Key Assessments MA in Education, Educational Leadership and Administration (Preliminary Administrative Credential)

Note: The EDAD program includes the MA in Education key assessments, plus 3 additional key assessments (indicated with a *).

EDAD.1	Writing Proficiency: Initial Writing Assessment (WP 1)
EDAD.2	Writing Proficiency: Advancement to Candidacy (WP 2)
EDAD.3	School Community Equity Study from EDMA 600 *Critical Perspectives in Education*
EDAD.4	Assessment Project from EDMA 602 *Assessment and Evaluation of Learning*
EDAD.5	Action Research Project from EDCI 601 *Curriculum Development and Instructional Design*
EDAD.6	Culminating Activity
EDAD.7	Exit Survey
EDAD.8*	Mid-Program Portfolio Review
EDAD.9*	Accountability System from EDAD 615 *Field-Based Accountability*
EDAD.10*	Final Portfolio Evaluation

EDAD.1 Writing Proficiency: Initial Writing Assessment
Applicants to the MA in Education program must submit an original piece of academic writing. The website directs them to choose one of six topics and to use the MA in Education Writing Rubric to guide their writing. The Graduate Coordinator uses the writing rubric to evaluate the writing samples and assign a score. The rubric contains seven criteria (presentation of ideas, organization, use of evidence, quality of evidence, conclusion, mechanics, APA formatting) with descriptors for four levels of performance (unacceptable, partial/inconsistent, acceptable/mostly consistent or exceptional/consistent. Applicants can earn up to 28 points. A candidate must earn at least 17 points for acceptance (among other admission requirements). Admitted candidates who earn between 17 and 21 points will be considered "conditionally classified" as a graduate student until they successfully pass the graduate writing course. Back to Top

EDAD. 2 Writing Proficiency: In-program Writing Proficiency (Advance to Candidacy)
To advance to candidacy, candidates must submit two work samples from their coursework. The candidate's faculty advisor evaluates these work samples according to the MA in Education Writing Rubric. Candidates who score a 24 or above on the rubric (out of 28) are eligible for advancement to candidacy, if they have met other program requirements.   Back to Top

(Rubric on next page)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MASTERS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
Rubric for Initial Writing Assessment and Advancement to Candidacy

	UNACCEPTABLE/ LITTLE TO NO EVIDENCE 1	PARTIAL/ INCONSISTENT 2	ACCEPTABLE/ MOSTLY CONSISTENT 3	EXCEPTIONAL/ CONSISTENT 4
GRAD STUDIES ACCEPTANCE[1]:	**Deny**	**Conditionally Classified**[1]	**Classified**[1]	**Advanced**[2]
Presentation of Ideas	Ideas are unclear or unsupported. Writing is informal.	Some ideas lack clarity and/or support. Writing style is inappropriate or inconsistent for professional use.	Ideas are clear and claims are supported by research and/or theory. Writing style is reflective and professional.	Ideas are clear and presented convincingly with an intense, in-depth, exploration of the topic, with claims that are supported by research and/or theory.
Organization	Structure of the paper distracts the reader from the content. Thesis is not evident. Thoughts are not ordered logically.	Structure of the paper includes a thesis, but it is not easily identifiable. Thoughts are ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels.	Structure of the paper has thesis that is identifiable and moves the reader through the text. Thoughts ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels.	Structure of the paper has a clear thesis that is identifiable, compelling, and moves the reader purposefully through the text. Smooth transitions, with thoughts ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels
Use of Evidence	Student incorrectly interprets, summarizes, and demonstrates comprehension of most statements, graphs, questions, etc. *OR* misinterpretation is due to bias.	Student demonstrates comprehension of most statements, graphs, questions, etc. but *misinterprets** Ideas **Misinterpretation is NOT due to bias.*	Ideas are developed and supported through interpretation, analysis and evaluation of data or other forms of evidence.	Ideas are well-developed and supported through accurate interpretation, thorough analysis and careful evaluation of data or other forms of evidence.
Quality of Evidence	Evidence is minimal and does not support claims.	Evidence cited is minimal and/or not credible, outdated and/or biased.	Student cites appropriate and adequate academic evidence to support claims.	Student cites current, relevant and appropriate academic evidence to

