area: ELCC 6.2: Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning. The faculty will address this Standard Element by providing additional training and explanation to site supervisors for Semester II Internship. Additionally, this is the first semester utilizing the new 2011 ELCC Standards. We need to compare how well students did in Semester I Internship to Semester II Internship (spring 2014) using the new ELCC Standards.

**Internship II**
All students were on target or acceptable as rated by the Internship Supervisor for CCU 5 and 6 cohorts for Semester II Internship. The areas that were not as strong were in ELCC Standard 4: Understands and can mobilize community resources by promoting an appreciation and use of diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within the school community and understands (4.2) and can respond to community interests needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3). The faculty determined that these elements could be weaker because they may have not had an opportunity to be as actively involved in the community in their internship and supervisors may see this as an area that only practicing administrators would fully do so. The faculty will address these standard elements with Site Supervisors and with the Principals’ Advisory Group. However, all students in the CCU 5 and 6 cohort are proficient in the ELCC Standard elements.
All students were on target or acceptable as rated by the Internship Supervisor for Marion/Florence cohort for Semester I Internship. The areas that were not as strong were in Standard 4: Understands and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment (4.1) and Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers (4.3). The faculty determined that these elements could be weak because they may not have had an opportunity to be as actively involved in the community in their internship and supervisors may see this as an area that only practicing administrators would fully do so. The faculty will address these standard elements with Site Supervisors and with the Principals' Advisory Group. However, all students in the Marion/Florence cohort are proficient in the ELCC Standard elements.

The faculty noted that in both cohorts that Standard 4 appears to be a weaker area and both cohorts scored the lowest in 4.3. However, the faculty are pleased with the results of this assessment indicating that all students in both cohorts are proficient in all elements of ELCC Standards 1-6. This is the first time that we have not had at least one or two students scoring at the unacceptable level in a particular standard element.
### TEAL Goal 5: Educational Leadership
Candidates will be able to demonstrate application of building-level leadership skills that support an effective P-12 learning environment.

**ELCC: Standards 1.1-7.3**  
**PADEPP: Standards 4-9**  
**CAEP: Standards 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>EDAD 689</th>
<th>EDAD 689 School Improvement/Performance Plan</th>
<th>90% of M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will interpret and analyze data to plan for student achievement, school performance, and accountability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CCU 9 Cohort**  
A total of 14 candidates from the CCU 9 cohort (spring 2014) were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies for each part of the three parts of the School Improvement Plan. The rating scale for all three parts is as follows:  
4 = Exemplary (E)  
3 = Proficient (P)  
2 = Developing (D)  
1 = Unacceptable (U)

**Part I:**  
The overall mean score of 3.5 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 2.1 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning
- ELCC 2.2 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program
- ELCC 3.2 Understands and can efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations
- ELCC 3.4 Understands and can develop school capacity for
Twelve candidates (85%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.

Part II:
The overall mean score of 3.5 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 3.1 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems
- ELCC 6.1 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers
- ELCC 6.2 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

Twelve candidates (85%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

Part III:
The overall mean score of 3.5 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 2.1 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students
- ELCC 2.3 Understands and can
develop and supervise the instructional leadership capacity of school staff

- ELCC 2.4 Understands and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment
- ELCC 3.2 Understands and can use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations

Twelve candidates (85%) received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

**Georgetown/Williamsburg Cohort**

A total of 8 candidates from the *Georgetown/Williamsburg* cohort (spring 2014) were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies for each part of the three parts of the School Improvement Plan. The rating scale for all three parts is as follows:

- 4 = Exemplary (E)
- 3 = Proficient (P)
- 2 = Developing (D)
- 1 = Unacceptable (U)

**Part I:**
The overall mean score of 4.0 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 2.1 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning
- ELCC 2.2 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and
coherent curricular and instructional school program

- ELCC 3.2 Understands and can efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations
- ELCC 3.4 Understands and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership

All eight candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.

