

PROGRAM REPORT FOR THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS (School Building Leadership Level) Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Option A (2011 Standards)

NOTE: This form uses the ELCC standards approved by NCATE in 2011. Beginning in Spring 2013 all programs must use the new standards.

COVER SHEET

1. **Institution Name**

Andrews University

2. **State**

Michigan

3. **Date submitted**

MM DD YYYY

03 / 14 / 2018

4. **Report Preparer's Information:**

Name of Preparer:

Janet Ledesma

Phone:

(269)471-6054

Ext.

E-mail:

jledesma@andrews.edu

Name of Preparer:

Duane Covrig

Phone:

(369)471-3475

Ext.

E-mail:

covrig@andrews.edu

Name of Preparer:

Bordes Henry Saturne

Phone:

(269)471-6702

Ext.

E-mail:

bordes@andrews.edu

5. **CAEP Coordinator's Information:**

Name:	
Kevin Wiley	
Phone:	Ext.
(269)471-3961	
E-mail:	
wileyk@andrews.edu	

6. **Name of institution's program**
Educational Leadership
7. **CAEP Category**
Educational Leadership-Principal
8. **Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared**
P-12
- (1) e.g. K-6, P-12
9. **Program Type**
 Other School Personnel
 Unspecified
10. **Degree or award level**
 Post Baccalaureate
 Master's
 Post Master's
 Specialist or C.A.S.
 Doctorate
 Endorsement only
11. **Is this program offered at more than one site?**
 Yes
 No
12. **If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered**

13. **Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared**
School Principal
14. **Program report status:**
 Initial Review
 Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
 Response to National Recognition With Conditions
15. **Is your Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) seeking**
 CAEP accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
 Continuing CAEP accreditation
16. **State licensure data requirement on program completers disaggregated by specialty area with sub-area scores: CAEP requires programs to provide completer performance data on state licensure examinations for completers who take the examination for the content field, if the state has a licensure testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?**
 Yes

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. **Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ELCC standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

Andrews University (AU) is a private Seventh-day Adventist Christian university in Berrien Springs, Michigan, with a motto to "Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, Change the World."

State, National, and International Contexts

The State of Michigan and our regional accreditation association, Higher Learning Commission (HLC), are responsible for approving Andrews University programs. Our HLC accreditation was renewed in 2017. In 2007, the educational administration program was one of two programs to be the first approved by HLC to be fully delivered online. The School of Education has also been continuously accredited by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1970. In the spring of 2012, the NCATE accreditation was renewed with no areas for improvements (AFI) identified upon the team's accrediting visitation.

In 2007, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) announced a change in its review process. All State approvals after 2008-9 had to be approved by Specialized Professional Association (SPA) organizations recognized by NCATE. As such, we submitted an application to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) in the fall of 2011. In the spring of 2013, we were notified that our Educational Leadership program was nationally recognized.

Michigan policy on K-12 administration licensing has changed. In 1996 the legislature dropped most of the conventional educational and teaching requirements for licensing of administrators. For over a decade, only an associate's degree and simple continuing education were needed. After a decade of university and professional association lobbying, in 2006, laws were created to introduce a voluntary credentialing programming centered on the ISLLC/ELCC standards. Amendment 2009 to Public Act 205, effective January 4, 2010, required the MDE to develop mandatory credential requirements and approve educational administration programs. It also allowed for "alternative pathways to earning the basic school administrator's certificate based on experience or alternative preparation." Credentialing is now mandatory although current practicing administrators will be grandfathered in if they stay in their locations. Once they move, they will have to initiate the credentialing process.

On January 22, 2014, we submitted an application for our MA Educational Leadership degree to be approved as a principal preparation program through the Michigan Department of Education. On July 17, 2014, we were informed that our program had indeed been granted state approval. Although we remain responsive to state (MDE) and regional (NCA) demands and seek to maintain our national ELCC recognition, we also respond to the expectations of the educational system of our sponsoring organization, the Seventh-day Adventist church, and specifically the Adventist Accrediting Association (AAA). As a result, we serve many educators who work throughout the nation and internationally in the Seventh-day Adventist system of

2. **education.** **Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. Please include a description to inform reviewers how the internship/clinical experience(s) have been designed to meet ELCC standards 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3. See Standard 7.0 rubric in Appendix 1 of the 2011 ELCC Standards for reference. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)**