				support claims. Evidence is compelling, drawing from a variety of sources.
Conclusion	Conclusion is not evident or is missing.	Conclusion is unwarranted or fallacious. May introduce new ideas or include evidence that should have been introduced earlier.	A well-reasoned conclusion that follows logically from the evidence is presented and serves to summarize the main points of the paper.	Conclusion is well-reasoned, compelling and follows logically from the evidence presented. Conclusion serves to summarize, makes connections, provide insights, and suggests broader implications.
Mechanics	Writing lacks proper sentence structure. There are consistent errors with mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (more than a few errors per page). Errors interfere with the reader's understanding of the content.	Student Inconsistently uses proper sentence structure and Inconsistently writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (a few errors per page). Errors distract from the content, but do not interfere with the reader's understanding.	Student uses proper sentence structure with few errors and writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (a few errors in the document).	Student consistently uses proper sentence structure and consistently writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (no errors).
APA Style, Citations, and References	No APA style used.	Student uses APA style inconsistently in text citations or end of document references	Student consistently uses proper APA style in 2 of the following ways: in text citations, end of document references, or alignment of the two.	Student consistently uses proper APA style in the following 3 ways: in-text citations, end of document references, or alignment of the two.

Tally_____ / 28
¹Initial Writing Assessment:
Student must earn at least 21 points for admission ("Classified") to program (pending GPA review).
Student must earn at least 17 points for conditional admission ("Conditionally Classified") to program (pending GPA review). Conditional Classified status requires additional work by the student early in the program in order to achieve Classified status.
²Advancement to Candidacy: Student must earn at least 24 points for advancement ("Candidate") to candidacy.

MA in Ed.3 School Community Equity Study from EDMA 600: *Critical Perspectives in Education*

Candidates complete a study of a school and community, including demographics overview, equity survey, school handbook analysis, community map, interview with a community based agency or organization. They then synthesize this data and write a report that describes the role of the school in the community. Papers are scored out of 30 points using the Equity Study Rubric.

	Level 1 Unacceptable Below 21	Level 2 Developing 21-23	Level 3 Proficient 24-26	Level 4 Exemplary 27-30
Content	Descriptions of the school's demographics, program description, and handbook analysis are incomplete and/or inaccurate. Community map is poorly done.	Any one section of the descriptions of the school's demographics, program description, and handbook analysis are incomplete or inadequate. Community map is inclusive of all of the categories in the assignment description.	Descriptions of the school's demographics, program description, and handbook analysis are sufficient to portray the school's population and culture. Community map is inclusive of all of the categories in the assignment description.	Thorough descriptions of the school's demographics, program description, and handbook analysis demonstrate a clear understanding of the school's population and culture. Community map is inclusive of all of the categories in the assignment description.
Mechanics/ APA Format	More than a few errors per page in grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, or sentence structure, and errors interfere with content. Gaps in APA format. Incomplete references.	A few errors per page in grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, but errors do not interfere with content. Inconsistent citations and APA format.	Careful editing—no more than a few errors in the document in grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling or sentence structure. APA format consistent.	Organized and thoughtful structure that provokes interest in topic. No errors in grammar or in sentence structure. APA format consistent.
Personal Investment	Lack of preparation and investment with the school and community.	Demonstrated engagement with the school and community. Indicate knowledge about the resources available to community members. Express personal commitment to connecting to students and community members.	Adequate level of engagement with the school and community. Indicate knowledge about the resources available to community members. Express personal commitment to connecting to students and community members in asset-based ways.	A high level of engagement with the school and community. Indicate a deep level of knowledge about the resources available to community members. Express personal commitment to connecting to students and community members in asset-based ways.

MA in Ed.4 Assessment Project from EDMA 602 *Assessment and Evaluation of Learning*
Assessment, Technology, Student Learning
Candidates create assessment instruments, administer the assessment to students, analyze data using technology, use the results to inform their understanding of student learning, and critique the assessment tool. The School Assessment Simulation Project is a multi-part Data Team assignment that comprises identifying the data schools collect, developing data overviews, creating and administering tests, and conducting test analyses. A Data Team assignment is a small group project that simulates assessment system processes one would expect a school faculty to do. All Data Team assignments involve a written report as well as a presentation or participation in a class discussion. Scores are assigned on a 4 –level scale (unacceptable, acceptable beginning, acceptable professional, exemplary).   Back to Top

