

# NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

## Preparation of Educational Leaders

### School Building Level

#### COVER PAGE

**Name of Institution**

University of Louisiana at Monroe

**Date of Review**

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2009

**This report is in response to a(n):**

- ☐ Initial Review
- ☐ Revised Report
- ☐ Response to Conditions Report

**Program(s) Covered by this Review**

Master of Education, Educational Leadership

**Program Type**

Other School Personnel

**Award or Degree Level(s)**

- ☐ Master's
- ☐ Post Master's
- ☐ Specialist or C.A.S.
- ☐ Doctorate
- ☐ Endorsement only

#### PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

**SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):**

- ☐ Nationally recognized
- ☐ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ☐ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- ☐ Not nationally recognized

**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
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ Not able to determine

**Comment:**

The state and the two adjacent states from which candidates are drawn require the SLLA for licensure.

**Summary of Strengths:**

Chart depicting field experiences represents multiple field experiences. Candidates meet the required score on the SLLA for licensure.

**PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS**

**Standard 1.0: 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.**

**1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning.**

- |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Met                   | Met with Conditions   | Not Met               |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.**

- |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Met                   | Met with Conditions   | Not Met               |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.**

- |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Met                   | Met with Conditions   | Not Met               |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.**

- |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Met                   | Met with Conditions   | Not Met               |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**Standard 2.0: 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.**

**2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.
---------------------------------

**Standard 3.0: 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.

3.1 Manage the Organization.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

3.2 Manage the Operations.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

3.3 Manage the Resources.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

Standard 4.0: 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.

4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

#### 4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

##### Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**Standard 5.0: 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, fairly, and in an ethical manner.**

#### 5.1 Acts with Integrity.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

##### Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

#### 5.2 Acts Fairly.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

##### Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

#### 5.3 Acts Ethically.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

##### Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**Standard 6.0: 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.**

#### 6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

##### Comment:

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

#### 6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

See notes in C.1, C.2, and C.3.

**Standard 7.0: Internship.** The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

**7.1 Substantial.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

The rubric indicates that 240 hours are required.

**7.2 Sustained.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

**7.3 Standards-based.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

Since the activities are not described and multiple standards are attributed to each section, it is difficult to determine whether or not the standards are related and/or met. The number of candidates not passing the sections is not given.

**7.4 Real Settings.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

**Comment:**

Although the internship is completed in P-12 schools, the practice to allow candidates to use only their current location of employment weakens the variety and diversity of this assessment.

**7.5 Planned and Guided Cooperatively.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

**Comment:**

The description of Assessment 4 indicates that the internship is developed cooperatively with the district.

**7.6 Credit.**

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

**Comment:**

Six hours of credit are given for the internship.

**PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE****C.1. Candidate knowledge of content**

Since data for Assessments #1, #2, and #6 are given as totals or in very general categories and are not broken down by standard or by element, it is not possible to determine whether candidates are meeting the content expectations. The grades that are used for final exams for Assessment 2 are not meaningful without explanation of the content of the questions used, or the grading policies, distributions, or definitions of the grades given. Nor was an explanation given for the substantial increase in the N for Tier II and Tier III for '06-'07 over the other year and for Tier I for both years. The overall enrollment data would not indicate the increase. Analysis of data for all assessments is not detailed.

The scoring rubric for Assessment #6 does not align to specific competencies outlined in the ELCC standard elements referenced. It appears it has been aligned to the ISLLC standards rather than the ELCC standard elements.

**C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

Assessments #3, #4, and #7: The scoring rubrics for these assessments do not align to specific competencies outlined in the ELCC standard elements referenced. It appears they have been aligned to the ISLLC standards rather than the ELCC standard elements. Since data for Assessments 3, 4, and 7 are given as totals or in very general categories and are not broken down by standard or by element, it is not possible to determine whether candidates are able to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The activities in Assessments 3 and 7 are related to some of the standards, however vaguely and not in enough detail. It is not known what activities are permitted for Assessment 4; therefore it is difficult to determine candidate mastery. The rubric appears to equate contact hours with quality/mastery. The data for Assessment 8 are separated by standard. Overall, it is not known whether there are problems with depth and/or breadth of standard coverage.

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

Assessment #5: The scoring rubric for Assessment 5 does not align to specific competencies outlined in the ELCC standard elements referenced. It appears it has been aligned to the ISLLC standards rather than the ELCC standard elements, but does ask candidates to relate their project to student learning. Since the score data are given by only two general categories, it is difficult to determine candidates' performance. Analysis of data is minimal.

## 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)**

Section V addresses program evaluation and changes. Because the scoring rubrics are not designed to measure candidate proficiency on specific ELCC standard elements, the data results are not meaningful for analysis. Once scoring rubrics have been updated to align to the ELCC standard elements rather than the ISLCC standards, this section should be updated.

## PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

**Areas for consideration**

--

## PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

**F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:**

The chart in Section I, question 8 is missing 2005-2006 data.

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

--

## PART G - DECISIONS

**Please select final decision:**

- ☒ Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

## NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

**The program is recognized through:**

MM    DD    YYYY

02
----

 / 

01
----

 / 

2011
------

**Subsequent action by the institution:** To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.



The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 4/15/09, 9/15/09, 2/1/10, or 9/15/10. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 9/15/09 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM    DD    YYYY  
09   /   15   /   2010

**The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.**

1. Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6, #7: Revise assessment descriptions and/or scoring rubrics to more closely align to the components found in specific ELCC standard elements (not ISLLC standards).
2. Provide revised data charts that align to specific scoring rubrics and break down data by specific ELCC standard elements.
3. Assessment #2: The grades that are used for final exams for Assessment 2 are not meaningful without explanation of the content of the questions used, or the grading policies, distributions, or definitions of the grades given. Nor was an explanation given for the substantial increase in the N for Tier II and Tier III for '06-'07 over the other year and for Tier I for both years.
4. Update Section V based on the updated data charts and include an analysis across the three content assessments (#1, #2, #6) and skill assessments (#3, #4, #7) that demonstrates improvements made based on the data to strengthen the program and improve candidate performance.

**Please click "Next"**

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