Institutional Report

Central Washington University
Center for Teaching and Learning
College of Education and Professional Studies
400 E University Way
Ellensburg, WA 98926-7415

Washington State
Focused Site Visit
April 19 – 22, 2008

Website addresses:
Center for Teaching and Learning
http://www.cwu.edu/~ectl/index.html

CWU Program Review Site
http://www.cwu.edu/~ectl/sitevisit/index.html

Contacts for Site Review:

Dr. Connie Lambert, Interim Dean, CEPS
LambertC@cwu.edu

Dr. Jim DePaepe, Director, OREA
DepaepeJ@cwu.edu

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued)

PART I: OVERVIEW OF THE INSTITUTION

History and Mission

Central Washington University (CWU) was established in 1890 for the sole purpose of preparing teachers. The first classes began in 1891 in an elementary school, which were moved four years later to the only building on campus, Barge Hall. Still at the center of campus life, Barge Hall currently serves as the central administration building. It honors the historic roots of the institution by continuing to carry the title Washington State Normal School above its main entrance.

Over the years the institution evolved from a Normal School into one of three comprehensive state universities granting baccalaureate and graduate degrees. The legacy of the University as a teachers' college and its transformation to a regional comprehensive university is specifically noted in the executive summary of the Institutional Self-Study, completed by Central Washington University for the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC), which refers to Central as an institution in transition. "This transition has been characterized by the growing independence and strengthening of the arts and sciences disciplines, which complemented but did not replace the University's strong and respected role as a teacher preparation program..." (Executive Summary, p.1).

As the academic program at the University expanded, so did the mission of the institution. Today, the mission of the University is to "prepare students for responsible citizenship, responsible stewardship of the earth, and enlightened and productive lives". Faculty, staff, and administrators foster the mission by creating an environment that nurtures the emotional, physical, intellectual, social, and ethical development of each student. Their efforts are realized through a multi-campus organization that promotes small classes and demonstrates concern for each student as an individual. Students at CWU are challenged through the mission to address a dynamic and diverse world by preparing themselves as independent life-long learners who can function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society.

The University community values teaching as the vehicle to inspire intellectual depth and breadth, to encourage lifelong learning, and to enhance the opportunities of its students. The faculty develop and strengthen bachelor's and master's degree programs in the arts, sciences, and humanities; in teacher education; in business; in the social services; and in technological specializations. A strong liberal arts foundation; applied emphases; opportunities for undergraduate research, creative expression, and international study; and close working relationships between students and faculty are hallmarks of the undergraduate experience. Graduate programs develop partnerships between faculty and students to extend scholarship to important areas of research and practice.

Organization

Academic programs are administered through the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Comprehensive in scope and nature, programs are grouped and offered through four colleges: Arts and Humanities; The Sciences; Business; and, Education and

Professional Studies. Only the College of Business does not offer programs that prepare education professionals.

Central Washington University began preparing candidates in programs for teachers for the State of Washington in 1890. In addition to offerings on the main campus in Ellensburg, individual courses and full programs are offered at six centers: CWU-Des Moines, CWU-Lynnwood, CWU-Moses Lake, CWU-Pierce County, CWU-Wenatchee, and CWU-Yakima.

Over time, professional programming for educators expanded to include school administration, school counseling, school psychology, and library media. As programs for the preparation of education professionals grew so did the need to develop a cohesive governance structure. To that end, the University Professional Education Council (UPEC) and the Center for Teaching and Learning were created to provide oversight to the collaborative preparation of professional educators by the College of Arts and Humanities, the College of the Sciences, and the College of Education and Professional Studies. In 2002, the UPEC was renamed the CTL Advisory Council; the purpose was updated, and the membership broadened to include the PK-12 community. This was accomplished in addition to the previously enacted WAC, which ensures widespread PK-12 participation through a Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) for each area of preparation: teachers, administrators, school counselors, and school psychologists.

The Latin phrase emblazoned on the seal of Central Washington University, *Docendo Discimus, By Teaching We Learn,* is the cornerstone for the historical purpose of CWU and promotes its distinctiveness as an institution in the state. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is the place where *Docendo Discimus* is emphasized and teaching as a means of facilitating learning is closely examined and practiced. The mission of the Center is played out through its theme**:** *Preparing Facilitators of Learning in a Diverse World.* To accomplish this mission, private and public school teachers, administrators, counselors, and psychologists from around the state join university faculty who represent the three colleges mentioned above, to establish a professional community.

This professional community reaches all corners of CWU and extends to the world of schooling**.** Representatives of this professional education community merge under the aegis of the CTL to: (1) design, deliver, and renew candidate recruitment, admission, and retention policies and procedures; (2) to assess, as an aggregate, candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and (3) to evaluate the efficacy of the CTL for the purpose of maintaining a state approval and national accreditation status.

The Center for Teaching and Learning is governed by an executive board under the leadership of the dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS). Members include the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Humanities and The Sciences; the director for the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment; and a local school district administrator (currently the superintendent of the Ellensburg School District). The dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies, with approval of the Executive Board, appoints the director of The Center for Teaching and Learning. Currently, the Dean is the director of the CTL.

An advisory council, whose membership includes representatives from preparation programs across the three colleges, is charged by the executive board to lead the efforts of the CTL.

Members of the CTL accomplish their work through subcommittees that collaborate to coordinate all programs designed to prepare education professionals to work in PK-12 schools. Guided by the conceptual framework, the primary responsibilities of the advisory committee are assessment, data interpretation, policy analysis, curriculum reviews and recommendations, faculty professional development and school partnerships. The directors of CTL and OREA as well as faculty members of the CTL are responsible for accreditation, program review, curriculum, communication and public relations, and policy formulation and review.

Members of the advisory council report directly to the CTL Executive Board, as do members of the CTL Assessment Committee, the Candidate Scholarship Committee, and the Professional Education Advisory Boards. Committees that report to the Advisory Council include the Faculty Development and Scholarship Committee; the Candidate Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention Committee; the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; the Graduate Programs Committee; the PK-12 School-Based Services Committee; the Educational Technology Advisory Committee, and the Diversity and Equity Committee.

CTL membership includes fulltime tenure track and fulltime non-tenure track faculty who teach in, or administer, one of the professional preparation programs. While public school personnel are voting members of the committees on which they may serve, they are ad hoc members of the CTL by virtue of their committee appointments.

Although the CTL is the organizing body, programs and the faculty who implement them are housed in traditional fashion within colleges and departments. Large departments, such as the Department of Education, are structured around programs (e.g., Elementary Education, Special Education, Early Childhood Education or Reading). Smaller programs, for example Social Studies Education or Traffic Safety, fall under the direction of a single faculty member with expertise in the content and pedagogy of the discipline. Still other program faculties collaborate to provide candidates across related programs (e.g., the professional sequence) with a stronger, more cohesive set of experiences.