EDCI 602 School Assessment Simulation Project Scoring Rubric

	Score 1 Unacceptable	Score 2 Developing	Score 3 Proficient	Score 4 Exemplary
Overall Simulation Response	The overall simulation has not been completely addressed. Components lack information and detail. Writing is less clear, less focused on the actual assignment, or lacks sufficient information. Discussion and interpretations sections may be disjointed, inaccurate and/or confusing.	The overall simulation has been addressed, but not as clearly or completely as needed. There may be unevenness between the written responses and discussions and interpretations. The written report may show less thoughtfulness, less balance and may be less accurate.	The overall simulation has been adequately addressed through each component. Written reports, discussions, and interpretations are generally complete and accurate.	The overall simulation has been completely addressed throughout all components. Written reports are informative, clear, and interesting. Components show attention to useful details that will help faculty and administrators better understand the school's assessment system. Discussions are complete and nuanced; interpretations are accurate and evidence-based.
School Assessment Inventory	For the selected grade level or secondary subject area, the assessment inventory provides incomplete information on external and internal assessments, recent instructional initiatives, and available student demographic data. Suggestions for more effective use of results and answers to related questions are incomplete or insufficient for assessment system planning. The inventory lacks useful information about the assessment system.	For the selected grade level or secondary subject area, the assessment inventory includes information on most external assessments. Information on internal assessments, recent instructional initiatives, and available student demographic data is limited. Suggestions for more effective use of results and answers to related questions are less clear and useful for assessment system planning. The inventory is a presents a good start at describing the assessment system.	For the selected grade level or secondary subject area, the assessment inventory includes information on all external and internal assessments, as well as recent instructional initiatives and available student demographic data that may be useful in understanding assessment results. The inventory discusses ways to more effectively use results. Most related questions are answered thoughtfully. The inventory is well organized, clearly written, and provides a solid description of the assessment system.	All of score level 3 plus: a school assessment calendar is included, all related questions are answered thoughtfully, the authors identify and explain data needed that will lead to better student learning outcomes. The inventory presents a truly comprehensive look at the assessment system.

Data Overview	The Data Overview poses limited educational questions. The data source may be inadequate to answer the questions. Data displays are not clear or incomplete or overly simplistic and thereby unable to encourage educators to explore student performance needs. A conclusion may be limited or missing.	The Data Overview attempts to answer educational questions that may not be clearly stated, and/or the identified data source is not clearly related to the questions. Data displays are provided to answer some of the questions, however the displays are not of sufficient quality to encourage educators to carefully explore student performance needs. The conclusion is a limited summary of findings.	The Data Overview poses multiple, related educational questions that can be answered through data analysis. One or more sources of student data are identified; the operation of the Data Team is briefly and clearly described. The report answers each question with a clear data display shows student performance and holds interest for educators. A brief conclusion accurately summarizes findings.	All of score level 3 plus: more than one source of student data has been analyzed across multiple years; some attempt has been made to conduct subgroup analysis; data displays are designed to clearly engage educators and others, as appropriate, in exploration of the drivers of student learning performance and potential next steps.
Test Construction	The Data Team description of need for more information about student performance in a specific content or skill is inadequate or missing. Identified educational standards are clearly too broad. The test blueprint is incomplete, or poorly aligned to identified standards, or very limited across limited taxonomic levels. The test has only limited alignment with the blueprint. Test design may create student response problems.	The Data Team description of need for more information about student performance in a specific content or skill area lacks clarity. Identified educational standards may be too broad. The test blueprint proposes to assess students primarily across limited taxonomic levels and/or with insufficient numbers of items. The test may lack clear alignment with the blueprint. Test design may lead to some difficulties for student responses.	The Data Team described the need for more information about student performance in a specific content or skill area. Related educational standards are identified. The test blueprint proposes to assess students on some of the identified standards across multiple taxonomic levels and with sufficient numbers of items. The test is well aligned with the blueprint and well designed for student responses.	All of score level 3 plus: the description of need for information is specific; selected educational standards are clearly related to needed students performance information and also limited to assessing those needs. The test blueprint proposes to assess students on most standards across multiple taxonomic levels. The test is clearly a product of the blueprint and designed to encourage high quality student responses.
Test Analysis	The Test Analysis Report shows major deficiencies in calculating or reporting test statistics and reliability. The item analysis by Data Team members is inadequate and incomplete. The report of	The Test Analysis Report does not include complete test statistics and/or calculation of split-half reliability with correction. A test item analysis is not provided for at least	The Test Analysis Report includes complete test statistics and calculation of split-half reliability with correction for at least one test administration, a test item analysis for at least three test items for each	All of score level 3 plus: test analysis is followed with clear suggestions for improving each test item; the report shows how the test worked across subgroups, and a rationale is provided for each

	overall test characteristics is confusing and not related to improvement of the test.	three test items for each member of the Data Team or item analyses are incomplete. A report of overall test characteristics based on ability of results to help interpret student learning and proposing next instructional interventions is incomplete or lacks clarity.	member of the Data Team, and a report of overall test characteristics based on ability of results to help interpret student learning and propose needed instructional interventions.	proposed instructional intervention.

