



EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL REQUEST FORM

Institution: William Carey University

Date submitted to TAP: June 2010

Submitted by: Dr. Barry Morris, Dean

Commission approval date: _____

Contact phone or email: barry.morris@wmcarey.edu

State Board approval date: _____

Proposed date of program implementation/modification: 2012

Proposal request and support materials are provided for approval to implement:

New Program _____ Modifications to Existing Program _____ New Licensure Requirement

In addition to your current education program course list/description, you must provide, where applicable:

- 1) a copy of the proposed new program
- 2) the current program with clear indication of proposed modifications
- 3) any evidence of institutions (state, regional or national) with the same or a similar course of study
- 4) evidence of qualified faculty
- 5) syllabi for any new or modified courses within the proposed program
- 5) any other documentation that further supports the proposal

NOTE: Use the spaces below for a brief statement of your proposal request. Additional sheets may be attached that include a formal request and detailed proposal components.

Please state your specific request: William Carey University requests approval to implement a new educational leadership program as evaluated and approved by renowned school leadership researcher, consultant, and author, Dr. Joe Murphy (Chair of Education and Associate Dean at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University), as part of MDE's requirement for the redesign of Mississippi's educational leadership programs. William Carey conducted research on the program's feasibility based on data from a pool of potential candidates for the program.

NOTE: Program approval is subject to standard review procedures that involve several entities and, therefore, timelines for final approval may vary. After TAP approves the program proposal, it may then be subject to presentation for approval by the Licensure Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development and the State Board of Education before program candidates are eligible for Mississippi Teacher Licensure.

Email this form to Gail Gettis at ggettis@mde.k12.ms.us or fax to 601-359-1728.

Initial Review of
William Carey University's
Proposed Educational Leadership Program

By

Dr. Joseph F. Murphy

June 2011

TO: Colleagues at William Carey University

FROM: Joseph Murphy

DATE: 9 June 2011

This is impressive work in many ways. In places, it allows the reader to see deeply into the program you propose. There are many strong elements here. I will touch on some below. However, the focus will be on the areas to consider to create an even stronger program design. Keep an eye on the dots.

I Program Mission and Vision

You have a solid design here. What you want to accomplish is quite clear. So too are the “guiding principles.” The grounding of the mission in the standards is very impressive.

The cardinal question is: how does this mission influence the other domains of the program? The answer in some areas is “quite well.” This is the case, for example, in the area of “curriculum.” In other domains, the answer is more mixed. For example, in the category of “program evaluation.” In still other places, we simply do not have sufficient information to answer the question, e.g., in “candidate selection” domain. You take a hit, therefore, because of these last two assessments—mixed storyline and no evidence.

- If you could create an integrative analysis for all the program domains—as you did for technology integration in each course, that would be very helpful.

Program Domain	Evidence of Vision/Mission
Recruitment Selection Curriculum • • •	

II Recruitment

You do not present any information on this program category. We can deduce an idea or two from your write up of the program overall, but we really do not learn your plans

- Can you provide a multi-faceted plan to secure the type of candidate you want to enroll? The plan should be aggressive, proactive, creative, concrete, and comprehensive—for example (1) sending personal recruitment letters to Board Certified Teachers and “teachers of the year” in schools and districts with whom you partner, and (2) asking each of your mentors for the top pick in his/her school to be a strong principal and then personally contacting these people. Employ but do not stop with the use of the traditional recruitment tools (e.g., flyers, web site notices) Make sure that the package aligns tightly with your vision/mission (e.g., if the emphasis is on instructional leadership, show how you are recruiting people with this profile).

III Selection

The same "gap" noted above is evident here as well. We do not know how you plan to admit students to the new program, other than (1) you will be employing the STAR Administrative Disposition Survey as one component and that (2) you will secure the written support of each candidate's superintendent. But even for the survey we have no information on scoring or on the measure needed for admission (i.e., the cut score).