PART II: EVIDENCE FOR MEETING EACH STANDARD

Standard II: Accountability
Residency Teacher / Principals and Program Administrators

B: The Assessment System

Criteria: *(1)(b) "The unit has an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework(s) and state standards and collects and analyzes data on qualifications, candidate and graduate performances, unit operations and program quality". (1)(c) "Explicit connections between professional, state and institutional standards, and candidate assessments."*

Assessment System Introduction

Consistent with the conceptual framework's constructivist philosophy, the CTL assessment system has dynamically evolved over the past decade as a result of relevant and meaningful experiences, which include constituent and community feedback. The latest edition of the system is comprehensively designed to be purposely redundant in the measurement of standards, flexible enough to meet specific program requirements, and robust enough to provide unit-wide analyses for the purpose of improving program and unit (CTL) operations, including the evaluation of the system. Multiple assessment measures are collected using a transitional timeline. Data are collected, aggregated, and reported at both the program level and unit level for both initial and advanced programs using CTL, state, and national standards as criteria for the measurements. Data reports and summaries are used by individual faculty to assess their own instruction; by candidates to assess their own learning and development; by program faculty and coordinators to assess program effectiveness; and by the OREA to assess unit operations. Summaries are also shared, discussed, and reported in numerous ways at each level of the unit's governance organization, and are made public through the CTL/OREA web sites. Feedback is sought at every level: candidate, faculty, PEAB, administration, as well as the public, please see Public Survey.

History of Assessment System Development

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) has been using assessment data to advise programs on candidates' performance and satisfaction since the late 1990s. Early on, grades and the results of first year and third year teacher and principal surveys were the primary sources of data. Summaries of these data were regularly shared with faculty and the professional community through PEAB meetings and periodically through faculty/principal/superintendent summit meetings.

The CTL began working on a more comprehensive electronic assessment system in May 2002 as it was revising and updating its conceptual framework and standards. Following a year of meetings, the CTL faculty and administration formally approved a new system in June of 2003 including the use of LiveText (LT) within that system as an additional means for collecting electronic data relative to candidate performance. Although electronic portfolios were the focus at that time, what resulted was an electronic course-based standards-embedded assessment initiative. [Since that time some programs have migrated toward an end-of-program assessment process.] Several training workshops for faculty were conducted throughout August and

September 2003, and an implementation plan was initiated. It was determined that volunteer faculty teaching EDF 301 "An Orientation to Teaching" would introduce LT to candidates from October 2003 through June 2004. A study was conducted to determine candidate acceptance of LT, as well as what additional knowledge and skills candidates' had acquired as a result of its use. Candidate survey data indicated neither a strong acceptance nor a strong dislike for the new electronic assessment requirements. Comparisons between candidates using LT to candidates not yet using LiveText revealed only one significant difference. Candidates using LT had a better understanding of the use of advanced multimedia tools (Northwest Regional Program Report, 2005, p. 84). Prior to publishing this report, data were reported to all faculty during a CTL meeting on 2/8/2004. At the same meeting, the science programs demonstrated the use of LiveText program data for program and course improvement, citing how the data reports in LiveText illustrated a need for course instructors to pay more attention to safety standards.

In February, 2004 a fulltime technology trainer was hired to assist faculty and candidates in the design and sharing of artifacts using LT. During the fall quarter of 2004, twenty-three program evaluations were individually conducted to measure the extent to which each program was including electronic data. These data were evaluated at the same time the Educational Benchmarking Inventory (EBI), and results of the first and third year teacher surveys were presented. As a result, the Teacher PEAB as well as the Advisory Council and Executive Board suggested the CTL needed to increase productivity and improve satisfaction. Therefore, in February 2005 the CTL bought new technologies and each program was assigned computers, scanners, and digital cameras specifically designated for candidate electronic artifact production. Over the next four months, implementation studies were conducted and meetings were held with each program as well as the CTL governing levels to report on the comprehensiveness of the data being shared and reported. Further, on June 10, 2005 the CWU Board of Trustees approved a resolution demonstrating support for the full implementation of the electronic data initiative. In October 2005, the CTL hired and trained five student workers to be "The CTL's LiveText Rescue Team", and established a web site for LiveText assistance for providing focused assistance to candidates having trouble negotiating the LiveText system.

About the same time, a new disposition inventory was being developed and integrated into the LiveText system. The new disposition inventory was distributed to CTL faculty, deans, department chairs, program coordinators, and the advisory council. A pilot test to validate the inventory was conducted using EDF 301 candidates, EDCS 311 candidates, and student teaching candidates. In September 2005, the validation of the disposition inventory was complete and results were shared with faculty. In addition, reliability and validity results were presented in a disposition manuscript submitted for national peer review.

Of course the assessment system consisted of much more than LT candidate performance data and dispositional data. A graphic of the comprehensive assessment system was presented and accepted by the CTL faculty December 5, 2005. It illustrated all of the measurements and standards examined at specified transition points.

- Transition one included admission requirements including GPA, LT rubrics, artifacts, and an admissions assessment, West B results, and the pilot data from the dispositional inventory.

- Transition two included cumulative grades in the professional sequence, LT data in the professional sequence, dispositional data in the professional sequence, and some trial Praxis II results (which were later replaced by the WEST E).

- Transition three included the State Pedagogy Assessment pilot data, LiveText reports, and dispositional data.

- Transition four data included LT reports on professional certificate candidates.

- Transition five, although only planned at the time, was to include NBPTS results. The other advanced programs were to mirror the assessment system graphic and insert their own transition points.

Other measurements used for program and unit operation assessments included: trend analyses of the first and third year teacher and principal survey data, and trend analyses of the EBI data for principals and teachers. Program completer data were collected and reported by Career Services for the years including 2002-2005.

After receiving State and NCATE feedback in May 2007, a unit work plan was developed in partnership with OSPI and shared with all CTL faculty and governance committees. The Office of Research and Evaluation was renamed the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) and thereby assigned an additional responsibility of assessment with an immediate task of evaluating the current assessment system with respect to the feedback provided during the State and NCATE reviews. Moreover, OREA was issued an additional position of research analyst by the Office of the Provost. Data collected are now analyzed, summarized, and shared electronically from one central location. The transitions were also redesigned for the teacher residency program and placed in a matrix table illustrating the standards, how each is measured, and at which transition level.