MA in Ed.5 Action Research Project from EDCI 601 *Curriculum Development and Instructional Design*
The AR project is designed to provide an opportunity for candidates to look closely at a question related specifically to their current position in education. Candidates formulate a question, collect and analyze data, engage in reflections and determine future directions. The assignment is scored on a rubric out of a total of 40 points.

Rubric for Action Research Project

Criteria	Level 1 Unacceptable 0-28	Level 2 Developing 29-32	Level 3 Proficient 32-35	Level 4 Exemplary 36-40
Content	Description of the required components is incomplete. Reflection on the process is minimal. Details are lacking. Conclusions are poorly developed or justified.	Description of the required components is inconsistent. AR question meets 3-4 of the guidelines. Description of data collection and analysis processes is lacking justification or an articulation of triangulation	Description and explanation of the required components are complete. AR question meets at least 5 of the guidelines for a well-written question. Description and justification of data collection and analysis processes, including a clear articulation of triangulation. Reflection on the process is thoughtful and informed. Details are engaging, conclusions are well developed and justified. Literature review is relevant and well organized.	Thorough description and explanation of the required components. AR question meets the 6 guidelines for a well-written question. Thorough description and justification of data collection and analysis processes, including a clear articulation of triangulation. Reflection on the process is thoughtful and informed. Details are very concrete and engaging, conclusions well developed and justified. Literature review is very relevant, well organized, and cohesive in structure.
Mechanics/ APA Format	More than a few errors per page in grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, or sentence structure, and errors interfere with content. Gaps in APA format. Incomplete references.	A few errors per page in grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, but errors do not interfere with content. Inconsistent citations and APA format.	Careful editing—no more than a few errors in the document in grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling or sentence structure. APA format consistent.	Organized and thoughtful structure that provokes interest in topic. No errors in grammar or in sentence structure. APA format consistent.
Personal Investment	Minimal reflection on the impact of the study on author's practice. Lack of personal investment is portrayed.	Some reflection on the impact of the study on the author's practice is described.	Author's interest and passion are detectable. Future directions and impact on author's practice is described.	The writing shows openness to the challenges of studying one's own practice. Self-learning, future directions, and impact on author's practice are clearly described.

MA in Ed.6 Culminating Activity

As a culminating activity for the Masters in Education degree, candidates may choose to complete a thesis, project or comprehensive exam. Both the project and the thesis include an oral defense and a written document, as described in the Guide to Graduate Studies. Upon completion, the candidate's thesis or project committee assigns a score to the written document and oral defense (unacceptable, pass, pass with distinction). There is one rubric for the thesis or project, and one rubric for comprehensive examinations.

Thesis/Project Rubric

MA in Education Rubric for Project and Theses				
	Not Acceptable/Not Pass (0)		**Pass (1)**	**Pass with Distinction (2)**
Presentation of Ideas	Ideas are unclear or unsupported. Writing is informal.	Some ideas lack clarity and/or support. Writing style is inappropriate or inconsistent for professional use.	Ideas are clear and claims are supported by research and/or theory. Writing style is reflective and professional.	Ideas are clear and presented convincingly with an intense, in-depth, exploration of the topic, with claims that are supported by research and/or theory.
Organization	Structure of the paper distracts the reader from the content. Thesis is not evident. Thoughts are not ordered logically.	Structure of the paper includes a thesis, but it is not easily identifiable. Thoughts are ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels.	Structure of the paper has thesis that is identifiable and moves the reader through the text. Thoughts ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels.	Structure of the paper has a clear thesis that is identifiable, compelling, and moves the reader purposefully through the text. Smooth transitions, with thoughts ordered logically, both at paragraph and sentence levels
Use of Evidence	Student incorrectly interprets, summarizes, and demonstrates comprehension of most statements, graphs,	Student demonstrates comprehension of most statements, graphs, questions, etc. but *misinterprets** Ideas	Ideas are developed and supported through interpretation, analysis and evaluation of data or other forms of evidence.	Ideas are well-developed and supported through accurate interpretation, thorough analysis and careful evaluation of data or

