

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE CHATTANOOGA
 January 29, 2016

REVIEW SUMMARY

TDOE Recommendation: Full Approval

Learning Centered Leadership Policy – Area of Focus	Rating
Partnership with LEAs	
Formal Partnership Agreement	M
Roles and Responsibilities	M
Screening and Selecting Candidates	M
LEA Perception Survey	M
Candidate Selection	
Selection Processes	M
Selection Criteria	M
Preparation Curriculum	
Alignment to TILS	M
Assessment System	M
SLLA First Time Pass Rate	N/A
Practicum	
Handbook and Materials	M
Mentor Selection	E
Evaluation of Candidates	E

E = Expectation Exceeded

M = Expectation Met

PM = Expectation Partially Met

NM = Expectation Not Met

N/A = Sufficient data not available

TBD = To be determined upon further review of evidence

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE CHATTANOOGA
January 29, 2016

REVIEW DETAIL

Review team findings are included in the table below for areas where the University of Tennessee Chattanooga (UTC) did not meet expectations in the Fall 2014 review. UTC was required to submit additional and/or revised evidence that was reviewed in the Fall 2015. The review team determined expectations were met in all areas.

Section 1: Partnership with LEAs	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>1.4 LEA Perception Survey</p> <p>Fall 2014 Comments: Unfortunately, the program’s LEA partner(s) did not respond to the survey. Prior to completing this review, the TDOE will send a final reminder to the LEA partner(s) your program submitted. We recommend your program contact LEA partners to request they respond to this survey or provide the TDOE with alternative contacts.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Comments: The LEA partner(s) was/were able to clearly articulate their role in the partnership with the program. LEA partners described their partnership with the program as moderately collaborative and often tailored to the specific needs of the LEA.</p>	TBD	Met

Section 3: Preparation Curriculum	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>3.1 Alignment to Revised TILS (2013)</p> <p>Fall 2014 Comments: The program is currently in the process of revising coursework with the revised TILS. For the purpose of this review, they submitted an alignment matrix that addresses the previous version of the TILS. This matrix sufficiently demonstrates the programs incorporation of all of the TILS (2008). The program indicated the revision process would likely be completed in October 2014. Once this is complete, the program should submit a curriculum matrix aligned to the revised TILS to the TDOE, which will allow reviewers to determine if expectations are met on this indicator.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Comments: After substantial revision, the program’s coursework, field experiences and practicum demonstrate significant alignment to the entirety of the TILS. The revision process included development of thorough tools to illustrate the alignment of all program components with the TILS.</p>	TBD	Met
<p>3.2 Assessment System</p> <p>Fall 2014 Comments: The program is currently in the process of revising their assessment system to align with the revised TILS. For the purpose of this review, they submitted a set of assessments and evaluation tools that address the previous version of the TILS. This evidence sufficiently demonstrates the programs incorporation of all of the TILS (2008). The program indicated the revision process would likely be completed in November 2014. Once this is complete, the program should submit an updated set of assessments and evaluation tools aligned to the revised TILS to the TDOE, which will allow reviewers to determine if expectations are met on this indicator.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Comments: After substantial revision, the program’s assessment</p>	TBD	Met

<p>system demonstrates clear alignment with the TILS throughout. Candidates receive both summative and formative feedback throughout the program, feedback which is specific and actionable. The revision process included a complete overhaul of assessments used throughout the program as well as tools that illustrate their connection to the TILS.</p>		
--	--	--

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
BETHEL UNIVERSITY
 January 29, 2016

REVIEW SUMMARY

TDOE Recommendation: Full Approval

Learning Centered Leadership Policy – Area of Focus	Rating
Partnership with LEAs	
Formal Partnership Agreement	M
Roles and Responsibilities	M
Screening and Selecting Candidates	M
LEA Perception Survey	M
Candidate Selection	
Selection Processes	M
Selection Criteria	M
Preparation Curriculum	
Alignment to TILS	M
Assessment System	M
SLLA First Time Pass Rate	E
Practicum	
Handbook and Materials	M
Mentor Selection	M
Evaluation of Candidates	M

E = Expectation Exceeded

M = Expectation Met

PM = Expectation Partially Met

NM = Expectation Not Met

N/A = Sufficient data not available

TBD = To be determined upon further review of evidence

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
BETHEL UNIVERSITY
 January 29, 2016

REVIEW DETAIL

Review team findings are included in the table below for areas where Bethel University did not meet expectations in the Fall 2014 review. Bethel was required to submit additional and/or revised evidence that was reviewed in the Fall 2015. The review team determined expectations were met in all areas.