- Transition I – Admissions

- Transition II – Endorsement Preparation

- Transition III – Student Teaching

- Transition IV – Certification

- Transition V – Graduation Follow-up

At the same time, faculty in each program began evaluating their LT data reporting, making certain that their assessment results were shared with the LiveText program technician, who in turn ensured all required data collected were represented by reports in the LT exhibit room. There is now a complete set of reports representing all courses that programs have designated to require artifacts and rubrics, which specifically measure state, institutional, and national standards. The exhibit room was redesigned to account for reports represented before May 2007 and reports submitted since May 2007. An analysis of the difference demonstrates full unit compliance, which means all programs across the unit have assessed candidates according to their specific program assessment protocols. At the time of the May 2007 visit, the CTL had

assembled 88 reports of aggregated candidate performance data representing 4,820 assessments of candidates in the LT system. After summer and fall quarter 2007, compliance had increased to 137 reports and 5,197 assessments of candidates. This means that an average of 1,200 candidates are being measured on standards, an average of four times during transitions II and III (5,197/ 1200 = 4.3). Winter quarter 2008 data were added to the LT Exhibit Room on March 21st, 2008, which resulted in an additional 2,320 assessments for a current total of 11,231 candidates assessed. Program reports (section 1) provide an overview of how each of the programs are measuring outcomes in relation to the NCATE and State standards of knowledge (content, pedagogy and professional), skills (professional and pedagogical), foundational knowledge, effective teaching, and professional development (also see LT data by program)). Section 1 of the program reports also reveals differences among program assessments, as some program assessments are course-based, while others are end-of-program based. These reports further reveal how faculty have been involved in developing the assessment process, as well as how the assessment of standards relates to the unit's conceptual framework.

During Fall 2007, the CTL Assessment Committee approved a new web-based concept designed by OREA for displaying and managing data in the assessment system. The new system includes the School Administration Program (advanced programs) as well as the Residency Teacher Program (initial programs). All assessment information is displayed under the following categories: programs, standards, measurements (including transitions) aggregated data, graphic summaries, program reports, and unit reports. The change was made to more clearly illustrate the comprehensiveness of the CTL assessment system.

The 2007/2008 Assessment System

The CTL assessment system is based upon a formative and summative evaluation model specifically designed to systematically and redundantly assess standards relative to candidate knowledge, skills, dispositions, and program design. The system is redundant because standards are measured in multiple ways, at multiple times across five transition levels, within endorsement programs, and across endorsement programs. This allows candidates to assess their competency development; for faculty to assess their candidates' learning as well as their own teaching effectiveness (in relation to personal Student Evaluation of Instruction [SEOI] data); for programs to assess the teaching and learning experience; and for the unit to assess operations (which includes a summative evaluation of the assessment system).

The assessment system website graphic was designed to simplify the multidimensionality of the system by illustrating the categories in a linear fashion. The system's categories are transparently displayed in a website graphic for easy access. Any person desiring to review the categorical components of the system would simply click on a category. Contained within each category is a display of the system's internal mechanisms. For example, the transition table found within the "measurement" category of the assessment system graphic illustrates when, where, and how standards are being measured. To examine the entry-level assessment process, the table shows the formative and summative measures used to determine admission acceptance into the residency teacher program. Summative measures used to assess content knowledge standards during Transition I include GPA analyses and WEST B results. In addition, an entry

data spreadsheet is used to measure the admission demographics and an admissions checklist is used to formatively track candidates' progress in attaining entry.

A formative measure of disposition is also conducted during this admission transition. Summaries of these data found in the graphic summaries category are used at several levels: a) by the Admissions/ Certification Office to effectively monitor candidate admission, b) by program faculty in making predictions about candidate success (found in program reports), and c) by the OREA in making inferences for a unit report. The data displayed in the aggregated data category contains data that offers a reviewer (candidates, board members, faculty, administration, the public, and external reviewers open access to all of the data collected). If someone has a question that has not been previously summarized by the OREA, the data are, therefore, accessible for unique analyses. Formal requests can be made to the OREA to analyze and summarize these data to answer queries for offices on campus or agencies off campus that may not have been previously considered. Each transition level works in the same manner. Levels II, III, IV, and V also describe the measures used to examine standards. All of the data collected for each level can be found in the categories of "aggregated data" and "graphic data" consistently recognizable by the measures used to collect the data. This method is used across the system, so that it is easier to view how data are used to interpret standard acquisition as described in each program report and ultimately in the unit report.

The system is built using the common denominator of standards. Standards are measured in a formative fashion within courses, within programs, and again across programs. This redundancy is purposely designed into the system because standard acquisition is believed to be developmental, which is congruent with our conceptual framework. "Within" program measures include those data specific to content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, professional knowledge and skills, and student learning standards, which differ for each content discipline (i.e., elementary, reading, early childhood, math, theatre, health/fitness, etc). This is why each program has a specific assessment process within the larger assessment system. This is also where state competencies are measured (within program using Live Text rubrics and grades). "Across" program measures include data typically collected on all residency teacher candidates and post -graduates (e.g., WEST B and follow-up surveys). In addition to these typical measures, standards are measured across programs using data collected in the professional sequence and student teaching. Professional sequence data include LT reports for all courses that all candidates are required to complete. Similarly, a Final Student Teaching Evaluation is used to formatively assess all candidates particularly addressing elements of state standard V. The State's Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA) Instrument is a summative measure used to ensure candidates who pass student teaching meet all standards.

Guided by the conceptual framework's 5 standards and 22 competencies, a matrix analysis was designed to align CTL, state, and national standards. Because most standards are related to the INTASC standards, the matrix of standards was created to demonstrate the common linkages between institutional, state, and national standards. To simplify the standards analyses, most assessments refer to the institutional standard (CTL standards) although some programs also reference state standards. Programs also reference state competencies as specified by program endorsements. These standards are cited and referenced in each program and across programs through course syllabi, program handbooks, LT artifacts, rubrics, and reports. In addition, OREA has examined how frequently standards are measured and where standards are measured

in the LiveText portion of the system (see sections 1-3 of program reports for each program). Taking the standards analysis one step further, OREA has summarized the standards measured within programs and across programs. Using standards as the criteria, analyses drill into data that are formatively assessed through course work and summarily interpreted by programs. The purpose is to assess how well the candidates are formatively and summatively meeting standards. Standards, after all, are the primary targets of measurement. Because there are so many different standards to make it simple, the system systematically addresses all standards at all levels and uses a complex assortment of redundant analyses and formative summaries to ensure all candidates are being measured and are meeting all standards.

Evaluation of the Assessment System

To be completely comprehensive, the assessment system must have a mechanism with which to evaluate the categories and components of the system. This examination is divided into four levels: a) the accuracy, fairness, and consistency of the measures; b) standard, artifact, and rubric analyses; c) technology effectiveness; and d) the usefulness of data presentation for program reporting. Evaluation of the assessment system is conducted annually and revealed in the unit report, which is published and shared publicly on the assessment system website.