	questions, etc. *OR* misinterpretation is due to bias.	*Misinterpretation is NOT due to bias.*		other forms of evidence.
Quality of Evidence	Evidence is minimal and does not support claims.	Evidence cited is minimal and/or not credible, outdated and/or biased.	Student cites appropriate and adequate academic evidence to support claims.	Student cites current, relevant and appropriate academic evidence to support claims. Evidence is compelling, drawing from a variety of sources.
Conclusion	Conclusion is not evident or is missing.	Conclusion is unwarranted or fallacious. May introduce new ideas or include evidence that should have been introduced earlier.	A well-reasoned conclusion that follows logically from the evidence is presented and serves to summarize the main points of the paper.	Conclusion is well-reasoned, compelling and follows logically from the evidence presented. Conclusion serves to summarize, makes connections, provide insights, and suggests broader implications.
Mechanics	Writing lacks proper sentence structure. There are consistent errors with mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (more than a few errors per page). Errors interfere with the reader's understanding of the content.	Student Inconsistently uses proper sentence structure and Inconsistently writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (a few errors per page). Errors distract from the content, but do not interfere with the reader's understanding.	Student uses proper sentence structure with few errors and writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (a few errors in the document).	Student consistently uses proper sentence structure and consistently writes with appropriate mechanics: spelling, punctuation, grammar (no errors).
APA Style, Citations, and References	No APA style used.	Student uses APA style inconsistently in text citations or end of document references	Student consistently uses proper APA style in 2 of the following ways: in text citations, end of document references, or alignment of the two.	Student consistently uses proper APA style in the following 3 ways: in-text citations, end of document references, or alignment of the two.

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION RUBRIC
MA in Education – Curriculum & Instruction, Education Leadership, and Special Education

Comprehensive exams are blind-scored by the School of Education Comprehensive Exam Committee, using the Comprehensive Exam Rubric. There are 3 questions in the comprehensive exam. There are 15 points possible for each question, for a total of 45 points. To pass each question, a minimum score of two points is required in each rubric category.

Two scorers score the comprehensive exam. Scores are averaged. Candidates earning a score of 41 or above, earn a "pass with distinction." Candidates who earn between 30 and 41 points, pass. Candidates with less than 30 points do not pass.

Description
Examination and Development of Topic
☐ In depth examination of the exam topics including detailed discussion of which past practices informs current or future directions for education **OR** discussion of the context for the issue **(3 points)**
☐ Examination of the topic over time to assess the degree to which past practices informs current or future directions for education **OR** discussion of the context for each issue **(2 points)**
☐ Assessment of the degree to which past practices informs current or future directions for education **OR** Context of the topics is minimal or missing **(1 point)**
☐ Response is off topic and does not respond to the question **(0 points)**
Ability to analyze, evaluate and draw conclusions
☐ In depth analysis and evaluation of alternative points of view and draws judicious conclusions **(3 points)**
☐ Analyzes and evaluates alternative points of view **AND** draws judicious conclusions **(2 points)**
☐ Superficial analysis and evaluation of alternative points of view **AND** conclusions are not consistently relevant **(1 point)**
☐ Response does not evaluate alternative points of view OR does not draw conclusions **(0 points)**
Application of theory to practice
☐ Strong and varied applications of theory to practice **(3 points)**
☐ Demonstrates the ability to apply theory to practice **(2 points)**
☐ Application of theory to practice is minimal **(1 point)**
☐ Response does not apply theory to practice **(0 points)**

Use of APA format

☐ Consistently documents current research using appropriate APA format   **(3 points)**

☐ Documents current research using appropriate APA format 80% of the time **(2 points)**

☐ Current research is not consistently documented **OR** appropriate APA format is not used **(1 point)**

☐ **Does not use APA format (0 points)**

Mechanics and Structure

☐   Consistent and appropriate use of mechanics and sentence structure **(3 points)**

☐   Appropriate use of mechanics and sentence structure 90% of the time; errors do not interfere with meaning **(2 points)**

☐   Mechanical errors and sentence structure interfere with meaning **(1 point)**

MA in Ed.7 Exit Survey

Candidates complete an online exit survey (22 items) that measures perception of preparedness in areas identified by program learning outcomes. A copy of this survey is available on the accreditation website.