- Can you develop a comprehensive system comprised of multiple elements as you are going to do for recruitment? For most of these elements you will need to develop protocols and scoring rubrics. For example, you might consider creating (1) a structured interview protocol with a rubric for assessment (and a cut score), (2) a structured letter of recommendation with a rubric and cut score, and/or (3) a writing prompt with a scoring guide and cut score, and so on. You can rely on traditional measures for sure (e.g., GPA, GRE scores), but you really need to find or create measures that allow assessment more tightly linked to your vision/mission (e.g., the writing prompt might ask candidates to describe ways in which they have acted as advocates for youngsters and their families—what they did; what leadership role they played, if any; what the outcomes were; and so on).

IV Faculty

Your proposal represents a major commitment from the University. Kudos to everyone for this. You have a good cadre of people with experience in the field. And you have a nice blend of clinical and regular professors. The commitment for four full-time professors is very impressive.

- One suggestion is as you add capacity (or replace faculty), especially the university-based folks, that you look for a few colleagues without their doctoral work from Mississippi universities. I love Mississippi but you might be a little more narrow (insular) than you should be.

The faculty development work seems appropriate. However:

- We could use richer description of what the faculty workshops look like—how often, how long, form, outcomes, and so forth.

- We also need a disaggregation of who participated in the various activities.

The “general” picture can mask a good deal.

V Instructional Delivery/Program Structure

You provide an impressive list of instructional strategies on pages 10 and 11. This could be quite meaningful. It could also mean nothing—a great list that every program says they employ but few actually do.

- How can you show us that these instructional strategies actually define your courses?

- You also note that the program includes weekend, evening, summer, institute, and online work. But we never see a picture of the structure or receive a narrative of what and how the program unfolds for students.

- Is it a cohort model? If not, why?

- Can you lay the program out? What is the time “box” in which the program fits? How many weekends are students on campus; for how long? What institutes? What does the online portion look like (entire classes, parts of classes)? And so on.

VI Curriculum

General

The curriculum is a significant improvement over the one that was in place before the University pulled out of the school leader preservice business. The four “landscape” framework (i.e., your program architecture) works fairly well, although the title for Landscape 3 might be stronger; all the components have a human dimension. The integration of technology into each of the courses is excellent. Your scaffolding on the standards is also quite good. Ideas for improvement are found in the next sub-section. In addition:

- What is the sequence to the courses? And how do later courses build on earlier ones?

Courses

(A) General

The format (consistently used) for your course syllabi is excellent. Individually and collectively the actual syllabi are very good. They are beautifully integrative—on the knowledge and skill dimensions, on the content and process dimensions, in the areas of assessments and use of technology, and so forth. They are deep (rich) and quite specific. Your emphasis on authentic field work as the base of learning and as the foundation for assessments is noteworthy. Your use of group work rather than individual work on the assessments is also worthy of merit.

- Sometimes you have assignments that focus on the “district.” This is, of course, needed on occasion. But in general push to get “school” analyses. This is where your students will start out.

- It isn't clear why the supplemental material is "supplemental" How does this material "work" in the courses?

(B) Specific Courses

Judicial and Ethical Considerations

- As appropriate, there is a heavy focus on "law" here. But you also treat two other critical constructs: ethics and social justice. You may want to add a good text on ethics to the course. And perhaps something on social justice, as long as it is action oriented.

Best Practices

- You probably should re-label this given the focus of the course, i.e., the title is too generic. Try "Effective Instructional Programs."

School Community Relations

- The course is heavily about public relations as it stands. This is fine as far as it goes. However, the critical issue of working with parents to help them help their children reach ambitious targets of performance could use more attention. So too could the topic of forging partnerships with social service agencies and advocacy groups to improve conditions for students.

(C) Missing Content

- There is one critical content area that seems to be missing. You do such an impressive job of integrating material that I am not sure where you might want to put it, but you need to add it. Specifically, one of the hallmark elements of great schools is that they create highly personalized learning environments for students. You have one of the two elements of this construct treated already—a safe and orderly learning environment.

But you need much deeper treatment of the second element—creating a climate in which each student is well known, cared for, and respected (and feels part of the school community)

VII Clinical Work/Internship

Clinical Work in General (field-based work)

You are off to a good start in terms of focus on the “authentic work” of school leaders.

- Currently you have 100 hours of practice (p. 29) outside of the internship.

This is an average of only 10 hours per course. It seems that you might easily double or triple that amount.

General

In many aspects the internship is noteworthy. The depth, richness, and available time (400 hours) are impressive.