- Accuracy, Fairness, and Consistency

The West B, West E, PPA, and the EBI are state supported assessments, which have been tested for validity and reliability by the agencies that were contracted to create the instruments. The Disposition Inventory was validated in September 2005 (see manuscript). LiveText inter-rater summary (accuracy) data are examined electronically and automatically on a continuous basis and updated as each new set of data is entered into the system. Inter-rater data can be found at the bottom of each report in the LT Exhibit Room. Under each assessment report is an inter-rater summary report. Content validity of the LT data were produced by each program as faculty discussed and agreed on the content to be assessed and how it is to be assessed. Efficacy of agreement is reviewed in section 3 of the annual program reports.

To ensure fairness and consistency, faculty within programs have met and agreed on the type of artifact candidates must submit. No matter who teaches a particular course requiring an artifact, the artifact will be the same for all candidates. In addition, the rubric assessing a particular artifact will be the same regardless of which faculty member is assessing the artifact. This ensures that all candidates are being assessed consistently and fairly on standards associated with each artifact. The next section reveals how accuracy, consistency, and fairness are reflected in program reports. The final measurement examined is grades. The CTL has been able to disaggregate grades and WEST E scores by program and the OREA has conducted descriptive statistics to show how closely the scores align. This is used to estimate a prediction of candidate success, although program reports also predict candidate success through the analysis of standard compliance (see section 4, Program Reports), and the unit report.

- Standards, Artifacts, Rubrics,

The assessment system is evaluated annually with regards to how the standards are being assessed. A standards analysis using continuous LT data has been reported and shared with

programs (see levels 2, 3, and 4 of the program reports). Prompts provided to programs and for which programs have provided responses, include:

1) Are the standards dispersed appropriately in your program?
2) Are all the standards represented as you wish them to be?
3) After reviewing this analysis are there changes your program would recommend making to the way you cite standards or assess your candidates using LiveText?
4) Please examine all of your reports in the LiveText exhibit area and discuss the accuracy, consistency, and fairness of the data, as well as what improvements could be made in the program assessment rubrics, courses, artifacts, or reporting.
5) Using these data, please reflect upon your candidates' success in meeting standards.
6) Compare these data to the data provided in the WEST B and E charts that follow. Is there consistency in the rates of success?

An external consultant evaluated the LT standards, artifacts, and rubrics during the summer of 2007 and again March 2008, which are found under the unit report category of the assessment system (2007 Assessment System Evaluation, 2008 Assessment System Evaluation/LiveText Standards Assessment (C, P, PP, SL)).

- Technology Effectiveness and Program Reporting

The unit report is a synthesis of the conclusions and interpretations written by each program as represented by each of the program reports. Because one of the functions of the assessment system is the integrated use of technology, program reports have included statements of strengths and challenges relative to using the LT electronic system, as well as the web- based reporting system. In determining how to improve unit operations, the governance system continuously discusses recommendations from faculty, students, and our professional community regarding better ways to collect, analyze, and report accountability information. To promote the professional culture in which data are a regular part of the faculty conversation, effective as well as efficient use of technology is continuously being discussed and enhanced. Conversations surrounding a desire for exploring a better electronic system have reached a point of consensus across the unit.

As the university also struggles with this issue, representatives for the CTL assessment committee discuss information learned from program reports with the university's assessment committee. There was an RFI issued on February 6, 2008 by the University's Information Technology Services unit to invite vendors to submit information about new technologies that may meet university-wide accountability needs. The request for information calls for a comprehensive academic assessment System that will enhance Academic Program Planning, Tracking & Assessment and Academic student learning/outcomes assessment. Please see the unit report for specific information regarding the evaluation of our current technology and program report effectiveness.

C: Use of Data for Program Improvement

Criteria: *(2) "During the first year following program completion, the unit solicits feedback from program completers employed in education, and their supervisors, regarding program's effectiveness." (3) "Maintain placement records for all program completers during the first year following program completion."*

An examination of the assessment system's category, entitled program reports demonstrates how the CTL regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, clinical experiences, and unit operations. Although faculty have been examining LiveText and WEST E data quarterly, and providing evidence of monitoring these data through program minutes and notes, a new annual reporting system has been developed and approved by the CTL for the purpose of improving the unit's systematic analyses and reporting efforts.

Programs are now provided, immediately following winter quarter, graphic summaries and short interpretations of both unit-wide and program specific candidate and post-graduate performance data. The summaries include: a Standard Citation Analysis, LiveText Rubric Reports, Candidate Success on Standards Across Courses or Dimensions, WEST B Trends, WEST E Trends, EBI Teacher and Principal Trends, First and Third Year Teacher Trends, Dispositional Analyses, a Final Student Teaching Evaluation LT Report, and Career Services Program Completer data. In return, program coordinators are asked to share these summaries with their respective faculties to facilitate discussions that ultimately culminate in responses to each set of summarized data. The culminating responses are syntheses of those conversations, which become evidence that the unit analyzes program data and performance data to initiate improvements where necessary. Programs are given the entire spring quarter to edit or update their reports as necessary. At the end of the spring quarter, program reports are locked and archived. At that time a final unit report is also archived.

The primary purpose of the program reports is to create a professional culture in which evidence and data are a regular part of faculty conversation, as well as to discretely demonstrate how the CTL uses data to update courses, improve programs, and evaluate unit operations including the assessment system. The latter is completed after all of the program reports have been submitted. Each program report is read and a content analysis is conducted across all program reports. The unit report is the last category of the Assessment System Graphic. The graphic depicts the unit report as the culminating analysis and report, which is fed back to programs, CTL governing committees, PEABs, and is open to the public for comment. PEAB minutes verify that data are regularly shared and evaluated, which result in recommendations for program and unit improvement. Please refer to the Unit Report category for details of the content analysis findings.

A public survey has been developed using Question Pro. This survey provides the academic community (candidates, faculty outside of the professional unit, and administrators), the professional community, and interested public with an opportunity to comment in a systematic way and to assess the data, summaries, programs, and unit reports published on the web. As the graphic illustrates, the assessment system is an open process of continuous improvement, which is closed looped, multilayered, comprehensive, efficient, reflective, and effective.