The EDAL680 Internship (3-12 credits) at Andrews University fulfills the requirements of Standard 7.0 by enabling the candidate to work on projects that are focused on the areas of growth that the candidate and the mentor/supervisor have both identified as in need of improvement. The internship experience is substantial and rigorous, as it allows the candidate to deal with increasing responsibilities and more complex tasks. It is also sustained, as the candidate participates in the planned activities during the entire course. By the end of the internship experience, the candidate will have completed the 225-hour field and clinical internship requirement, generally over two semesters, within a school-based environment under the mentorship of a qualified educational leader who has demonstrated expertise in educational leadership. The internship experience includes: (a) conducting a pre- and post-internship self-assessment, (b) conducting a school/building assessment, (c) developing an Educator's Vita, (d) composing a letter of application, (e) compiling a network of resources, (f) experiencing the art of reflective practice, (g) application of knowledge base and practice aligned with ELCC Standards, through the various projects engaged, (h) gaining leadership experiences in specific areas of administrative responsibility, (i) presenting a portfolio demonstrating mastery of the integration between theory and practice. (ELCC 7.1, 7.2, 7.3)

The internship provides opportunity to identify a school site and a mentor, so that all internship experiences are conducted in K-12 school settings. Through various assessments, the candidate is able to obtain a 360-degree view of themselves from the perspective of others. It will also help the candidate create position and leadership goals. The candidate will be able to assess their school, and write their personal Candidate Assessment Narrative. The data collected will enable them to reflect upon and report what the results may suggest during the portfolio presentation. (ELCC 7.1)

The candidate is required to complete 225 hours, generally in 9 to 12-hour increments per week, which demonstrates a sustained internship experience. Additionally, candidates have the option to complete their hour requirements through noncontiguous clinical internships. (ELCC 7.2)

On-site internship mentors are identified and selected based on the following criteria. They (a) are skilled and experienced school administrators in local K-12 schools, (b) may be suggested by the candidate, and (c) have a proven track record as a mentor for our program. Mentors are trained and oriented through one-on-one ongoing sessions between the mentor and the internship coordinator, supported by the program's internship manual. (ELCC 7.3)

3. **Attach the following contextual information:**
Files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

MDE Application	MDE State Approval Letter
-----------------	---------------------------

See the **Attachment** panel.

5. **Candidate Information**

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:		
Educational Leadership MA		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers⁽²⁾
2015	12	0
2016	10	3
2017	10	2

(2) CAEP uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

6. **Faculty Information**

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program. (Please refer to the footnotes for clarification)

Faculty Member Name	Baumgartner, Erich
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Intercultural Studies, Fuller Theological Seminary
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Faculty Coordinator of International Leadership Programs
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	President, American. Society of Church Growth 2006-08 Editor, Journal of Applied Christian Leadership, 2009- present Chair: Andrews University Program Review & Dev Committee, 2007- 2011
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Teacher - Religion in multiple elementary grades

Faculty Member Name	Brand, Jay
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, University of Louisville
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Faculty Member
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor of Leadership and Higher Education
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major	

contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	Covrig, Duane
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Education Administration University of California, Riverside
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Faculty; Chair, Department of Leadership Leadership and Educational Leadership courses
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Presenter, ASDASA: Association of Seventh-day Adventist School Administrators, 2009; Presenter, Atlantic Union Conference Pastors and Teachers Convention, 2009; Presenter, Michigan Conference Teachers Convention, 2009
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	7th grade teacher, 1989-1990; K-6th math instructor, 1988-1989; Substitute teacher: 1987-1988; 1989-1993

Faculty Member Name	Henry Saturne, Bordes
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Religious Sciences, Strasbourg University (France)
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Faculty, Educational Leadership Internship Coordinator
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Associate Professor of Educational Leadership
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Member and Reviewer for University Council of Educational Administration; Member of Michigan Association of Professors of Educational Administration; Reviewer NASPA 2017 Conference submissions (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education)
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Elementary Principal of Hebron School in Brooklyn, New York; Superintendent of Schools for Greater New York Conference; New York State Certified School District Administrator