- Are 30 full days (240 hours) used before school opens, right after school closes, and during the summer? This is not a problem; it is good. The problem is that you only have 160 remaining hours for the 36-week school year. This is about 2¼ hours per week. Is this interpretation of page 29 accurate? If so, can you add more time in the year?

Mentoring

The critical function of mentoring is woven throughout the program description. In many areas your development is quite good, e.g., or example, the use of two mentors per candidate (one in the home-based school and a second with a different principal). So

too is having students work along side the principal to open and close the school year.

The scaffolding on the standards is impressive as well.

- At the same time, we do not get a deep enough description of “mentoring” overall. How are mentors selected? You note that they need a track record of effective leadership. How do you determine this? How are they matched with candidates? How are they trained to perform the role of mentor? How are they evaluated for effectiveness as a mentor? Most importantly, how does the hip-to-hip (mentor-mentee) relationship work? We learn what your students have to do but we do not see the role of the mentor as the mentee completes his/her internship assignments. We need a much richer narrative here.

- A well-developed “internship handbook” would be great. A well-developed “mentor handbook” would be quite helpful as well.

VIII Partnerships

You have some really strong “elements” of the partnership component in various sections of the proposal. For example, there is a nice description of involving practitioners in program development work (p. 23 and Appendices D and E). You also show how mentors are used in the internship and additional practitioners are employed in teaching courses and modules. Other threads appear here and there. But you are silent about involvement in other domains of the program (e.g., selection of candidates)

- Do you have other types of partners (e.g., from inside the University, the business community, social service agencies)?

- Can you create a form (with accompanying narrative) that lists all the key program domains on the left and concrete descriptions of partnership activities in each?

Program Domain	Description of Partnership Activities
Recruitment Selection Curriculum • • •	

IX Principal Induction/Mentoring

This is an impressive commitment to your graduates.

- If you could provide a bit more detail about operations, it would be helpful.

X Candidate Assessment

The activities that are visible in various sections of the report are often quite good, e.g., (1) some of the assignments in courses, the “embedded assessments” (pp. 42-54); (I assume the embedded assessments are designed to model and prepare for the SLLA? If so, they are fine. If not, then you will want to make them more practice based, i.e., anchored in authentic work); (2) the SLLA at the end of the program; (3) reviews each trimester.

- We do not see “assessment” in the selection of students (see earlier notes on this domain of the program).

XI Program Evaluation

I understand that you do not have any evidence of effectiveness yet. However, you should have a well-developed plan to assess program effectiveness once you restart

Knowledge Skills Dispositions	Student L.O.	Real World Protection Project	Value- Added Projects
-------------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Course

operations. You should think in terms of a four-part design, one that answers these

questions: (1) are students receiving the "right stuff" (knowledge, skills, and dispositions)?; (2) are they learning what you want them to?; (3) do they use what they learn on the job?; (4) does that work lead to organizational outcomes (i.e., does the quality of instruction in their schools increase?; do these students learn more?)? You have partial or full answers to some of these questions. On question number one, you have nice data showing the rich treatment of the national standards, and you have a couple of methods for demonstrating this. On question number two, for example, you will have test results from the SLLA, data from the embedded assessments, and assignments from the various classes and the internship.

- You will want to organize all the measures into a matrix around the four questions.
- You will want to add methods of data collection on question one. In particular, well-designed strategies to gather post-program data from graduates about what was missing or underemphasized in their programs would serve you well.
- You will want to build out methods of collecting data (e.g., written protocols, focus groups) on questions numbers three and four—assessments of students' use of knowledge and skills on the job and impact of that work on their schools.
- In addition, your comprehensive and concrete evaluation design will want to answer these two questions: (1) how are you collecting data on program quality from your customers? And, (2) more importantly, what is the strategy for regularly analyzing feedback to direct ongoing program improvement?

Final Review of
William Carey University's
Proposed Educational Leadership Program

By

Dr. Joseph F. Murphy

August 2011

TO: Colleagues at William Carey University

FROM: Joseph Murphy

DATE: 31 August 2011

You have done a very thorough and effective job in addressing issues raised in the 9 June 2011 report. The result is that you have made a good program even better. There are a few places where improvements can still be made before you start or in the early stages of working with the first cohort of students. But the bottom line, from my perspective, is that you are ready to begin the new program.