Standard IV: Program Design
Residency Teacher

C: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Criteria: *(3)(a) Programs shall assure that candidates are provided with opportunities to learn the pedagogical knowledge and skills required for the particular certificate, and for teacher preparation programs, the endorsement competencies.*

D: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Criteria: *(3)(b) Programs shall assure that candidates are provided with opportunities to learn the professional knowledge and skill required for the particular certificate.*

There are multiple ways, in which the unit ensures candidates' abilities to apply pedagogical content knowledge (P), and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (PP) as delineated on professional, state, and institutional standards. The CTL ensures that candidates are provided: a) an in-depth understanding of the subject they plan to teach; b) a myriad of teaching and learning strategies through challenging coursework, and c) multiple opportunities to reflect on learning and practice. As is evident in the conceptual framework, candidates construct knowledge in a similar manner that the CTL faculty expect candidates to facilitate knowledge construction for students they will ultimately teach. A key emphasis of a CWU candidate's preparation, therefore, is the differentiation of student learning based on individual student need.

West E results indicate a greater than 90% pass rate across all programs, rubric-based assessments indicate exemplary ratings of at least 90% across and within all programs, and no candidate advances to student teaching with a GPA lower than a 3.0. These measurements as well as other indicators are found within the Assessment System. The measurements, aggregated data, and summaries of the data are used at the various transition levels, and aligned by state and national standards as presented in the assessment system. A summary for all candidates can be examined in the unit and in summary graphics.

Evidence of Program Design

At a rudimentary input level, the unit checks syllabi for standards and how those standards are being measured, and at the same time each syllabus is entered by program on the website for public observation. Syllabi and standards that for this review include the P and PP standards and are consequently placed under the Program category of the Assessment System for each program reference (look at the top for program matrix) also see LiveText Standards Assessment (C,P,PP,SL) . The LiveText electronic exhibit room is also organized by program. The aggregated data reports are organized in the LiveText electronic exhibit room by: Content Knowledge (C), Pedagogical Content Knowledge (P), Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills (PP), and Student Learning (S). Programs check standard competency in three ways: by Washington Competencies: by C, P, PP, and SL; and by Washington foundational knowledge, effective teaching, and professional development (WAC elements a-y). Each program decides which courses will require artifacts that will be used to assess candidates on particular standards. The unit ensures that standards are being measured by analyzing the data reported in LiveText

using a triangulation method, the results of which are found in the program reports and unit report.

The first measure identifies and counts the number of courses and artifacts that were specifically used to measure content knowledge (27 courses/47 artifacts), pedagogical content knowledge (36/50), pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills (38/82), and student learning (6/12) please see LiveText Standards Assessment (C,P,PP,SL) In addition, this measure totals the number of candidates assessed according to each of standards, each year. Prior to May 2007 visit, 4,820 candidate assessments were measured using this method. By the end of fall 2007 quarter, the number of candidate assessments increased to 5,197, and by the end of winter quarter 2008 the number of candidate assessments increased to 6,411.

The second measure standard citation analysis, can be accessed under program reports section 2, which identifies and counts each time standards are measured and identifies where standards are measured within the sequence of the endorsement program and across all endorsement programs using the sequence of courses all candidates are required to complete. This analysis of the data is not only used to ensure that all standards and competencies are being measured, but equally as important that these data illustrate how and where programs are measuring standards. The latter is useful for evaluating the programs' assessments and subsequently the unit assessment system.

The third measure of the triangulation method candidates' levels of success on standards across courses and dimensions can be accessed under program reports section 4, which verifies how well candidates are achieving standards within each program and across programs. The last two measures use disaggregated data by program and therefore include state competency standards in the analyses. Triangulation results clearly indicate that candidates are redundantly measured on standards as they progress through the residency teacher program, and as they progress through their chosen endorsement program. It should be noted that this redundancy paradigm (rehearsal and scaffolding) is purposely built into the assessment process because of the CTL's constructivist philosophy of learning as presented in its conceptual framework. Therefore, it is reassuring to discover that when these measures are examined separately and together, the data consistently indicate that over 90% of the candidates are reaching proficient levels of acquisition on all required performance standards (content, pedagogy, and skills. Another way to view what programs use to ensure candidates are meeting pedagogical content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills is to enter the LiveText Exhibit Room. Individual faculty, endorsement programs, and the unit use these reports to assess how well the courses are preparing candidates to achieve standards, and how well the artifacts and rubrics are measuring candidate success (see section 3 of the program reports).

By disaggregating grades in courses that are identified as primarily C, P, PP, or SL; the unit analyzed whether there was a commonality between candidate success on WEST E scores and candidate success on standards as measured by grades (see GPA vs WEST E and P/PP vs Pro-Sequence Grades Graphic Summaries). Using this basic exploratory descriptive analysis, the data show some level of commonality. The next edition of LT promises to provide a method to identify candidates by student identification number. When this is made available, the OREA plans to conduct a correlational analysis to see if there are any statistical relationships between these two measures and to determine the strength of those relationships. Once that is accomplished, the next analysis will be to examine the grades of pedagogy courses and rubric

scores. In the meantime, for this current review under these particular standards, the evidence strongly suggests CTL candidates show high levels of competence when measured on all required standards of the teacher residency program, particularly pedagogical content knowledge, and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Other measures that provide the unit with confidence that our candidates are entering the world of teaching with the requisite knowledge and skills as measured by standards include the first and third year teacher data, as well as the EBI principal and teacher data. These EBI surveys are administered through OSPI and are contracted through Educational Benchmarking Inc. The EBI graphic summaries represent a seven-year average satisfaction trend by category. Highest satisfaction ratings are in the areas of: student learning, instructional strategies, management, control, and environment. While the lowest satisfaction ratings are in the areas of reading skills. The five-year Principal response trend followed similar patterns as teachers. Principals and teachers frequently comment on how well prepared CWU teachers are when they are hired. What is interesting, is that a three-year graphic trend of first and third year teachers indicates first year teachers consistently feel more satisfied with their learning than third year teachers. Even more interesting is that both first and third year teachers consistently rate subject matter knowledge and application of EALRs higher than their skills in classroom management, and involving and collaborating with parents. These interpretations are shared with faculty, who in turn discuss and respond to these findings in the program reports (please refer to section eight of program reports).

Each program is provided summary tables of each of these trends and asked to comment on the measures, the data, and especially the performances as well as the satisfaction ratings regarding current candidates' rates of success in meeting standards. Further evidence of this level of analysis can be found in program reports. To examine the results of all candidates you must look specifically at the professional sequence and final student teaching evaluation program reports.

Furthermore, to ensure that professional, state, and institutional standards are being addressed in the program and measured in the Assessment System, in the Standards section of the Assessment System there are two matrices that demonstrate the alignment of professional (INTASC 1-10 and NCATE 1), state (WA II, IV, and V), and institutional (CTL 1.1-1.5) standards. One matrix aligns the standards numerically, while the other matrix aligns the standards with greater definition of the standards' language. The latter includes new Standard V (2009) language as well as current Standard V language. This has been done to assist the unit in making a smooth transition to the new Standard V intent, as we adapt instruction and assessment to meet the new language and requirements.

