NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Preparation of Educational Leaders
School Building Leadership Level

Keene State College, NH
March 15, 2007

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the **Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC).**

This report is in response to a(n):

n Initial Review   ¤ Revised Report   ¤ Response to Conditions

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Award or Degree Level(s)
Educational Leadership **Licensure category:** Principal K-12	Master's Post Master's

PART A—RECOGNITION DECISION (see Part G for specifics on decision)

A.1—SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

¤ Nationally recognized
¤ Nationally recognized with conditions
n Not nationally recognized

A.2—Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

¤ **Yes**   ¤ **No**   n **Not applicable**   ¤ **Not able to determine**

Comment: The state does not require a test.

A.3—Summary of Strengths:

Please see the comments contained in Part E of this Report.

PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

ELCC Standard	Specific Program or Level: Master's and Post Master's	Specific Program or Level
Standard 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community.		
Standard 1.1. **Develop a School Vision of Learning.**	**Not Met**	
Comment: Due to the lack of specificity of all of the assessments, there was no way to determine whether or not the assessments could adequately assess this standard element. See the comments section of the report for additional details. This comment applies to Standards 1-6.		
Standard 1.2. **Articulate a School Vision of Learning.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 1.3. **Implement a School Vision of Learning.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 1.4. **Steward a School Vision of Learning.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 1.5. **Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.		
Standard 2.1. **Promote a Positive School Culture.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 2.2. **Provide an Effective Instructional Program.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 2.3. **Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 2.4. **Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.		
Standard 3.1. **Manage Organization.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 3.2. **Manage Operations.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 3.3. **Manage Resources.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.		
Standard 4.1. **Collaborate with Families and Other**	**Not Met**	

ELCC Standard	Specific Program or Level: Master's and Post Master's	Specific Program or Level
Community Members.		
Comment:		
Standard 4.2. **Respond to Community Interests and Needs.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 4.3. **Mobilize Community Resources.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.		
Standard 5.1 **Acts with Integrity.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 5.2. **Acts Fairly.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 5.3. **Acts Ethically.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.		
Standard 6.1. **Understand the Larger Educational Context.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 6.2. **Respond to the Larger Educational Context.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 6.3. **Influence the Larger Educational Context.**	**Not Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 7.1. **Substantial.**	**Met**	
Comment: The internship hour minimum is met and exceeded. However, the assessment is vague and gives no detail of the types of activities candidates would participate in. The internship was not elaborated on or defined.		
Standard 7.2. **Sustained.**	**Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 7.3. **Standards-Based.**	**Not Met**	
Comment: While the assessment denotes each of the standards and the student's self assessment delineates the standards and the standard elements, there is no scoring guide or rubric that connects the two nor is there a way for the mentor to give feedback on any projects that the candidates would perform. This is very difficult to evaluate given the internship was not elaborated on nor was it defined in terms of activities or standard elements.		
Standard 7.4. **Real Settings.**	**Met**	
Comment:		
Standard 7.5. **Planned and Guided Cooperatively.**	**Not Met**	
See comment for 7.3.		
Standard 7.6. **Credit.**	**Met**	
Comment:		

PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1—Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessment 1, 2, and 6 do not determine candidates' content knowledge. None of the assessments contained a data table or standard elements alignment to determine candidate mastery of ELCC standards.

C.2—Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

(Note: none of the assessments presented in the report addressed skills and dispositions – all assessments were aimed at Content Knowledge.)

The portfolio design for **Assessment 1** could be a good assessment. The planned use of the portfolio demonstrates faculty commitment to candidate progress and development over the course of the program. However, the portfolio assessment lacks direct alignment to the ELCC standard elements and to the rubric used to evaluate it. Significant changes in these areas would improve the intent of this assessment.

Assessments 3, 4, and 5 are vague in design with no specific activities that are directly linked to the ELCC standards. The lack of a data table along with a rubric that has no linkage to specific standard elements, but instead lumps the standards into rubric 'groups', makes it impossible to determine levels of proficiency and mastery.