EDAD. 8 Mid-Program Portfolio Review

Candidates present oral and written documentation of completed courses in the program to date, a review of accomplishments towards their Professional Growth Plans, a summary of their strengths and areas for professional growth, and a review of their Portfolios, including progress in field-embedded coursework, and documentation of meeting CPSELS and CCTC Administrative Standards. The mid-program review is scored on a 4 point scale (1=not proficient, 2=developing,3=proficient,4=exemplary) according to five leadership roles.

Key: 1-Not Proficient 2-Developing 3-Proficient 4-Exemplary

Candidate Outcomes	Self Rating	Assignment	Evaluator Rating	Growth Area
1: Leader as Principal Teacher				
1a. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to coach teachers and manage the supervision and evaluation responsibilities of a school leader.		**EDAD 611** Supervision Eval Project		
1b. Candidate will be able to guide and facilitate the development and implementation of a sound curriculum that meets the needs of a diverse population of students and is based on state adopted standards and is frequently evaluated for effectiveness.		**EDCI 601** Curriculum Development & Instruction		
1c. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to implement and sustain collaborative communities of practice in schools and provide and model continuous professional learning.		**EDAD 611** Supervision & Staff Development		
1d. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and leverage accountability and assessment and policy demands and structures in the service of improved student learning.		**EDCI 602** School Assessment **EDAD 613** Adequacy Assignment		
2: Leader as Purposeful Manager				
2a. Candidate will apply systems thinking to the work of leadership and demonstrate the ability to efficiently and purposefully manage organizational elements of the school (fiscal, facilities, resources, legal, disciplinary, etc) in the service of teaching and learning outcomes for students.		**EDAD 613** Adequacy Assignment **EDAD 612** Site Discipline Policy Analyses		

Candidate Outcomes		Assignment	
2b. Candidates articulate and effectively apply leadership actions to manage individuals and groups and strengthen coherence and cohesion in the organization.		**EDAD 612** Vision Assignment **EDCI601** Action Research Project	
2c. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to carry out legal responsibilities and analyze apply and influence policy.		**EDAD 614** Handbook Policy Assignment	

Key: 1-Not Proficient 2-Developing 3-Proficient 4-Exemplary

Candidate Outcomes	Self Rating	Assignment	Evaluator Rating	Growth Area
3: Leader as Inquirer, Reflector and Connector				
3a. Candidate will develop and practice cycles of inquiry.		**EDMA 610** Lit Review **EDAD 615** Accountability Assignment		
3b. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to be reflective with self and with peers, interrogate his/her identity, and demonstrate a high degree of social and emotional intelligence.		**EDAD 610** Temperament Assignment **EDAD 609** Equity Audit		
3c. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to build relational trusts in colleagues and is able to solve interpersonal conflicts.		**EDAD 610** Temperament Assignment Communication Plan		
4: Leader as Community Organizer				
4a. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to engage family and community stakeholders in student learning outcomes.		**EDAD 609** Equity Audit **EDAD 612** Vision		
4b. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to analyze the community, discuss the dominant and invisible power structures that affect the school community and form relationships with parents who are part of invisible communities for the purpose of involving in schools.		**EDAD 609** Equity Audit **EDAD 610** Communication Plan		

Candidate Outcomes	Self Rating	Assignment	Evaluator Rating	Growth Area
4c. Candidate will demonstrate the ability to marshal resources in the service of school outcomes.		**EDAD 613** Adequacy Assignment		

Candidate Outcomes	Self Rating	Assignment	Evaluator Rating	Growth Area
5. Leader as Change Agent in a Democracy				
5a. Candidate will articulate a shared vision of educational change in developing a just and democratic society.		**EDAD 612** Equity Audit **EDMA 604** Democratic Action Project		
5b. Candidate will examine and address the complexities of diversity and equity in the classroom, the school, the community and in the society.		**EDAD 609** Equity Audit **EDAD 610** Communication Plan		
5c. Candidate demonstrates the ability to navigate the political context of schools in districts, state and national arenas for the purpose of advocating and influencing social justice, equitable and democratic outcomes.		**EDAD 614** Analysis of Key Court Cases **EDAD 615** Accountability: Inquiry Protocol		

EDAD. 9 Accountability Project from EDAD 615 *Field-Based Accountability: Managing for Learning*