Standard V: Knowledge and Skills
Residency Teacher

Foundational Knowledge (a)-(k); Effective Teaching (l)-(v);
and Professional Development (w)-(y)

As stated previously in the Standard IV narrative, matrices under the Standards category ensure the unit has clearly articulated the integration of knowledge and skills across all programs. In addition, matrices by endorsement program are found under the Programs category, for example the professional sequence illustrates curriculum mapping of the artifacts, assessment tool, where in the course sequence assignments are assessed, and how the CTL/WAC 181-78A-270 standard elements are aligned. LiveText data and course grades provide evidence for compliance with the a-y elements of Standard V, which are also identified in course syllabi and measured in programs and across programs. Programs have the option of citing the standards directly or citing the CTL standard that is associated with the state element. The standards matrices aligns the standards in this way: CTL standard 1.1 reflects elements a and b; 1.2 reflects elements (b), (e), (f), (l), (p), (r), (s),and (x); 1.3 reflects elements (c), (d), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (r), and (w); 1.4 reflects (k), (r), (u), (v); and 1.5 (m), (n), (o), (q), (t), (u). Throughout the sequence of study, candidates are specifically instructed in and assessed on these standards. A formative assessment of these standards is conducted using the Final Student Teaching Evaluation and a final summative assessment using Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment Instrument. The Final Student Teaching Evaluation data can be accessed in the LiveText Exhibit Room. In addition, the Final Student Teaching Evaluation interpretations of candidate success can be found in the program reports and the unit reports. These reports also reveal how each program plans to address the few but common deficits, which are identified in the data associated with these standards. The Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment instrument is collected and filed, but there are no data to aggregate because the criteria (met or unmet) are too discrete to discern anything other than rate of success. The rate of success is 98%. There are approximately 2 candidates each quarter who do not pass the PPA. For those few candidates, an individualized remediation program is developed through the Office of Field Experiences. Some of the candidates, after individualized counseling, decide to discontinue their pursuit of a teaching degree. Others reapply to student teach in a subsequent quarter.

Examination of the data reports in the LiveText Exhibit room, on the Standards Analyses, and on the C, P, PP, & SL assessment reveal different numbers of candidates being assessed in different courses. It is important to understand why these differences occur. Approximately 200 candidates are accepted and complete the Residency Teacher Program each quarter. Even though all candidates are required to complete the professional sequence, many arrive with courses that are equivalent to some of the courses in the sequence, so different numbers of candidates actually take the professional sequence courses. Other differences are due to candidates' dropping courses or having to take courses more than once. The unit has separated the data for analysis (pre may 2007 and post may 2007). The pre May 2007 includes data accumulated since the use of LiveText began. The post May 2007 data include only those courses taught spring, summer, and fall 2007, and winter 2008. Data that includes winter 2008 are represented in LiveText reporting. Data automatically accumulate as faculty enter rubric results. Given the fact that the unit has compiled over 11,000 candidate assessments just on LiveText (multiple assessments for any one candidate), it is believed that there is sufficient

evidentiary data to make a determination on the preparation of candidates according to standards. The unit has aggregated an enormous amount of data to interpret candidate competencies and program effectiveness, and to accurately recommend program and unit improvements. This line of reasoning can be followed as one examines the assessment system data from measurement through unit report.

A: Foundational Knowledge

A review of Professional Sequence syllabi demonstrates that required foundational knowledge is provided for all candidates and includes clear targets/standards that are aligned with appropriate learning opportunities. Specifically, content methods courses cover method and materials for teaching specific endorsement areas as well as appropriate EALRs and GLEs associated with the content area (e.g., Science – SCED 342: Science Education in Secondary Schools; History – HIST 421: Methods and Materials in Social Studies, Secondary; Teaching English as a Second Language – EDBL 318: Culture & Curriculum). Courses in the Professional Sequence specifically address and assess a-y elements. For example, EDF 301: Foundations of Education, which includes professional responsibilities and an introduction to the professional certificate. Specifically the EDF 301 syllabus states, "*Write a 750-1500 word teaching philosophy. Idealistic and practical factors influence, our philosophies. This course has provided you an opportunity to explore elements within the continuum of these factors. Therefore, include with your paper elements of philosophical (particularly constructivism), historical (influences of social change) and legal (Washington State reform efforts e.g. WASL and EARLS), diversity and equity in learning and teaching, and the organization, governance and funding of public education.*" The philosophy of education requirement covers WAC 181 (a), (c), and (i). The artifact in LT, for PSY 314: Human Growth and Development is an "*ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY. You will write a 2-3 page annotated bibliography of a research journal article on a specific topic in developmental psychology. Your bibliography will begin with an APA format reference, followed by a detailed summary of the article, and will conclude with an analysis of how the article applies to your career as an educator. Specific topics, acceptable journals, and additional guidelines will be provided. This paper must be posted in your LiveText portfolio, and I must be listed as a "Reviewer" for you to receive credit for this assignment. Rewrites will not be accepted."* This artifact covers WAC 181(e) and (f). EDCS 444: Educational Law, which includes professional ethics and issues of child abuse, requires a self-reflection artifact on legal influences in education and organization, governance, or funding. The course focuses on WAC 181 (g), (h), and (j). Syllabi, course artifacts, and rubric alignments (pro sequence matrix) provide evidence of strong subject matter and foundational coursework that is aligned to state, national, and institutional standards. By examining all of the course data that measure foundational knowledge, it is evident that not only are candidates measured several times, but each time they are assessed over 90% of the candidates' perform at an exemplary level in foundational knowledge.

B: Effective Teaching

Specific courses focus on instructional strategies, for example, EDCS 311 Teaching: Classroom Curriculum, Management and Assessment, which requires candidates to develop a unit of instruction that includes learning goals, student contextual information, planned sequences of lessons, modifications for students from diverse backgrounds and those with exceptionalities,

working with parents, and assessments and includes information aligned with WAC 181 (m), (o), (r), and (s). EDCS 424: Reading in the Content Fields or EDRD 308: Reading I both include strategies for the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties and includes information aligned with WAC 181 (p) and (q). EDF 302: Introduction to Students with Exceptionalities includes information and strategies for working with student with a variety of learning needs and includes information aligned with WAC 181 (1) and (n).

Aggregated candidate data in all courses is made available to make course and program decisions. For example, from information based on course evaluations and LT data from EDCS 311, it was determined that, although candidates were proficient in developing measures to assess learning targets, more instruction was needed on interpreting the results and using the results to inform instructional planning. Therefore, additional information has been added to the course (refer to program minutes).