The internship, **Assessment 4,** reveals no information on the activities of the internship or alignment to the ELCC standard elements. While there are multiple experiences and opportunities for administrative interns working in educational systems, without some list or suggestions of what constitutes appropriate experiences in the internship, it is impossible to determine whether or not all candidates receive common experiences that meet the standard elements.

Assessment 7, employer survey is not presented in the report and there is no way to determine how it is used or administered. Furthermore, Assessment #7 does not have a scoring guide or data table.

C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

None of the assessments provide any information or data that could be used to determine if candidates' performances in the program have any effect on P-12 student learning. Assessment 7 focuses on a survey of candidates and employers and there is no Assessment 8.

PART D—EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

This portion of the report speaks to the portfolio as the "spine" of the program. However, as stated in other portions of this report, this assessment is essentially flawed in numerous ways as an assessment

that would provide the program any meaningful information about the candidates' performances on the ELCC standards and standard elements. There is no data table for this assessment or for any of the other six assessments, which makes it very difficult at best to determine the performance of candidates and thus the performance of the department.

PART E—AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

General Comments:

- The language throughout the information presented does not delineate the ELCC standards from the ELCC standard elements. Broad brush strokes of alignment are stated or often alluded to, yet are not backed up by assessment descriptions tied to the standard elements, tied directly to the scoring guides or tied to the data tables (in fact there were no data tables presented – only a statement that data would be available next semester; even so, a data table should have been constructed to demonstrate the alignment of the data to the scoring and to the assessment). Lack of data tables makes it impossible to determine how the data table might be used when data is available.
- Scoring guides do not delineate specific elements – thus making it difficult to determine if a candidate has indeed met the standard elements. Use of "Not Yet" as part of the scoring titles should be reconsidered – it lacks the professionalism expected in a scoring guide or rubric and should be reflective of the level of proficiency the guide is designed to demonstrate.
- The descriptions used in the scoring guides are inconsistent across assessments and in many cases are grammatically incorrect (Assessment 2 is an example).
- The detailed scoring guide in Assessment 1 is not as useful or complete as it may seem. While there is significant detail, it is the same throughout the scoring guide and the only significant changes to each of the three levels is the wording: (1) artifacts taken together do not provide convincing evidence of candidate mastery; (2) artifacts taken together demonstrate candidate mastery; (3) artifacts taken together demonstrate impressive candidate mastery. Therefore the scoring guide is a rubric of "does not provide evidence, demonstrates mastery, and demonstrates impressive candidate mastery" for each of the ELCC standards and there is no way to discriminate between the levels on each of the standard elements.
- While some assessments show promise (Assessments 3 and 5), all lack specificity in the description of assignments that would lead to a demonstration of proficiency for candidates in meeting the standard elements. For example, what are the "school-based projects" and the "action research projects?" These projects should have clear alignment to the standards and standard elements, with scoring guides, and data tables to demonstrate proficiency of the standards.

Comments on individual assessments:

- Assessment 1
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - The scoring guide does not address meaningful attributes of candidate performance on the assessment and is not specific enough to anchor judgments about the degree of candidate success on the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.

- Assessment 2
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - Scoring guide is very weak – grammatical errors throughout the guide and lacks specificity in the rubric language. For example, what is the difference between "some concepts are well understood" in the proficient category and "outstanding understanding" in the exemplary? It is unclear how the scoring guide will provide reviewers with information on how the standard elements are met by candidates.
  - Reflection is a strong aspect of this program and care should be taken to assure that the assessment is developed in a manner that allows reflection as a tool for school leaders, but one that is enhanced by the practice candidates receiving during the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.