Faculty Member Name	Jeffery, James R.
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Educational Administration, University of Alberta
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Faculty Dean Emeritus, School of Education, 2003-2015
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	NCATE Board of Examiner (BOE) member (4 visits) and chair (one visit). Chair, MDE Committee of Scholars for Miller College, Battle Creek; President, Seventh-day Adventist Association of Chairs and Deans of Education
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	District Superintendent of Schools, 1988-1995; High School Principal, 1983-88; High School Teacher, 1977-83; Middle School teacher and principal, 1973-77

Faculty Member Name	Ledesma, Janet
----------------------------	----------------

Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Leadership, Andrews University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Associate Dean, Faculty, Professor of Leadership, Coordinator of Educational Leadership Program
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Professional Affiliations: AERA; International Leadership Association; International Mentoring Association; ASCD; National Association of Secondary School Principals; Association of Seventh-day Adventist School Administrators; National Association of Independent Schools Presentations: Resilience and the Leader (How Conceptual Models on Resilience Help Me as an Educational Leader). Peer reviewed paper presentation, UCEA Annual Convention, Detroit, MI: November 18, 2016. Diversity Through the Eyes of Grace. Oral Presentation. Global Leadership Summit, Istanbul, Turkey: January 2, 2015. Conceptual Frameworks and Research Models on Resilience in Leadership. Peer-reviewed paper presentation, Annual Convention of the International Leadership Association, Montreal, Canada: October 31, 2013
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	2006-2011 Principal Pre-K to 8th, Forest Lake Education Center; 2001-2005 Principal Grades 9-12, Garden State Academy; 1989-1999 Principal Grades 1-10, Waldwick Seventh-day Adventist School; 1985-1989 Principal Grades 1-8, Jackson Heights Seventh-day Adventist School; 1982-1985 Teacher Grades 3-4 Jackson Heights Seventh-day Adventists School

Faculty Member Name	Marinho, Robson
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD, Higher Education Administration, Indiana University at Bloomington
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Dean, School of Education; Faculty, Leadership Department
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	ICERI Conference. Madrid, Spain: November 16-18, 2009. Paper presentation. 11th Annual ILA Global Conference, Prague, November 11-14, 2009. Poster presentation. 61st Annual NAFSA Conference, Los Angeles, CA, May 28, 2009. Poster session co-presented with Zachary Mngo and Mordekai Ongo.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	N/A

Faculty Member Name	Randy J. Siebold
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	PhD in Instructional Systems Technology, Indiana University, Bloomington
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Associate Professor of Leadership
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Jeffrey, D. A., & Siebold, R. J. (in press). Upgrading LMSs: Understanding Faculty Perceptions and Use for Improved Implementation. Adventist Online Learning Conference/Conferencia de Aprendizaje en Línea. Gregorutti, G., Siebold, R. J., & Ferguson, D. (2017). Leading Undergraduates to Become Leaders: A Case Study. Journal of Applied Christian Leadership (v11, n1 Spring, 2017).
	Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Lansing, Michigan, USA. July 2007-July 2009 Associate Superintendent of Schools (Teacher supervision K-12; focus on working with secondary principals and school boards; educational use of technology; and strategic planning presentations and retreats) Broadview Academy,

Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾

LaFox, Illinois, USA. June 2005-July 2007 Principal (Designed and implemented a competency-based curriculum in cooperation with teaching faculty and the conference, union, and division educational leaders; added two additional off-the-main-campus sites that used daily videoconferencing and monthly gathering weekends; facilitated the closing of an academy campus)

(3) For example, PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) For example, faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) For example, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by CAEP as a systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

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

(8) For example, officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

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

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ELCC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. **Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)**