Section 1: Partnership with LEAs	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>1.1 Roles and Responsibilities Area of Concern: The agreement needs to specifically explain how the program will meet the leadership needs of LEAs and how a shared vision and program design are created. Although this is mentioned in the narrative, the evidence of these things is not clear in the current agreement.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: Bethel has engaged in a formal process to revise their partnership agreement with their LEA partners. Revisions to the partnership agreement show a stronger focus on meeting the needs of LEA partners. In addition, Bethel's engagement in revisions to their partnership agreement demonstrate strong evidence that partnering LEAs are actively involved in the process of creating a shared vision and providing input on program design.</p>	Partially Met	Met
<p>1.3 Screening and Selecting Candidates Area of Concern: Sample partnership agreement lacks a focus on how the program and LEA partner select candidates who have: (1) expertise in curriculum and instruction; (2) evidence of leadership potential (program-defined); and (3) a track record of improving student achievement.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: Bethel has engaged in a process to revise their partnership agreement and processes. The revised document includes an assurance that both partners are in agreement in selecting candidates that have: expertise in curriculum, evidence of leadership potential, and a track record of improving student achievement. In addition, the revised recommendation form includes requested information which provides evidence that the LEA will be involved in the selection process.</p>	Partially Met	Met
Section 3: Preparation Curriculum	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>3.2 Assessment System Area of Concern: The program provided a clear set of assessments (aligned to the TILS) throughout the program. However, evaluation tools for major assessments and evidence that candidates receive specific and actionable feedback on these assessments were not clearly present.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: Bethel has revised documents to show further alignment between key assessments and the TILS throughout coursework and field experiences. Feedback is provided to candidates using internally developed rubrics that provide actionable feedback on key assessments as well as the TEAM evaluation rubric used throughout field experience assessments. These tools demonstrate that the program provides candidates with specific and actionable feedback.</p>	Partially Met	Met

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
 January 29, 2016

REVIEW SUMMARY

TDOE Recommendation: Approval with Stipulations (see language from LCL below)

Approval with Stipulations. Stipulations are specified critical deficiencies that must be addressed by the program provider prior to the granting of full approval. DOE staff will work with the program provider in establishing timelines for correcting the deficiencies. Full approval will be granted if the critical deficiencies are corrected within the stipulated timelines. If sufficient annual progress is made, approval with stipulations may be extended up to three years. At the end of a three-year period of extension or earlier, an onsite visit will occur. As a result of the onsite visit, the DOE will recommend to the SBE either full approval or denial of approval.

Learning Centered Leadership Policy – Area of Focus	Rating
Partnership with LEAs	
Formal Partnership Agreement	M
Roles and Responsibilities	M
Screening and Selecting Candidates	M
LEA Perception Survey	E
Candidate Selection	
Selection Processes	M
Selection Criteria	M
Preparation Curriculum	
Alignment to TILS	M
Assessment System	PM
SLLA First Time Pass Rate	E
Practicum	
Handbook and Materials	M
Mentor Selection	M
Evaluation of Candidates	M

- E = Expectation Exceeded
- M = Expectation Met
- PM = Expectation Partially Met
- NM = Expectation Not Met

- N/A = Sufficient data not available
- TBD = To be determined upon further review of evidence

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM
ACTION REPORT
FOR
MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
 January 29, 2016

REVIEW DETAIL

Review team findings are included in the table below for areas where Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) did not meet expectations in the Fall 2014 review. MTSU was required to submit additional and/or revised evidence that was reviewed in the Fall 2015. The review team determined expectations remain partially met in one indicator (3.2 – Assessment System).

