

**NCATE
Approval with Specialized Professional Association
Guidelines**

Professional Organization: Educational Leadership Constituent Council-ELCC

Institution Submitting Program: Loyola College in Maryland

Program: Administration and Supervision

Date of Review: November 29, 2001

Degree Level: Masters

GUIDELINES/COMPETENCIES NOT MET: 4.5, 4.6, 5.2, 7.5, 8.4, 11.2, 11.4, 11.7, 12.1, 12.2, and 12.3.

PERCEIVED PROGRAM STRENGTHS:

Guideline Indicator 2.4: The “Delphi Forecast” activity and the “Analysis” activity in AD 650 requires candidates to analyze and interpret data and meets the requirements for this indicator.

Guideline Indicators 4.3: The revised syllabus for AD 662 now includes an activity where candidates observe supervisory techniques and performance appraisal.

Guideline Indicators 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5: The activities and course requirements referenced in AD 650 now show evidence of expectations that align with these indicators. The development of a program for administering student activity clubs is an internship project under organizational leadership.

Guideline Indicators 10.1, 10.5, and 10.6: The description of the new activities and requirements in AD 681 AD 682 aligns with the expectations for these indicators. It is evident that candidates will now have opportunities to gain competency in these important areas.

Guideline Indicator: 11.1: AD 674 has been revised to includes candidate performance activities that meet the intent of this indicator.

Guideline Indicator: 11.6: Through a section in the mid-semester exam for ED 601 candidates are expected to analyze the major philosophical tenets of contemporary intellectual movements and analyze their effect on school contexts

PERCEIVED PROGRAM WEAKNESSES:

Guideline Indicator 4.5: Revised syllabi for courses AD 668 and AD 684 were not included in the rejoinder. No additional evidence supporting candidate application of personnel issues is found.

Guideline Indicator 4.6: No additional evidence of a candidate performance requirement is found in the referenced course AD 668.

Guideline Indicator 5.2: AD 680 includes a discussion of a presentation about a counseling program. However it does not include opportunities for candidates to develop such a program. No relevant candidate performance activities were found in the other cited courses (AD 682 and AD 668). Although the "Homework Program" includes elements for this indicator, it is labeled a "project suggestion" indicating that is not required of all candidates

Guideline Indicator 7.5: No evidence is found in course AD 662 that describes a candidate performance requirement to use stress management and conflict management techniques.

Guideline Indicator 8.4: The activity referenced in AS 662 requires only a discussion rather than performance of budget management functions. The Excel activity described for AS 682 does not include performance of budget management functions nor does the activity in AS 684.

Guideline Indicator 10.3: There are insufficient details to determine whether the "group dynamic exercises" in AD 650 meet the requirement of this indicator. The AD 662 citation refers only to an objective. The revised syllabus for course AD 674 was not included in the rejoinder.

Guideline Indicator 11.2: A revised syllabus was not included for AD 668. Neither the final exam nor the paragraph describing how this course meets the indicator requirement is specific or complete enough to determine compliance.

Guideline Indicator 11.4: The syllabus for AD 662 did not contain descriptions of candidate activities on understanding how school policies are formulated, enacted, implemented and evaluated or developing strategies to influence policies. The syllabi for cited course AD 682 was not included in the rejoinder. No relevant candidate performance requirements were found in the included candidate work.

Guideline Indicator 11.7: The references in AD 684 do not include a description of the appropriate candidate performance that are relevant to meeting this indicator. The revised syllabi for course AD 684 is not included in the rejoinder report.

Guideline Indicator 12.1: While the rejoinder notes that candidates will now document the number of hours of internship, this does not show that the internship has been extended to require at least six months worth of internship activity. In addition, it is not clear from the statement: "internships are in a variety of settings" how each candidate will be provided with opportunities in diverse settings. Please provide more specific details on the nature of the internship requirements for candidates and the types of experiences that are required.

Guideline Indicator 12.2: Although the rejoinder notes that the training of "site supervisors will be discussed," there is no evidence that this has been implemented.

Guideline Indicator 12.3: In the initial review, this area was cited as a weakness because the experiences were encouraged, but not required. The rejoinder does not indicate that there has been a change in this policy.

OTHER COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS:

Including summaries of a selection of journal articles, "reflections," and literature reviews are not adequate as candidate performance descriptions. Also, including the assignments of a particular candidate is not necessarily representative of the work of all candidates. What is needed are descriptions of candidate performance activities that align the actions described in each indicator.

The organization of the rejoinder document lacks several features that would make it more accessible for a reviewer. Examples are a lack of page numbers and syllabi that are not included in the report. In a number of cases, a syllabus was incomplete. There is only a paragraph describing a section of the syllabus and it is not clear that the paragraph is from the original or the revised syllabus.

SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION'S RECOMMENDATION(S):

Program(s) Approved: None

Program(s) Not Approved: Administration and Supervision

Program(s) Deferred: None

REJOINDERS: A rejoinder may be filed with NCATE to be reviewed by the ELCC if you feel that a recommendation is not correct for a given guideline indicator. Please include clarified and supporting evidence needed to re-evaluate approval. Do not refer to previous program reports. If a second review of the program report is requested, please submit two copies of the rejoinder to ELCC, via NCATE. Please do not send a rejoinder unless explanations and candidate performance evidence support a case for approval.