C: Professional Development

Specific courses aligned with elements w-y, for example, include PSY 314 Human Development, EDCS 316 Educational Technology, EDCS 444 Education Issues and the Law, and EDCS 431 Multicultural Education. These are examples of courses all candidates are required to complete. In each program, however, student growth and learning, technology, and decision-making are addressed specifically for applications relative to the subject matter content. The Program matrices category on the Assessment System will demonstrate how specific programs measure professional development elements.

Student teaching data reveal a final formative measure of a-y elements that is produced just prior to the summative PPA measure. Candidate data demonstrate the level of competence candidates have attained in Standard V during transition III. Because these data refer to all candidates, the report is shared with all programs and open to public review. Program reports section 10 reveal what faculty recommend for improving candidate competence, particularly in the areas of Standard V. Candidates are generally performing at a high level, although there are some candidates (≤.10), as depicted by the colors green and red who are not performing to standard.

Examination of those elements indicates some agreement with the 1st and 3rd year teacher survey results.

Standard IV: Program Design
Principals and Program Administrators

A: The Conceptual Framework

At Central Washington University, the conceptual framework (CF) as illustrated is centered in constructivist philosophy specifically embracing contextual, reflective, inquiry, and community based teaching and learning research, theory, and practice. Standards that include content, pedagogy, equity, and technology are measured through knowledge, skills, and dispositions, which are examined transitionally to inform efficacy. The framework is further defined through seven distinguishable but compatible components:

The first component is **the professional commitments, dispositions, and beliefs**. This includes commitments, on the part of the university and the Center for Teaching and Learning, to support outstanding programs for the preparation of professional educators and shared beliefs about learning, generally, and professional educator preparation specifically.

The second component is the philosophy of the program. Typically, a unit will adopt a formal **philosophy** that encompasses a perspective about how learning occurs and how the teaching act influences learning. At Central Washington University, the philosophy is constructivism.

The third component is the program **theme**, a word picture that describes the program or its primary goal. Consistent with the professional commitments, dispositions, and values, and with the philosophy of constructivism, Central Washington University has chosen the theme "facilitators of learning in a diverse world" to emphasize what the faculty strive to be and what they encourage their candidates to become.

The fourth component is the **knowledge base**. The knowledge base identifies contemporary research, the wisdom of practice, and emerging educational policies and practices on which all other elements of the conceptual framework rest.

The fifth component is program **competencies**. The competencies describe major categories of performance indicators, which characterize initial or advanced level professional educators. Three developmental strands describe sequence and coherence of the initial preparation program. A fourth strand is introduced when candidates seek an advanced degree. Candidates progress through each strand as they learn how to become facilitators of learning in a diverse world. Strand I is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as an Expert learner. Strand II is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as Knowledge Specialist. Strand III is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as Master of Art and Science of Teaching and Strand IV is entitled, Facilitator of Learning as a Teacher Specialist/Scholar.

The sixth component is **field experience**, in which the philosophy of and requirements for field-based application are described.

The seventh component is **assessment.** Consistent with the conceptual framework's constructivist philosophy, the CTL assessment system has dynamically evolved over the past decade as a result of relevant and meaningful experiences, which include constituent and community feedback. Assessment data are used by individual faculty to assess their own

instruction; by candidates to assess their own learning and development; by program faculty and coordinators to assess program effectiveness; and by the OREA to assess unit operations (Assessment System).

The CF serves all of the CTL's programs except for the School Counseling and School Psychology programs, which have developed a separate conceptual framework. The Principal and Program Administrator Program uses the CTL conceptual framework as presented, and is positioned within the framework under the Facilitator of Learning as Teacher/Specialist Scholar strand. Standards of the Teacher/Specialist Scholar strand are common for all advanced programs, which ensures that each of the unit's advanced programs design a curriculum relative to commonly held beliefs of what a graduate of the unit values, knows, and is able to do. The strand is written to be inclusive of standards specific to each program. Each of the unit's advanced programs refers to the seven standards of this strand as curriculum is being designed, assessed, and redesigned. Notwithstanding, outcome measurements are specifically defined with standards associated with each program's respective professional community, association, or discipline. Advanced programs illustrate the relationship between these CF standards and their respective professional standards by creating an alignment matrix.

The Principal and Program Administrator Program uses ISLLC standards to guide instructional assessment and dispositional assessment. Below is an analysis of school administrator's candidate dispositions when they began their internship in summer 2007.

A completed self-inventory was collected from 16 candidates; the data were entered into SPSS for analysis. In reference to the ISSLC Standard 1, Disposition indicators, 64% rated themselves high on the educability of all children (concept 4 &12). Results for concepts 11 and 13 need to be reconsidered, due to low ratings of candidates themselves. Concepts 8, 9, and 10 are evaluated as being above average (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

On Standard 2, ISSLC, "advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth" the Disposition indicators for concepts 39 through 46, indicate that the candidates' mastery of the concepts are average (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

On Standard 3, ISSLC, "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment," the Disposition indicators revealed that**,** 64% of the candidates show sufficient mastery of taking risk to improve school (concept 76). Concepts 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81 show average results of the candidates' disposition (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

Standard 4, ISSLC, "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. The Disposition indicators results show a considerable weakness. Concepts 110 through 117 percentages are below expected average, which is 60% (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

Standard 5, ISSLC, “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.” The Disposition indicators results show some weakness in the candidate mastery of the concepts. However, on concept 146 (examines personal and professional values), 64% of the candidates show sufficient mastery of the concept (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

Standard 6, ISSLC, “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.” The Disposition indicators show that majority of the candidates’ scores fell between some or sufficient mastery of the concepts (Tables in Pre Autumn Report).

Standard V: Knowledge and Skills
Principals and Program Administrators

(1) Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community

(2) Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

(3) Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

(4) Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

(5) Through professional leadership by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

(6) Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Central Washington University school administration program is designed to prepare school leaders to demonstrate strategic, instructional, organizational, political, and community leadership. Candidates in the program have the opportunity to participate in a process that is structured to: a) meet the professional development needs of educational leaders; b) focus on student centered success; c) provide a schedule that meets the needs of educational professionals; d) prepare candidates for the challenging new directions in education; and e) provide an experience in which the best practice of practical, policy, personnel and political (legal and social) aspects of school administration and instructional leadership are experienced, understood and practiced.

The school administration program is further designed to provide school leaders the knowledge and skills based on the of the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium standards (ISLLC) which are aligned with the Washington standards for administrator preparation in Washington State.

