

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
CLEAR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL**

Assessment Instruments

A signature assignment is required for each course. Data collected through the assignment is uploaded to Task Stream. Also collected is on-going formative data on Dispositions of Noble Character. Additional assessments are conducted by each professor and utilized to formulate a grade for each candidate. Data is analyzed biennially resulting in ongoing changes for program improvement. In the 2014-2015 school year there was no biennial report due to the California Teacher for Credentialing. The following cites a summary of evidence of the student learning which has been used for continued improvement.

Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Standards Assessed
GED 796 Induction CPSEL	Induction CPSEL	PS 5: Curricular Individualization PS 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance PS 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance
GED 796 Induction 360 Degree Survey	Induction 360 Degree Survey	PS 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance PS 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance
GED 797 Professional Development CPSEL Survey	Professional Development CPSEL Survey	PS 5: Curricular Individualization PS 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance PS 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance
GED 797 360 Survey	360 Survey	PS 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance PS 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance
GED 797 Culminating Activity	Culminating Activity	PS 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance PS 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Summary: Evidence and Analysis of Candidate and Program Data

Discussion:

Prior to the start of the 2013-14 academic year, the program faculty discussed the simplification and revision of the Taskstream DRF for the Administrative Clear Credential. This resulted in an additional DRF in the system. The first, (that kept quantitative data) and the revised, (that kept “met” and “not met” data) were simultaneously active on Taskstream. Communication with candidates at the regional centers was not consistent. The resulted in inconsistent data collection patterns and overall lack of quantitative data. This was not realized until data for the Biennial Report was run. With the implementation of the new CTC standards in the fall of 2015, a new DRF will be established to yield the quantitative data that is required for program review and improvement. Below is an explanation and analysis of the data collection for the two academic years (signature assignments, disposition assessment, and exit survey).

Signature Assignments:

CSPEL Initial (796) and Final (797) Self Assessments - All professional clear administrative credential program candidates are required to complete a self-assessment of their leadership skills and competencies using a five point rubric based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs) along with a narrative section for strengths and weaknesses. This instrument is used to guide the candidate and the university fieldwork supervisor/coach in developing an Individual Induction Plan (IIP). The CPSEL Initial Self-Assessment is archived in Task Stream for data analysis and program improvement purposes.

360 Degree Survey #1 (796) and #2(797). - Each professional clear administrative credential candidate asks a small, randomly selected group of their certificated and classified staff to complete an anonymous survey of the candidate's competencies as an educational leader. This survey is based on the CPSELs and is scored using a five point rubric. The responses are not seen by the candidate and are sent to the university supervisor/coach for compilation and analysis. The compiled responses are provided to the candidate and form the focal point of a coaching conversation that leads to the development of the IIP. The survey results are archived in Task Stream for data analysis and program improvement purposes. These surveys are completed just prior to the development of the Individual Induction Plan and then again at program completion.

The Culminating Exhibition – This activity is a multi-media presentation made by the candidate that showcases understanding, application, internalization, and mastery of the CPSELs via an exhibition and analysis of artifacts, events, and reflections derived from the induction plan and implementation.

Analysis of Data:

GED 796 CPSEL Self-Assessment:

During the 2012-13 academic year, 6 candidates entered data for GED 796 self-assessment. The range of scores were 3.33 to 4.50 which indicates overall candidate proficiency, with the highest scoring criteria being *“Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.”* One candidate performed at a 2.0 level in each of the criteria.

In the 2013-14 academic year 0 candidates entered data, the result of inconsistent communication to candidates and revised rubric of “met” and “not met” yielding no quantitative data.

GED 796 CPSEL 360 Degree Assessment:

During the 2012-13 academic year, 7 candidates entered data for the GED 796 360 degree assessment. The range of scores were 4.3 to 5.0 on a five point rubric which indicates overall candidate proficiency, with the highest scoring criteria being *“modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.”*

During the 2013-14 academic year, 9 candidates entered data for the GED 796 360 degree assessment. The range of scores were 4.13 – 5.0 on a five point rubric which indicates continued overall candidate proficiency, with the highest scoring criteria also being *“modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.”*

GED 797 CPSEL Professional Development Self-Assessment:

During the 2012-13 academic year, 16 candidates entered data for the GED 797 self-assessment. The range of scores were 4.0 to 5.0 on a five point rubric which indicates overall candidate proficiency, with the highest scoring criteria also being “*modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.*”

During the 2013-14 academic year, 11 candidates entered data for the GED 797 self-assessment. The range of scores were again 4.0 – 5.0 on a five point rubric which indicates continued overall candidate proficiency. The highest scoring criteria came in at a 4.62 for both “*modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity* and “*advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.*”

GED 797 CPSEL Professional Development 360 Degree Assessment:

During the 2012-13 academic year, 16 candidates entered data for the GED 797 360 degree assessment. The range of scores were 4.0 to 5.0 on a five point rubric which indicates overall candidate proficiency, with the highest scoring criteria being “*modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.*”

In the 2013-14 academic year 0 candidates entered data, the result of inconsistent communication to candidates and revised rubric of “met” and “not met” yielding no quantitative data.

GED 797 Culminating Activity:

There exists, a plethora of criteria for this culminating activity to include competencies, oral presentation style as well as the written composition of the project. 18 candidates entered data for the 2012-13 academic year, and 11 candidates entered data between the 2013-14 academic year. Consistently, candidates received scores between the 4.0 and 5.0 indicating overall candidate proficiency. Of concern is the lack of scoring for the following criteria: Fieldwork advisor/coach dispositions assessment, Completion of culminating activity at proficient or above, and Completion of exit survey. It is obvious that the evaluators were not clear on closing the gap and completing this evaluation.

Disposition Assessment:

In reviewing the data over the past two years, the results were not very informative. With almost no exception candidates were scoring themselves in the 3.5-3.9 range no matter when they assessed. In the 2012-13 academic year, 8 candidates entered data. This is a low count based on the actual number of candidates moving through the program. All disposition data score between 3.5 – 4.00 on a four point rubric. The top scoring disposition is *Honor and Integrity*. In the 2013-14 academic year, 15 candidates entered data. All disposition data score between 3.5 – 4.00 on a four point rubric. The top scoring dispositions were *Honor and Integrity* and *Dignity and Honor*.

Exit Survey:

Exit survey data was only captured for the 2012-13 academic year. On a 5 point scale, the following criteria received these scores:

Relevance of the Program – 4.68

Professional Growth – 4.58

Fieldwork Support – 4.84

Mentor Support – 4.63
Disposition Focus – 4.26