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment (10)	Type or Form of Assessment (11)	When the Assessment Is Administered (12)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Portfolio Presentation	Rubric	Presented and completed at the end of the candidate's coursework
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership (required)	Course Grades 1. EDAL 520 Foundations of Educational Administration 2. EDAL 560 K-12 School Law	Course grades, which includes the use of rubrics, projects, research papers, and field experience	Accumulated throughout the course and the final grade is recorded at the end of the course
Assessment #3: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' instructional leadership skills in working with faculty on issues of instruction, curriculum, culture, and professional development within the school. (Required)	Supervision of Instruction Project	An aggregation of several smaller assessments with rubrics leading to a complete observation and plan for a teacher to improve instruction	From weeks 6 to 11 of EDAL 570 Principles of Education Supervision
Assessment #4: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' leadership skills through school-level internship/clinical practice settings.	Internship Experience: Documentation and Portfolio	Internship Portfolio Presentation Rubric: a collection of assessments culminating in the mentor evaluation demonstrating mastery of all seven ELCC standards	At the completion of EDAL 680 Internship
Assessment #5: Assessment of ability to support student learning and development (required)	Educational Leadership Employer Survey	Survey of the graduate's performance by work supervisor	One year after graduation
Assessment #6: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' organizational management and community relations leadership skills in developing effective school-based management and resource systems and school-community partnerships. (Required)	Organizational Management and Community Relations Project	2 Rubrics to assess the candidate's school community engagement	During LEAD 525 Public Relations: Community Partnerships
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)			
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional)			

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

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

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

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ELLC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ELLC standards.

- Standard 1.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1.1 Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.								
1.2 Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.	✓	✓		✓	✓			
1.3 Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.								
1.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.								

- Standard 2.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within a school environment.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
2.1 Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.								
2.2 Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
2.3 Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.								
2.4 Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.								

- Standard 3.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
3.1 Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.								
3.2 Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.								
3.3 Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		
3.4 Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.								
3.5 Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.								

- Standard 4.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school relationships with community partners.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
4.1 Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.								
4.2 Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		
4.3 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.								
4.4 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.								

- Standard 5.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

5.1 Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.
5.2 Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.
5.3 Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.
5.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.
5.5 Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

✓	✓		✓	✓			

6. **Standard 6.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

6.1 Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.
6.2 Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.
6.3 Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		

7. **Standard 7.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor.**

7.1 Substantial Field and Clinical Internship Experience: The program provides significant field experiences and clinical internship practice for candidates within a school environment to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop professional skills identified in the other Educational Leadership Building-Level Program Standards through authentic, school-based leadership experiences. Information should be provided in Section IV, Assessment 4 to address this standard.

7.2 Sustained Internship Experience: Candidates are provided a six-month, concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school-based environment. Information should be provided in Section I (Context), question 2, to address this standard.

7.3 Qualified On-Site Mentor: An on-site school mentor who has demonstrated experience as an educational leader within a school and is selected collaboratively by the intern and program faculty with training by the supervising institution.

Information should be provided in Section I (Context), question 2, to address this standard.

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides/rubrics to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in CAEP Standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

- (1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:
 - a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
 - b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
 - c. A brief analysis of the data findings;

d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
and

(2) Assessment Documentation

- e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
- f. The scoring guide/rubric for the assessment; and
- g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides/rubrics may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above, and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible. Please name files as directed in the guidelines for preparing a SPA Program Report found on the CAEP website at: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

1. **State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to: Standard 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #1: Portfolio

See the **Attachment** panel.

2. **Assessment of content knowledge in educational leadership. ELCC standards addressed in this assessment could include but are not limited to Standard 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0. Examples of assessments include course grades, comprehensive examinations, essays, and/or case studies. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #2: Course Grades

See the **Attachment** panel.

3. **Assessment that demonstrates candidates' instructional leadership skills in working with faculty on issues of instruction, curriculum, culture, and professional development within the school. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: Standard 1.0, 2.0, and 5.0. Examples of assessments include conducting faculty observations, developing a faculty professional development plan, a faculty intervention plan, and/or a school instruction/curriculum project. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment #3: Supervision of Instruction Project

See the **Attachment** panel.

4. **Assessment that demonstrates candidates leadership skills through school-level internship/clinical practice settings. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: Standard 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0. Examples of assessments include faculty evaluations of candidates' performances, internship/clinical site supervisors' evaluations of candidates' performances, internship projects, and evaluation of candidates' formative and summative logs and reflections. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment #4: Internship

See the **Attachment** panel.

5. **Assessment that demonstrates candidates' school leadership skills that support P-12 student learning within a school. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: Standard 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0. Examples of assessments include a school leadership intervention project, an action research project to improve a school problem related to P-12 student learning, and/or project to develop a school P-12 student learning model. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #5: Employer Survey of Leadership Impact

See the **Attachment** panel.