- Assessment 3
  - Assessment has promise and strength. It is recommended that examples of "suggested projects" actually become some of the program assessments that provide the direct correlation to the ELCC standards.
  - There is a question about the use of this assessment with the scoring table indicating that points are awarded on the amount of systemic change in the system (Implementation). This could be very difficult to determine.
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - The scoring guide does not address meaningful attributes of candidate performance on the assessment and is not specific enough to anchor judgments about the degree of candidate success on the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.
  -

- Assessment 4
  - The assessment description is vague. It is recommended that a concrete delineation of the roles and responsibilities for the mentor and the candidate be identified and described in the internship. A list of expectations along with the evidence necessary to demonstrate successful completion of the internship experience should be provided.
  - This assessment fails to align the Mentor/Aspiring Principal checklist to the overall success of the internship. It is unclear when the checklist is used or how it aligns with the creation of the internship. Is it used to determine the direction of the internship? Are areas of weakness used in creating focused areas of study?
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - The scoring guide does not address meaningful attributes of candidate performance on the assessment and is not specific enough to anchor judgments about the degree of candidate success on the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.

- Assessment 5
  - This assessment has promise as presented in the description. However, there is no definition of what an "Action Research Project" would look like within this program. It is recommended that clear criteria for Action Research Projects are created that are directly aligned with the desired standard elements. This will allow for correlation between the designed project and the desired proficiency levels for candidates. Providing various examples of projects as a portion of the assignment is also suggested.
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - The scoring guide does not address meaningful attributes of candidate performance on the assessment and is not specific enough to anchor judgments about the degree of candidate success on the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.

- Assessment 6
  - This assessment mirrors assessment 1 and 2. The assessment focuses on the 'Individual Artifact Cover Sheet" – this is already a requirement inside the portfolio and is a part of assessment 1.
  - The assessment is vaguely tied to the ELCC standards as a whole. It is unclear which parts of the assessment activities align with specific ELCC standard elements.
  - The scoring guide lumps the ELCC standards as a whole into one criteria measure. This makes it impossible to measure candidate success on specific ELCC standard elements (i.e. 3.1, 2.3 etc.).
  - The scoring guide does not address meaningful attributes of candidate performance on the assessment and is not specific enough to anchor judgments about the degree of candidate success on the assessment.
  - No data table is provided.

- Assessment 7
  - A description of surveying employers and graduates does suffice for this assessment.
  - Where are the surveys? How are they worded? What standards do the surveys tie to? How are the surveys scored and how is that scoring translated into meaningful data? How is the data collected and used for meaningful change in the program?

Strengths:
- There are to be field experiences in course work throughout program; this is commendable and should be built upon as the assessments for the standards and standard elements.
- The internship hour requirement is a minimum of 160 hours; this program has far exceeded that amount by having 300 internship hours over 2 semesters.
- The program is to be commended for its immediate follow through on the state evaluation's recommendation to include more technology.
- The program is to be commended for its requirement to have all candidates "experience at a level other than their current level" during their internship.
- It should also be noted that the program provides employment opportunities through partnering schools and others.

PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1—Comments on context and other topics not covered in sections B-D:

The distinction between the two different programs included in the report needs explanation, especially since the two programs are using the same assessments, scoring guide rubrics, and data tables.

F.2—Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G—TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS

Program is not nationally recognized. Programs that retain recognition from a prior review will lose recognition at the end of the semester in which the NCATE accreditation visit is held, unless a revised program report is submitted in or before that semester.

Subsequent action by the institution: A revised report, addressing unmet standards, may be submitted no later than 18 months from the date of this report (see below for the range of submission dates possible for a revised report).

NCATE will accept a revised report to meet any one of the following deadlines, and suggests that programs do not submit a revised report until they have fully addressed all concerns noted in this review. (Some states, however, may require the program to resubmit sooner. Please contact your state if there is a question about the state requirement for resubmission.) The NCATE deadlines for submission of a revised report for this program are **Sept. 15, 2007; February 1, 2008; April 15, 2008;** or **September 15, 2008.** The institution should notify NCATE that it plans to submit a revised report at least one month before the report is due.

After **September 15, 2008**, NCATE will not accept a revised report based on this submission. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

For further information on due dates or requirements, contact program review staff at NCATE (202-466-7496).