**Part II:**
The overall mean score of 4.0 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 3.1 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems
- ELCC 6.1 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers
- ELCC 6.2 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

All eight candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

**Part III:**
The overall mean score of 4.0 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- ELCC 2.1 Understands and can
sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students

- ELCC 2.3 Understands and can develop and supervise the instructional leadership capacity of school staff
- ELCC 2.4 Understands and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment
- ELCC 3.2 Understands and can use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations

All eight candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

**Marion/Florence Cohort**

A total of 11 candidates from the Marion/Florence cohort (spring 2014) were assessed by the college supervisor on proficiencies for each part of the three parts of the School Improvement Plan. The rating scale for all three parts is as follows:

- 4 = Exemplary (E)
- 3 = Proficient (P)
- 2 = Developing (D)
- 1 = Unacceptable (U)

**Part I:**
The overall mean score of 3.63 was the highest on the following proficiencies:
ELCC 2.1 Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning
ELCC 2.2 Understands and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program
ELCC 3.2 Understands and can efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations
ELCC 3.4 Understands and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership

All eleven candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.

Part II:
The overall mean score of 3.63 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

• ELCC 3.1 Understands and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems
• ELCC 6.1 Understands and can advocate for school students, families and caregivers
• ELCC 6.2 Understands and can act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment

All eleven candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as
measured by Part II of the project.

**Part III:**
The overall mean score of 3.63 was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- **ELCC 2.1** Understands and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students
- **ELCC 2.3** Understands and can develop and supervise the instructional leadership capacity of school staff
- **ELCC 2.4** Understands and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment
- **ELCC 3.2** Understands and can use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations

All eleven candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

**Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement:**
The School Improvement Performance Plan project is divided into three specific parts. Each part has a scoring rubric that addresses the ELCC standard elements. Thirty-three candidates completed the three parts of the Assessment 5: School Improvement Performance Plan utilizing ELCC 2011.
Standards in a total of three cohorts. Each cohort was assessed individually. Based on the three cohorts, the following is an evaluative summary of candidates’ knowledge and skill based on the ELCC Standard elements.

**Part I Standards: ELCC 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 2.4**
- Exemplary - 24 candidates (73%)
- Proficient - 7 candidates (21%)
- Developing - 2 candidates (6%)

**Part II Standards: ELCC 3.1, 6.1, 6.2**
- Exemplary - 24 candidates (73%)
- Proficient - 7 candidates (21%)
- Developing - 2 candidates (6%)

**Part III Standards: ELCC 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1**
- Exemplary - 24 candidates (73%)
- Proficient - 7 candidates (21%)
- Developing - 2 candidates (6%)

Since this is the second application with a new assessment meeting the 2011 ELCC Standards, we evaluated and monitored the new assessment and rubric and compared it to the first application of administration in spring 2013 to determine any necessary changes. We determined that the assessment and rubric needed to provide a more clear assessment of standard elements and revised it to administer in fall and spring 2014. Additionally, the faculty determined it would review and clarify the instructions with students before each part is due to assist with clarity and expectations of the assignment (noted in the 2 students who were developing). Next, the faculty will continue to increase the amount of classroom instruction, in-class practice and real-life activities that focus on the areas of weakness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAL Goal 6: Educational Leadership candidates will demonstrate application of building-level leadership skills in organizational management and community relations.</th>
<th><strong>EDAD 680</strong></th>
<th><strong>EDAD 680 School Community Relations Plan</strong></th>
<th><strong>100% of M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will design a plan to improve student achievement by collaborating with families and other community members.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC: Standards 3.1-3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC: Standards 4.1-4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADEPP: Standard 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.4, 3.2,3.3, 3.5,3.6, 4.2,4.3,5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCU 7/CCU 8 Cohort**  
**PART I: Assessment of School Community Relations**  
A total of 30 CCU 7/CCU 8 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part I. The rating scale is as follows for all four parts:  
4 = Exemplary (E)  
3 = Proficient (P)  
2 = Developing (D)  
1 = Unacceptable (U)  

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiency:  
- 3.90 Ability to collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment  

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiency:  
- 3.67 Understands and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive relationships with families and caregivers  

Twenty-nine CCU 7/CCU 8 candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.  