6. **Assessment that demonstrates candidates' organizational management and community relations leadership skills in developing effective school-based management and resource systems and school-community partnerships. ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to: Standard 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0. Examples of assessments include developing school-based strategic plans, a school improvement project, a school-community relations strategic plan, and/or a school simulation. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #6: Community Relations & Organizational Management

See the **Attachment** panel.

7. **Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional). ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, postgraduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, faculty intervention plans, strategic plans, simulations, school intervention plans, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers.**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

8. **Additional assessment that addresses ELCC standards (optional). ELCC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 1-6. Examples of assessments include portfolio tasks, postgraduate 360 evaluations, action research projects, needs assessment projects, faculty intervention plans, strategic plans, simulations, school intervention plans, internship evaluations, candidate test scores on comprehensive exams, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies of employers.**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. **Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.**

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Introduction:

The Educational Leadership Program at Andrews University embraces continuous improvement by assessing our program to improve instruction and deliver optimum learning experiences for our students. As the program faculty have examined our assessment results, it has become apparent to us that we needed to reorganize some of our assessments to more clearly and logically meet each ELCC standard. To accomplish this, some of our assessments have been revised to very deliberately focus on content knowledge (Assessments #1 and #2) and some on skills (Assessments #3, #4, #5, and #6). In doing these revisions, we have also redistributed how we meet some of the standards. For example, Assessment #3, which used to address a fairly wide range of standards, focuses exclusively on the three elements of Standard 2. We believe that these changes will improve our ability to provide the necessary content knowledge as well as to monitor candidates' ability to meet the ELCC standards, both those that are skill based and those dealing with content knowledge.

Content Knowledge:

As program faculty have examined the evidence from assessments of content knowledge (Assessments #1 and #2), we have seen that our completers are performing at the Satisfactory level (3 out of 5 on our Likert scale) or above, with the majority of candidates scoring that the Proficient or Exceptional levels (4 or 5). This is true for both the portfolio assessment (Assessment #1) and the course grades assessment (Assessment #2).

We are proud of our candidates' consistently solid performance on our portfolio assessment as a rigorous summative assessment of their learning throughout the whole program. Though we have periodically reviewed and revised the structure of the portfolio over the years, it has continued to be a pillar of our candidates' learning across all ELCC standards and elements. Candidates' display, reflection, and final presentation of their learning artifacts in the portfolio continue to provide a comprehensive view of their attainment of content knowledge in each ELCC standard and element. Program faculty will continue to monitor not only candidate performance on this assessment but also the continuing relevance of the structure, procedures, and content associated with the assessment.

While Assessment #2 includes grades from only two courses, repeated review and evaluation of these courses has shown that they are content rich and that they effectively evaluate candidate content knowledge. More importantly, candidates are provided with opportunities to transfer their mastery of administrative concepts learned into practical experiences through comprehensive field experiences in most courses.

EDAL520 Foundations of Educational Administration comprehensively reviews major theories and conceptual frameworks of best practices in school-based leadership. Candidates continue to show their mastery of the knowledge bases in multiple assignments. We continue to review and select the best textbook and latest research journal articles to give candidates the most cutting-edge research and proven knowledge base.

EDAL560 School Law offers extensive case study readings in constitutional, legislative, administrative and case law, researching the 15 most prominent cases in American public education and their impact on education. Mastery of this crucial knowledge base for school-based leaders enables candidates to acquire essential knowledge of student, teacher, and parent rights.

Program faculty annually review course evaluation feedback from candidates, which is taken into account in making course changes, which have included change of instructors, timing of the course, and flexibility in credits assigned to the course. In addition, an APA tutorial was developed and implemented for candidates having difficulty in formatting papers needed throughout their course work.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:

As program faculty have examined the findings of Assessments #3, #4, and #6, they have gained some insights into candidates' growth in professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Candidates gain invaluable supervision experience (some of the activities of which are assessed in Assessment #3, Supervision of Instruction) in EDAL 570 Principles of Education Supervision. This course, which has been a backbone of our program for decades, has created an intensive experience for candidates that walks them through the detailed aspects of supervising and improving instruction in the K-12 school setting. Candidates have consistently achieved high levels of success in this course and on this assessment. Faculty will continue to monitor candidate performance in order to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the course and its assessments.