To provide school leaders with the opportunity to examine their own school leadership practices with respect to the knowledge, dispositions, and performances contained within the ISLLC Standards, during the Pre-Autumn internship orientation on August 3, 2007, 15 candidates for Principal and 2 for Program Administrator attended an orientation. At the orientation, a self-inventory designed to provide a personal profile of the school leadership assets based on the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders was administered to the candidates. The candidates were asked to respond to each statement by reflecting on what they have learned, what they believe and value, and what they are accomplishing as a school leader. The results of this self-evaluation suggest that the candidates have some mastery of the ISSLC standards. For detailed explanation of results and recommendations, see evidence in Pre-Autumn Self-Evaluation Report. It should noted that results were shared with candidates, PEAB members, and College Dean, Department chair, and School Administration faculty. A post self-evaluation will be completed in June to compare interns' mastery of the standards.

To demonstrate how candidates are meeting the goals of Standard V Knowledge and Skills, each component of the standard is addressed in sections a-f below. The components are addressed in assignments and experiences aligned with ISLLC Standards, as well as in the following coursework: EDAD 580, EDAD 581, EDAD 582, EDAD 583, EDAD 584, EDAD 586, EDSE 512, and EDAD 692/693. Syllabi are found in the assessment system under programs and syllabi and rubrics are found in The LiveText Exhibit Room.

The principal interns meet the ISLLC standards through the preparation and assessment of a professional growth plan found in the syllabi, rubric assessments, and reports on LiveText. (See program matrix) The artifacts that are produced to demonstrate these competencies includes weekly research topics (e.g., management theory) Professional Leadership Plan (e.g., vision of leadership) and such as developing a mission and vision statements as evidence in LiveText system and aggregated (See evidence in Program Report).

For the implementation of the principal interns professional growth plans, the university supervisors, building supervisors and interns meet quarterly to review intern's School Improvement Plan (SIP), School Action Plan (SAP), Teaching and Learning (TAL), Resource Alignment Plan (RAP), Community Action Plan (CAP), and Political Analysis Map (PAM) aimed at improving instruction. Please see evidence in interns' plans in portfolios on LiveText. Artifacts in candidates' portfolio are assessed on the course rubric on LiveText, and summarized by individual faculty members for review at a bi-weekly Education Administration program meeting. During meetings recommendations for improvement, if any, are made and shared with candidates for feedback.

(1) Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

To determine whether the interns are meeting component (a) with ISLLC Standard 1, "Articulate, implement, and steward a vision of learning", building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC Standards Quarterly Assessment on the intern's performance and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the results show intern mean scores were consistently above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. The results were shared with PEAB members, faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of the knowledge and skills, they were asked to complete a mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills. The results show that intern mean scores were consistently above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills). Data analysis shows that the interns have a slight weakness in "Developing plan to celebrate efforts and achievement of the vision". The mean score was 2.9. This item was discussed at our intern seminar and faculty meeting, and suggestions were made for mastery of this requirement (See evidence in minutes).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by their building supervisors, mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills, and feedback from PEAB members, candidates, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that our candidates are meeting ISLLC Standard 1, "Articulation, implement, and steward a vision of learning", and standard V knowledge and skills requirements.

(2) Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

To determine whether the interns are meeting component (b) with ISLLC Standard 2, building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC Standards Quarterly Assessment on the intern's performance and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the results show intern mean scores were consistently above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. The result was shared with PEAB members, faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of the Knowledge and Skills, they were asked to complete a Mid-Quarter measurement of Knowledge and Skills. This summary indicates that intern mean scores were consistently above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by building supervisors, and mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills, feedback from PEAB members, candidates, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that our candidates have mastery of ISLLC Standard 2, "Maintaining school culture and instructional program", and Standard V Knowledge and Skills requirements.

(3) Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

To determine whether the interns have mastery of component (c) above, with ISLLC Standard 3, "Management of Organization and Operations", building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC Standards Quarterly Assessment on the intern's performance and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the result showed that the interns' mean score was above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. The results were shared with PEAB members, Department chair, Education Administration faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of Standard V knowledge and skills requirement, they were asked to complete a mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills. The results show the intern mean scores were above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills). The interns show some weakness in "Identifies the responsibilities related to financial, human, and material resources as required by state law, board policy, and employee contract. The mean score was 2.9 (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by their building supervisors, and feedback from PEAB members, candidates' feedback, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that candidates are meeting ISLLC Standard 3, "Manages of the school's organization, operations, and resources", and the knowledge and skills requirements.

As to the item, "Identifies the responsibilities related to financial, human, and material resources as required by state law, board policy, and employee contract", it was recommended at the

seminar that interns discuss the item with their building supervisors and take a more active role in budget meetings and contract discussions as required by state law.

(4) Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

To determine whether the interns are meeting component (d) above, with ISLLC Standard 4, "Collaborates with family and community", the building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC standards quarterly assessment on the intern and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the results show the intern mean scores are above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. It should be pointed out that the intern mean scores on "Understands that parental support affects student success in school" was 4.00. The interns were very proud of themselves after seeing these results. The results were shared with PEAB members, faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of Standard V knowledge and skills requirement, they were asked to complete a mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills. The results show intern mean scores were above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by their building supervisors, mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills, feedback from PEAB members, interns, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that candidates have sufficient mastery of ISLLC Standard 3, "Manages of the school's organization, operations, and resources", and Standard V knowledge and skills requirements.

(5) Through professional leadership by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner

To determine whether the interns are meeting component (e) with ISLLC Standard 4, "Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner", building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC Standards Quarterly Assessment on the interns and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the results show intern mean scores above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. The results were shared with PEAB members, faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of Standard V knowledge and skills requirement, they were asked to complete a mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills. The results show intern mean scores to be above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by their building supervisors, mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills, feedback from PEAB members, interns, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that candidates have sufficient mastery of ISLLC Standard 3, "Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner", and Standard V knowledge and skills requirements.

(6) Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context

To determine whether the interns are meeting component (f) with ISLLC Standard 4, "Collaborates with family and community", building supervisors are required to do an ISLLC Standards Quarterly Assessment on the interns and mail the assessment to the director of the program for analysis. After data analysis, the results indicate that intern mean scores were consistently above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. The results were shared with PEAB members, faculty, and interns for review and feedback (see evidence in the ISLLC Standards-Quarterly Assessment Report). To determine whether the interns have mastery of Standard V knowledge and skills requirement, they were asked to complete a mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills. The results show intern mean scores were above 3.00 out of a maximum of 4.00. However, mean scores for "items 41, 42, and 43 were below 3.00 (see evidence in Mid-Quarter Measurement of Knowledge and Skills).

Based on the results of the analysis of the candidates' portfolios, assessment of interns' performance by their building supervisors, the mid-quarter measurement of knowledge and skills, feedback from PEAB members, and university supervisors, it can be concluded that our candidates could improve in meeting ISLLC Standard 3, "Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context, and resources." The knowledge and skills requirements component needs improvement. The PEAB recommended that interns attend school board meetings, community social activities, get to know their legislators, and learn more about the process of passing a school bond.