**PART II: Assessment of Parent Involvement**  
A total of 30 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part II.
The overall mean was the highest on the following proficiency:

- 4.00 Ability to collect and identify resources, activities and practices of family members pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment

The overall mean was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.80 Understanding of community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers

All 30 CCU 7/CCU 8 candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

Part III: Assessment of Business and Community Involvement
A total of 30 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part III.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiency:

- 3.89 Ability to collect and analyze community information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:
3.83 Ability to identify resources, activities and practices of diverse cultural, social and intellectual business and community resources

3.83 Ability to provide an improvement change that is based on community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships

Twenty-nine CCU 7/CCU 8 candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

PART IV: School Community Action Plan
A total of 29 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on five competencies in Part IV.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiency:

- 4.00 Understanding and collaborating with family and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment and responding to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.62 Understanding and promoting school-based policies and
procedures that protect welfare and safety of students and staff within the school; understanding use of human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations; ability to develop school capacity for distributed leadership.

Twenty-five CCU 7/CCU 8 candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part IV of the project.

Georgetown/Williamsburg Cohort
PART I: Assessment of School Community Relations
A total of 9 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part I.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.67 Ability to collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment
- 3.67 Ability to understand community resources by use of data that involved diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within the school community

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiency:

- 3.44 Understands and can respond
to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive relationships with families and caregivers

Seven Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part I of the project.

PART II: Assessment of Parent Involvement
A total of 9 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part II.

The overall mean was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.67 Understanding of community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers

The overall mean was the lowest on the following proficiency:

- 3.44 Ability to collect and identify resources, activities and practices of family members by using diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within the school community

Nine Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part II of the project.

Part III: Assessment of Business and
Community Involvement
A total of 9 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on three competencies in Part III.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.89 Ability to collect and analyze community information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment
- 3.89 Ability to identify resources, activities and practices of businesses and community by using diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within the school community

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.56 Ability to provide an improvement change that is based on community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships

Nine Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part III of the project.

PART IV: School Community Action Plan
A total of 9 candidates were assessed by the college supervisor on five competencies in Part IV.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collect and analyze community information</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify resources, activities and practices of businesses and</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community by using diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to provide an improvement change that is based on community</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 3.78 Understanding and promoting school-based policies and procedures that protect welfare and safety of students and staff within the school; understanding use of human, fiscal and technological resources to manage school operations; ability to develop school capacity for distributed leadership

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

• 3.56 Understanding and collaborating with family and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment and responding to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships

Nine Georgetown/Williamsburg candidates received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by Part IV of the project.

Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement:

CCU 7/CCU8 Cohort
Thirty candidates completed Parts I-III of the project this semester. Twenty-nine candidates completed Part IV. One candidate had personal issues and decided not to submit Part IV.
Twenty-nine candidates are exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part I and Part III. Thirty candidates are exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part II. Twenty-nine candidates are exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part IV School Action Plan and 25 are exemplary or proficient in the Reflection assignment. However, one candidate in Part I was developing but later took an Incomplete in the course and was able to complete in the proficient category for Parts II and IV but developing again in Part III as the candidate forgot to complete the entire assignment (e.g. include one improvement change to be implemented). Four candidates were developing in Part IV in the Reflection assignment. These candidates did not respond to all areas as required by the assignment. However, all were, at least, proficient in the School Improvement Action Plan. As stated above, one candidate decided not to submit Part IV due to personal issues.

After reviewing the data on each project component, it appears that candidates scored the lowest in their knowledge and skills regarding Standard 3 in Part IV of the Reflection assignment (3.1, 3.2, 3.4). However, as noted above, the faculty believes that this is not due to their lack of knowledge of Standard 3 but their lack of thoroughness in reading the entire assignment. The faculty member will send reminders before the candidates begin each Part and provide additional clarification with each assignment in Summer I. Since this is the first administration of the new ELCC 2011 assessment and rubric, the faculty will review the assessment to ensure that all
The directions are clearly stated in each section.

