

UCEA Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Program Award

2018 Review/Evaluation Form

Directions to Reviewers:

Please review the documents in each application folder (Parts I-V) from the applicants and use this form as a rubric for evaluation. The rating scale is described below. We strongly encourage you to leave constructive comments to help inform and explain your final selection decision.

Program Ranking:

Use quartiles to rank the applicants, e.g. 1= top 25%, 2= second 25%, 3= third 25%, and 4= bottom 25%. Please give rationale as to why that ranking was given, especially for the top quartile.

Program Features / Evaluation Criteria	Rating Scale in Quartiles	Provide Rationale for Rating & Additional Commentary
1. Program Focus		
<p><i>What kind of leader does the program claim to prepare and is that type of leadership reflected in the various dimensions of the program (e.g., recruitment, curriculum/courses, practical experiences, and assessment)?</i></p>		
2. Recruitment/Selection		
<p><i>What strategies are used to recruit candidates? What perspectives, priorities and data inform the development of recruitment materials? Who participates in the recruitment process and why (e.g. is there evidence of collaboration between district partner(s) and program for recruitment)? What strategies, information and criteria are used to select candidates for participation in the preparation program (e.g. selective admissions that draws upon evidence of student learning impact; evidence of leadership potential)? How is the selection criteria and process integral to the program’s goals and approach? Who participants in candidate selection and how? Does recruitment/selection yield a student body that reflects the diversity of the area served by the program; individuals committed to serve in that community?</i></p>		
3. Learning Experiences/ Instructional Strategies		

What is the point of view about learning in the program? How does teaching reflect this perspective? What kinds of learning approaches/experiences are integrated into the program? Is there significant evidence of an “active learning” pedagogy where instructional approaches engage aspirants in application of learning and using application/practice as a later learning resource (e.g., course-embedded and clinically enacted work tasks, problem or case based learning, simulations, action research). Is there strong evidence of course-related learning experiences that are designed to promote theory/research/practice connections (consider course readings and work tasks/projects)?

4. Expected Candidate Knowledge, Skills, Practices/Program Curriculum

Knowledge/Skills/Practices: *Is the program meaningfully anchored to a set of nationally recognized leadership standards? Given that standards are “performative” in nature, is there evidence that aspirants have opportunity to learn/develop standards-aligned **practices** (in addition to new knowledge and understandings)?*

Curriculum: *Is there evidence of curriculum coherence; curriculum that links learning goals, activities, and assessments in key areas of curricular emphasis including: instructional leadership (school-wide improvement of instruction), organizational leadership, adult learning, data use/inquiry/change/school improvement, issues of leadership for equity and social justice; curriculum that demonstrates developmental sequencing/scaffolding across courses/modules?*

How and by whom are course/modules designed?

5. Internship/ Clinical Experiences

What is the quality of the internship or residency and leadership experiences? *For example, ELCC calls for internships that provide at least a six-month, concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school-based environment; an internship that provides carefully planned leadership experiences (moving beyond observation and collaboration to actual leadership actions/authority) in a range of leadership areas during this experience/residency that are typical of school leaders (specifically including leadership for school improvement).*

What is the quality of internship/residency developmental supports? *For example, ELCC calls for internships that provide an on-site school mentor who has demonstrated experience as an effective educational leader within a school and is selected collaboratively by the intern*

and program faculty with training by the supervising institution. Expert support is necessary and has been provided from either/both mentors and leadership coaches

6. Supportive Structures		
---------------------------------	--	--

***Students:** What program structures (e.g., cohorts or networks) are provided to support communities of practice?*

***Faculty:** Enacting a program with a range of exemplary features will necessitate a high degree of faculty collaboration for design/program enactment/ongoing improvement. What, if anything, can you tell about faculty (tenured, clinical, mentor principals, leadership coaches other) collaboration for the design, enactment, ongoing improvement of these program features? How do faculty members work together to design, improve and deliver the program? How does the program ensure that its faculty has the capabilities to prepare effective educational leaders?*

7. Partnerships		
------------------------	--	--

What kinds of partnerships (e.g. school district, other) support the program? Is there evidence of an effective partnership (e.g. common goals, defined responsibilities, communication and evaluation/feedback structures)? How is the partnership leveraged to support/enhance elements of the program/program experience? In what ways are district personnel utilized to influenced and/or informed the program?

8. Candidate Assessment		
--------------------------------	--	--

*Are course and clinical assessments aligned to state/national standards? How do you know that candidates’ are gaining the intended knowledge, skills and dispositions? Given that standards are “performative” in nature, is there evidence that aspirants have opportunity for standards-aligned **practice** assessment? How are candidate assessments used by to support candidate growth?*

9. Program Effectiveness & Ongoing Program Continous Improvement		
---	--	--

***Program Effectiveness:** What is the evidence of program effectiveness (level/rate of impact to candidate learning/development, rates of licensure, rates of and timeline to administrative job*

placement following program completion, impact of training on leader practice/leader practice evaluation, leader retention in administrative position, impact data for schools led by program-trained leaders including organizational culture/climate, instructional quality, student learning, other)? How credible & compelling is the program effectiveness evidence?

Ongoing Program Continuous Improvement: *What is the evidence of the program’s ongoing continuous improvement (beyond the “redesign of a program” but also evidencing ongoing attention to strengthening program elements/experiences)? What is the quality of data that this program uses to inform ongoing program improvement? What is quality of the process(es) (such as tools/routines, timelines, range of individuals engaged in improvement work) used to support ongoing program improvement/evaluation? What do you learn, if anything, about how individuals (within the program) and the collective group approach ongoing improvement (related to particular courses/learning experiences, more broadly across elements of the program)?*

10. Faculty

What number of faculty and of what role types (tenured, clinical, adjunct) design and teach courses/learning experience/modules in this program? If there are multiple cohorts simultaneously being taught, what number of faculty members and of what role types (tenured, clinical, adjunct) teach aspirants from an individual cohort? Who has designed each of the most recent program courses/syllabi and what is their expertise in relation to the area of study? Do program faculty represent expertise from the research and practice communities? Does the program ensure that adjunct/district personnel have the ability/readiness to teach courses?

11. Model and Ability to Catalyze Improvement in other Programs

What evidence suggests that this program can serve as a strong model and can also catalyze and support ongoing program improvement in other universities?