In their field placements, candidates select an authentic and important site or district problem and apply an inquiry protocol to expand their frames of reference and reflect on the evidence that emerges from viewing the problem through different frames. Candidates then facilitate conversations and receive feedback on their problems from small group, whole class and colleagues in their professional settings. During this process, they listen, reflect and give feedback that assists in problem framing, problem solving, interpreting evidence, designing action plans, and designing measures of success for action plans. The final project is a 15 minute presentation targeted to school constituencies such as teachers and parents. Candidates present to a panel of faculty, graduates in leadership roles in regional schools and cohort members, who give feedback.   Back to Top

 (Rubric next page)

Accountability Project: Problem Framing, Problem Solving

Criteria	1 Unacceptable	2 Developing	3 Proficient	4 Exemplary
Sources of input for framing problem	Candidate accepts external definition of problem only, sometimes based in data.	Candidate accepts principal's definition of the problem only, sometimes based in data.	Candidate applies perspectives of three separate groups for problem framing (teachers, classmates, some literature.) Applies frames from Boleman & Deal (2008) to enhance understanding of problem. Applies evidence to support understanding of problem	Candidate applies perspectives of four separate groups for problem framing (teachers, classmates, 8 literature sources, Principal, Supt). Applies frames from Boleman & Deal (2008) to enhance understanding of problem. Applies evidence to support understanding of problem.
Facilitation with problem framing groups	Poor listener, attempts to dominate discussion	Tells about own view of problem, not interested in others issues or perspectives.	Listens and records, supportive, reflective, question poser.	Listens, records, asks questions in response to participant thoughts: grounded theory, co-learner, co-inquirer, question poser (Byrnes-Jimenez & Orr, 2007).
In class structured Discussion-Reflection	Gives minimal attention, know-it-all, in control	Tells about own problem, not interested in others issues	Listens and participates, supportive, reflective.	Listens, offers critical friend feedback, offers literature, co-inquirer (Byrnes-Jimenez & Orr, 2007).
Link to Accountability	Problem definition links closest to political accountability, tough on schools but little understanding of the issues.	Problem definition links closest to Leadership accountability, technocratic, results in lower trust from publics (Johnson, Rochkind & Dupont, 2011).	Reciprocal and professional accountability (Darling-Hammond, 2004) resources provided based on thorough understanding of problem. Problem definition recognizes Ethical responsibility (Elmore, 2005)to all publics and students.	Reciprocal, professional, ethical, democratic accountability (Rich & Brazer, 2004) public accountability, transparent and understandable: results in trust from all publics (Johnson, Rochkind & Dupont, 2011). Results in best possible outcome for students.
Presentation to faculty, graduates in leadership roles in schools, cohort members.	Problem viewed in same way as when process started. Candidate unable to expand or deepen understanding of the problem, or is stuck on a preconceived solution. Data might be used. Action might result in harm or help to students.	Problem viewed through two frames of reference. Data is applied but only provides a shallow understanding of the issue. Action might result in harm or help to students.	The problem is viewed through three or more frames of reference. Multiple frames of reference (Boleman & Deal, 2008), data and evidence support the understanding of publics. approaches root causes. Action will likely help students.	Four or more frames of reference (Boleman & Deal, 2008) Draws audience in, supports understanding, inspiring and rational. Clearly understands root causes (Bauer & Brazer, 2012). Next steps apparent. Action will likely help students.

EDAD. 10 Final Portfolio Evaluation

The portfolio is compiled throughout the program and includes a number of course-embedded assignments linked to the candidates' field-based experiences. The portfolio is evaluated on a four-point scale (1=not proficient, 2=developing,3=proficient,4=exemplary). The elements of the portfolio include: Back to Top

- Developing a Vision for Learning: Theory to Practice
- Community/School Site Demographic Study
- Crisis Response: Oral and Written
- Management of Funds and Facilities
- Staff Development Plan
- Using Research
- Leadership for Diversity

Portfolio Evaluation

Candidate_____   Date _____

Program Representative/_____Site Mentor _____
University Supervisor

Not Proficient	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
θ	θ	θ	θ
One or more categories are not represented. Some reflections are missing.	All categories exist. Relevant documentation is included for each category. Reflections exist in each category.	All categories contain thoughtful documentation. Reflections for each item are well-written, address administrative issues, and show connections to categories.	Documentation relates to administrative activities and the category; is clear and specific and is chosen to show the connection to performance indicators of the standard. Reflections for each item are well written, show depth and make meaningful connections to categories and performance indicators.
Comments			