Results of Assessment #4 (Internship Portfolio) show that all candidates perform at least satisfactorily on most of the individual tasks involved in the internship. However, faculty have observed that many candidates do not perform as well on activities involving school law as they did on most other internship activities. So while candidates show sufficient knowledge of school law (see Assessment #2 above), internship evaluations (see Assessment #4) show that candidates have difficulty in applying school law in field experiences. Faculty believe this is because interns, while they have the knowledge, have limited opportunities to engage in practical use of the knowledge. As interns (not full-time administrators), they are not privy to all the conversations or the processes related to sensitive legal issues (e.g., employment disputes or fiscal legal issues). Faculty are planning to discuss ways to improve this situation.

Our current findings from Assessment #6 (Organizational Management and Community Relations Project) confirm our decade-long improvement in our candidates' professional skills in community relationships and leadership. In the early 2000s, public relations and community engagement had been incorporated into other administrative courses. Increased use of ISLLC standards and later the ELCC standards moved us in 2006 to develop a course focusing exclusively on public/community relations/communication. In our preparation to fulfill the ELCC 2002 standards in 2010, we added more administrative skills (ELCC Standard 3) to this assessment and later added socio-political trends and advocacy skills (ELCC Standard 6). In 2012, the planning and implementation of community building activities and events were given equal emphasis based on early data collection. Going forward, we are reversing the order of these parts (phases) of the assessment based on candidate feedback.

Student Learning:

Assessment #5 (Employer Survey) addresses completers' ability to support student learning and development. As program faculty have examined survey results, we have noticed that all completers in the two applications of this survey (2012-2014 and 2015-2016) were rated highly, with one exception. In the case of the one with lower ratings, the survey respondent noted that "this student has some difficulties with making decisions on her own," suggesting that it may not have been an issue of the completer's competence (experience/training) but of her confidence. Since this involves a single completer, we could suppose that this is simply an anomaly. However, we plan to explore whether there is something that we need to do in our program to encourage candidates to grow in confidence in their competency to make administrative decisions.

When ELCC reviewers pointed out that our employer survey was built on the old (2002) ELCC standards, program faculty set out to recreate the survey to not only meet the 2011 ELCC standards but also to shorten the survey to (a) make completing the survey a less onerous task for busy administrators, and (b) focus it more specifically on completers' ability to support student learning and development. We believe the newly created survey, which we will pilot in May 2018, will be a big improvement over the old survey. Faculty look forward to getting results of the new survey, and will happily analyze both the completer data it will yield and the effectiveness of the survey instrument itself.

Summary:

Program faculty have been thankful for the insights gained through the process of examining assessment results, and will continue to monitor program effectiveness and candidate progress in order to support continuous improvement of our Educational Leadership program.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. **For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>**

For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION NOTED BY THE ELCC REVIEWERS:

Assessments #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7

Scoring Rubric: Multiple standard elements are lumped together ELCC (3.1, 3.2, 3.3) into one measurement making it impossible to determine mastery on any single standard element. Measure each standard element independently.

Align scoring rubrics and data charts to assessment activities.

Scoring rubrics should reflect assessment activities and criteria that address a majority of standard elements. Also, it is helpful to use specific element indicators (content knowledge for assessments 1 & 2, and professional skills for assessments 3, 4, 5, and 6) to indicate expected performance at different levels of the scoring rubric. See the 2011 ELCC Building Level Standards, starting on page 8.

Data collected on multiple items for the same standard element must be averaged to obtain an aggregated data score for the standard element. Data must be summarized for each ELCC standard as a whole (e.g., ELCC 1.0, 2.0). This information is helpful for analyzing candidate proficiency on each ELCC standard in Section IV, part 1(c and d).

Assessment #1 - Since your state does not require a state licensure test in the

content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge. Please use the guidelines for documentation of an assessment as is outlined in the introduction to Section IV in the program report template as a resource.

Assessment #2 - Revise the assessment description to provide a rationale for how the courses for this assessment align with specific 2011 ELCC standards.

Assessment #5 - Please provide the definitions rubric that will outline how candidate performance at each level of the Likert scale will be determined for each ELCC standard element listed.

