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<thead>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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This report is in response to a(n):
- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

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

Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration Option

**Grade Level**

P-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

**Program Type**

Other School Personnel

**Award or Degree Level(s)**

- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only
# PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

**SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):**
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

**Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**
The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

**Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:**

**Summary of Strengths:**
- There appears to be a process in place to review assessment results in an effort to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.
PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA 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.

1.1 Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

1.2 Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

1.3 Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

1.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

2.2 Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

2.3 Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of
2.4 Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

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 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.

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

4.3 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

4.4 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.

5.3 Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

See Section C1, C2, C3.
5.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

5.5 Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

6.1 Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

6.2 Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

6.3 Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
See Section C1, C2, C3.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
Not enough specific information was provided in Section 1.2 to determine compliance with this standard element. Please refer to the rubric measurements found for Standard 7.0 in Appendix I of the 2011 ELCC Building Level Educational Leadership Program Standards.

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.
### Met Met with Conditions Not Met

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**

Not enough specific information was provided in Section 1.2 to determine compliance with this standard element. Please refer to the rubric measurements found for Standard 7.0 in Appendix I of the 2011 ELCC Building Level Educational Leadership Program Standards.

### 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.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**

Not enough specific information was provided in Section 1.2 to determine compliance with this standard element. Please refer to the rubric measurements found for Standard 7.0 in Appendix I of the 2011 ELCC Building Level Educational Leadership Program Standards.
C.1. Candidate knowledge of content
ELCC standards addressed in this entry could include (but are not limited to) Standards 1.1-1.4, 2-1-2.4, 3.1—3.5, 4.1-4.4, 5.1—5.5, 6.1-6.3. Information from Assessments #1, and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessment #7 may also focus on content knowledge.)

Assessment #1: State Licensure Exam. Oklahoma Subject Area Tests (OSAT) for principal certification are provided by Certification Examinations for Oklahoma Educators (CEOE) and area specific to the level for which they are being certified. The tests are said to align with all of the ELCC standards. A Correlation Table that provides a cross-reference for the alignment of the ELCC Standards and the state of Oklahoma required competencies was included in the report. Data charts for 3 years indicated that all candidates passed the test with at least an overall score of 240, the minimum composite score. Met.

Assessment #2: Education Law ELCC Standards Connections Project. This assessment is said to align with elements of ELCC standard elements 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. The assessment activities are aligned to the cited ELCC standard elements. The evaluative criteria contained within the levels of the rubric align to a majority of concepts contained within any single ELCC standard elements. Two applications of data were provided. Met.

Assessment #1: State Licensure Exam. Data shows that candidates were successful in demonstrating content knowledge on an exam that aligns with the ELCC standards. Met.
Assessment #2: Education Law ELCC Standards Connections Project. The scoring rubric needs to be aligned with the content knowledge elements shown in the building level standards. The rubric's wordings need to reflect elements in alignment with the standard - currently they do not.

C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
ELCC standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 1.1-1.4, 2-1-2.4, 3.1—3.5, 4.1-4.4, 5.1—5.5, 6.1-6.3. Information from Assessments #3, #4 and #6 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessment #7 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Assessment #3: Staff Development Project. The assessment is said to align with ELCC standard elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.4, 3.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5. Assessment activities are aligned to the ELCC elements. The evaluative criteria contained within the levels of the rubric do not align to a majority of concepts contained within any single ELCC standard elements. The scoring rubric lumps multiple standard elements together into one measurement making it impossible to determine candidate proficiency on any one standard element. Three applications of data were provided.

Assessment #4: Internship Supervisor Evaluation. This assessment is said to align with all of the ELCC standards and elements. Multiple assessment activities are stated for each ELCC standard element. They are not fully described nor included in the scoring rubric. The evaluative criteria contained
with the levels of the rubric do not align to a majority of concepts contained within each ELCC standard element listed. Three applications of data were provided.

Assessment #6: Activity Funds. This assessment is said to align with ELCC standard elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Assessment activities are aligned with the stated ELCC standard elements. The evaluative criteria contained with the levels of the rubric do not align to a majority of concepts contained within each ELCC standard element listed. Three applications of data were provided.

Assessment #7: Educational Leadership Platform. This assessment is said to align with all of the ELCC standard elements. Assessment activities are aligned with the stated ELCC standard elements. The evaluative criteria contained with the levels of the rubric do not align to a majority of concepts contained within each ELCC standard element listed. Three applications of data were provided.

Assessment #3: Staff Development Project.
Assessment #4: Internship Supervisor Evaluation.
Assessment #6: Activity Funds.
Scoring rubrics need to reflect the professional leadership skills language for each standard element.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning
ELCC standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 1.1-1.4, 2-1.2-2.4, 3.1—3.5, 4.1-4.4, 5.1—5.5, 6.1-6.3. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessment #7 may also focus on student learning.)

Assessment #5: Building Improvement Plans. This assessment is said to align with ELCC standard elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.4, 3.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.5. Assessment activities are not aligned to the stated ELCC standard elements. The scoring rubric lumps multiple standard elements together into one measurement making it impossible to determine candidate proficiency on any one standard element. The evaluative criteria contained with the levels of the rubric do not align to a majority of concepts contained within each ELCC standard element listed. Three applications of data were provided.

Assessment #5: Building Improvement Plans. Although data were provided the scoring rubric language needs to reflect the professional leadership skills language in each element.
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)

There appears to be a process in place to review assessment results in an effort to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.
## Areas for consideration

| --Assessment activities - For assessments 4 and 5, directions given to candidates for completing the assessments activities should be clearly written to measure candidates on the concepts outlined in each ELCC standard element listed in the 2011 ELCC standards. It is helpful to cross-reference the ELCC standard element at the place in the directions where the concept is being addressed. |
| --Scoring rubrics - For assessments 3, 4, 5 6 and 7 scoring rubrics should relate back to the assessment tasks outlined in part 2(e). It is helpful if the scoring rubrics lists the assessment tasks. The evaluative criteria used within the levels of the rubric should relate to/include a majority of evaluative indicators outlined in the rubric starter charts given for each ELCC standard element listed in the 2011 ELCC standards document. |
| --Data charts - one application of data for each assessment. |
| --Part D: Please revise this section once assessments have been revised and data becomes available, and include information on how assessment results are analyzed and will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. |

Joan Auchter, SPA Coordinator, auchterj@nassp.org, is a resource.
**PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thru Date 8/1/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Date 3/15/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

☑️ Program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.
Terms and Subsequent Actions

**National Recognition with Probation** The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit a Revised Report addressing unmet standards and other concerns in accordance with the dates provided on this Recognition Report. A program should NOT submit a Revised Report until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all of the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in this recognition report. If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program's recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Revised Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

**Comment on decision:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thru Date</th>
<th>Action Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2020</td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.