MTSU must adequately address critical deficiencies prior to receiving a recommendation of Full Approval. Following State Board action in January 2016, TDOE will communicate with MTSU to develop a specific timeline for addressing stated deficiencies and facilitate an onsite visit which will result in a recommendation of full approval or denial of approval. Throughout the Spring 2016, TDOE will direct MTSU to carry out an improvement plan with specific action steps that must be taken to address the critical deficiencies prior to a formal on-site review. TDOE proposes that an on-site review be facilitated in the Summer 2016 and a final recommendation presented to SBE in October 2016.

Section 1: Partnership with LEAs	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>1.2 Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>Area of Concern: The agreement needs to specifically explain how the program will meet the leadership needs of LEAs or how a shared vision and program design are created. Although the narrative frequently references contact with the LEAs, the evidence of a shared vision and incorporation of LEA needs is not clear in the current agreement.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: MTSU has engaged in a process to significantly revise their partnership agreement and place a greater emphasis on meeting the needs of partnering LEAs. There is evidence that primary partners were involved in the revisions made to the partnership agreement and ongoing, formalized conversations take place between partners. The partnership agreement is to be revisited annually, in part, to address the changing needs of LEA partners. In addition, MTSU provided concrete plans for implementing the new partnership agreement.</p>	Partially Met	Met
<p>1.3 Screening and Selecting Candidates</p> <p>Area of Concern: Sample partnership agreement lacks a focus on how the program and LEA partner select candidates who have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (4) expertise in curriculum and instruction; (5) evidence of leadership potential (program-defined); and (6) a track record of improving student achievement. <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: MTSU has significantly revised their partnership agreement and processes with the support of primary LEA partners. As part of this effort, selection expectations have been formalized to include specific requirements for ensuring potential candidates demonstrate evidence of the aforementioned criteria. In the revised structure, greater emphasis is placed on the review of potential candidates by the LEA partner, university mentor, and advisory/admissions committee.</p>	Partially Met	Met

Section 2: Candidate Selection	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>2.1 Selection Processes Area of Concern: Evidence was limited or missing to indicate that the program has a clear process for selecting screening and evaluation committee members (i.e. admissions committee).</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: MTSU has significantly revised expectations related to requirements related to serving on the advisory/admissions selection committee. The program places a strong emphasis on this throughout their partnership agreement. Both LEA and University members are expected to meet minimum requirements, which include but are not limited to: experience as an administrator, evidence of knowledge of leadership standards, and nomination from a select group of individuals.</p>	Partially Met	Met

Section 3: Preparation Curriculum	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>3.2 Assessment System Area of Concern: Evidence minimally supports the indicator at the Partially Met level. There is an unclear assessment system documented. There is no clear evidence of how the assessment program is connected with TILS.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: The review team determined the assessment system remains inadequately developed. Specifically, the team identified the following deficiencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assessment system is not comprehensively or systematically aligned to the TILS 2. The assessment system does not systematically provide candidates and the program with actionable feedback <p>While assessment of candidates throughout the practicum is present, the remaining system is primarily course and project-driven but may vary based on the individual candidate's identified needs. As a result, the program does not have the ability to look across TILS in a systematic way. In addition, feedback tools (e.g., self-assessment, course assessment, and capstone) provide candidates with broad, general feedback that is also not systematic throughout the program. The rating for this indicator remains unchanged.</p>	Partially Met	Partially Met

Section 4: Practicum	Fall 2014 Rating	Fall 2015 Rating
<p>4.1 Practicum Handbook and Materials Area of Concern: General information is provided regarding the expectations, processes and schedules for the practicum but there was insufficient detail.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: As part of the revision process, MTSU has formalized their practicum handbook as part of a broader program handbook including materials that cover all aspects of the program. These revisions include details regarding the expectations, processes and schedules for the practicum.</p>	Partially Met	Met
<p>4.2 Mentor Selection Area of Concern: Evidence of communication between the program and LEA regarding the selection of mentors was not present.</p> <p>Fall 2015 Review Comments: MTSU has refined their process for selecting mentors and included expectations for mentors within their partnership agreement, effectively ensuring both the program and LEA partner agree upon the stated criteria for the selection of mentors. In addition to selection requirements, expectations for mentors are clearly outlined in the agreement.</p>	Partially Met	Met