Assessments #5 and #6

These assessments are aligned to the 2002 ELCC standards rather than the 2011 ELCC standards. Revise the assessments to align to the 2011 ELCC standards as required by CAEP.

Assessment #7 does not identify activities related to the standard elements. Identify and assess a clear set of internship activities that relate to the indicated standard elements.

OUR RESPONSE:

Scoring Rubrics:

We have carefully re-aligned or revised all our scoring rubrics across Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 to ensure that each line measures only one ELCC standard element, making it easy to determine mastery on each element.

The reviewers were concerned that our scoring rubrics and data charts were not sufficiently aligned to the assessment activities. We have taken care to make sure these items are explicitly aligned with each other.

Scoring rubrics have been reviewed and aligned so they now reflect assessment activities and criteria that address the standards and their elements appropriately. Specific element indicators have been used to indicate expected performance at different levels of the scoring rubric.

Reviewers also asked that data collected on multiple items for the same standard element should be averaged to obtain an aggregated data score for that element. We have provided such aggregated data where possible. In addition, per the reviewers' request, we have also summarized data for each ELCC standard as a whole in our assessment documents where possible.

Assessment #1:

Realizing that we need to use a valid assessment in lieu of a state licensure test (which is not required in Michigan), we have chosen to present our program portfolio assessment as Assessment #1. The completion of this portfolio is a graduation requirement for all candidates in the Educational Leadership MA program. The portfolio is an assessment process that results in a collection of carefully chosen

artifacts to describe and document the attainment of content knowledge and level of mastery of ELCC building-level standards. It is developmental, reflective, scholarly, representational, synthesizing, and individualized.

Assessment #2:

We continue to use selected course grades to demonstrate candidates' content knowledge for Assessment 2. At the reviewers' request, we have revised our assessment description to provide a sound rationale for why we have chosen to use the grades for the two courses that we have selected. In summary, we have chosen those courses because they cover a broad range of the content knowledge required by ELCC. The course grades are based on candidate performance in the courses on various assessment, including projects, research papers, and field experience.

Assessment #5:

Reviewers have asked us to provide a "definitions rubric" that shows how each candidate performance level on the Likert scale aligns with the relevant ELCC standard element. We understand the reason for this request—that respondents should be rating our graduates based on concrete descriptors. At the same time, we also realize inherent weaknesses in our survey design, namely that it was created to align with the 2002 ELCC standards (also noted by ELCC reviewers), and that at 30 questions it was exhaustingly lengthy. Our response to this situation was two pronged:

(a) We have created a new, more robust survey, much shorter (12 questions) and focused on the 2011 ELCC standards, and more specifically, those that pertain to the completers' ability to support student learning and development. This new survey, rather than requiring an accompanying definitions rubric, has detailed descriptions of each performance level built into the survey, enabling us to see clear evidence for how the selected ELCC standard elements are being met. Unfortunately, we have not yet had an opportunity to pilot the new survey (which is conducted one year after candidates have graduated), so we have no assessment data to accompany it. We plan to pilot the survey with our May 2017 cohort of completers, the most recent to be eligible for this assessment.

(b) For data presentation purposes, we have realigned the old employer survey as best we could to the 2011 ELCC standards, without changing the wording of the survey questions (which would compromise the integrity of the data associated with this survey). It seemed impractical to engage in the cumbersome process of creating a definitions rubric for the old survey that will never again be administered, so we have simply re-presented the existing data in this submission, aligned to the 2011 ELCC standards, to provide stronger evidence for candidate ability to support student learning and development.

Assessments #5 and #6:

As stated above, we have realigned Assessment #5 to the 2011 ELCC standards. We have done the same with Assessment #6, as described in the new Assessment #6 document.

Assessment #7:

What we presented for Assessment #7 in our last submission was an assessment of

our candidates' portfolio presentation. Since we have decided to use the portfolio assessment as a content knowledge assessment for Assessment #1, we have decided not to do an Assessment #7. We have taken to heart the reviewers' feedback on our past presentation of the portfolio assessment and have revised how we present it as Assessment #1.

SUMMARY:

To summarize our response to the reviewers' feedback, we have resubmitted the following portions of the report, with the changes as noted in the preceding paragraphs:

- Section I
- Section II
- Section III
- Section IV, Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
- Section V
- Section VI

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.