**Georgetown/Williamsburg Cohort**
Nine candidates completed Parts I-IV of the project this semester. All nine candidates were exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part II-Part IV. Seven candidates were exemplary or proficient in all proficiencies as measured by Part I. However, two candidates in Part I were developing but after meeting with the faculty member teaching the course, both were able to become proficient in Parts II-IV.

After reviewing the data on each project component, it appears that candidates scored at the proficient level on Standard 3 in Part IV of the Reflection assignment (3.1, 3.2, 3.4) which was not the case in Maymester. The faculty member did send reminders before the candidates began each Part and provided additional clarification with each assignment and will continue to do so. Since this is the second administration of the new ELCC 2011 assessment and rubric, the faculty will review the assessment to ensure that all directions are clearly stated in each section.

**CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort**
A total of 26 candidates from CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort were assessed by the university supervisor on the ELCC Standard Elements 1-6. The rating scale is the following:

- 4 = Exemplary
- 3 = Proficient
- 2 = Developing
- 1 = Unacceptable

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAL Goal 7: M.Ed. Educational Leadership candidates will be able to demonstrate content knowledge of the ELCC building-level standards through exemplars of their program coursework.</th>
<th>EDAD 696 EDAD 697</th>
<th>EDAD 696/697 Internship Portfolio</th>
<th>90% of M.Ed. EDAD 696/EDAD 697 will complete the Internship Portfolio</th>
<th>CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC: Standards 1.1-7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A total of 26 candidates from CCU 5/CCU6 Cohort were assessed by the university supervisor on the ELCC Standard Elements 1-6. The rating scale is the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADEPP: Standards 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 = Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP: Standards 1.1-1.5, 2.1, 3.2, 3.2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 = Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4.2, 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 = Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 = Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-six candidates from **CCU 5/CCU 6** Cohort received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by the university supervisor’s evaluation of the intern.

**Marion/Florence Cohort**
A total of 10 candidates from **Marion/Florence** Cohort were assessed by the site supervisor on the ELCC Standard Elements 1-6.

The overall mean score was the highest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.88 ELCC 2.1-2.4; 3.1-3.4; 4.1-4.4; 5.1-5.5; 6.1-6.3

The overall mean score was the lowest on the following proficiencies:

- 3.77 Ability to collaboratively develop, articulate, implement and steward a shared vision of learning for the school (1.1)
- 3.77 Ability to collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and create and implement plans to achieve school goals (1.2)
- 3.77 Ability to promote continual and sustainable school improvement (1.3)
- 3.77 Ability to evaluate school progress and revise school plans
A total of 9 candidates in the Marion/Florence Cohort received at least a score of 3 (Proficient) on all proficiencies as measured by the university supervisor’s evaluation of the intern.

Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement:
Data are presented that indicate 26 candidates from CCU 5 and CCU 6 Cohort, and 9 candidates from Marion/Florence Cohort, during Spring 2014 Internship II, were exemplary or proficient for the established expectations for Assessment 6: Portfolio. One student from Marion/Florence cohort was developing in Standard 1 (1.1-1.4). All candidates were evaluated by their university faculty.

Each ELCC Standard assessed is score individually and the results compiled for the overall evaluation. This allows a very comprehensive assessment of the candidate on each of the ELCC elements. After using the revised (2011 ELCC Standards) assessment and rubric for two semesters, it is very clear that the data provided are depicting much more detailed information regarding each candidate’s level of understanding. This revised scoring guide provides very specific information on performance of students and gives us better insights for program improvement. Faculty has reviewed the data for one semester of the Portfolio assessment. Since this is only two semesters of data with the revised assessment and rubric, further study may result in some minor adjustments. Faculty
members will continue throughout courses providing more problem-solving activities, case studies, assignments and projects that represent Standard 1. However, the faculty believes that the one student who scored a developing in this area did not represent the standard well through the artifact and reflection presented. The student has scored proficient in ELCC Standard one in similar assignments and SPA assessments throughout the three-year course of study.