A few issues are raised below by program area (e.g., program evaluation). These notes are of three types. A few questions for your consideration are provided (question marks). Some minor ideas that may strengthen the program are noted (sometimes in the form of a question) with dashes. Finally, there are few areas where major attention is needed (marked with an X)—but these should not delay program approval.

I also want to encourage you to continue to lavish the kind of resources, attention, and hard work on the program once it is up and running that you have in getting it birthed. If you do so, I believe that you will have a commendable program to share with reviewers a decade hence.

As a reminder, as was the case with the original review my focus here is on “issues for improvement.” The original and rejoinder documents are full of very good content. I do not attend to these. The fact that something is not addressed, either an entire domain or sub areas, is a compliment.

Selection

? What are the GRE and Miller cut scores

? How did you arrive at a cut score of “8” on the Haberman instrument. You might want to return to this decision after you see how your best students scored on this measure.

? What is the QDI

? How many evaluators of the writing sample are there

— On the “candidate interview,” questions 4 and 5 ask the candidates to examine their own practice. Questions 1, 2, and 3 are hypothetical. You would be advantaged if you changed 1, 2, and 3 to tap into the candidates’ practice. This is a stronger frame.

— Wouldn’t it be wise to score “verbal communication skills” when you do candidate interviews? You value these in the program and this is your best opportunity to assess them.

— On the “letters of support,” add “or in the community” to the end of the 4th category (i.e., the leadership position one). This will broaden the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate leadership work (e.g., in a community-based agency, or in church-related activities).

— Think about how you are going to aggregate scores for a final average.

Faculty

— Very impressive professional growth activity here, and all of it grounded in the work of “preparation program development.” My question is: how do you structure things back in the shop so you learn from each other?

— You may find it helpful to send a member of your team to one of the national professors of educational leadership conferences each year, either UCEA or NCPEA, or both.

Instructional Delivery/Program Structure

X I would encourage you to make the “group projects/simulations” (pp. 25-26) and “independent projects” (pp. 29-31) closer to “authentic practice.” These would be activities that get students into schools and beyond “interviewing” and “shadowing” work. You do not want assignments that your students can complete just from reading either. They have to apply the knowledge. Let me give an example using “EDU 688 School/Community Relations.”

What you have now is “create an ideal school/community climate program.” This can be done 100% from the research. It is decontextualized from a real school.

How about this instead: (1) locate, examine, and evaluate various “school climate” surveys based on the research on positive school culture; (2) select one of the best; (3) partner with a school that is committed to strengthening its culture; (4) give the survey at the school and analyze the results; (5) based on those results, filtered through the research, develop a plan to strengthen climate in this particular school; (6) deliver the data analysis and the plan to the school leadership team (and videotape the presentation to allow the principal and university-based faculty to provide feedback on communication skills, meeting planning skills, and so on). This makes all the activity “real,” which is what you want.

Curriculum

X What you did to deepen EDL 688 with the addition of “All Kinds of Minds” is good. But I do not believe that you have gone nearly far enough. “Student Climate” is one of the critical pieces in the effectiveness equation. It will, I am fearful, get lost in EDL 688. It needs its own course, I believe.

Partnerships

? You do not mention the district role in supporting your students; is this an oversight

? On the “clinical faculty” front, my hunch is that you could use a few more principals.

? You do not address the role of partners in getting the curriculum developed; do they have one

Principal Internship/Mentoring

X The “internship” and “mentoring” handbooks are good additions—since the initial review in June. They ground all parties in the work. My comment here amplifies the one provided above under “Instructional Delivery”—and represents the essential aspect of my feedback overall. I am looking at the “additional practicum tasks” on page 11 (I thought there were 7 not 6?) in the “internship handbook.” My sense is that you can, and should, drive these assignments closer to the “authentic practice” end of the activity continuum. Three things to keep an eye on: (1) try not to rely on only one source of data (e.g., interviewing); (2) remember that “observing” and “interviewing” are on the weak end of the authentic work continuum; you want “doing”; and (3) remember that “planning” can be abstract and is not “doing.” For example, activity number 3, “meeting with and shadowing the custodial manager,” is not especially robust. The same problem holds for activity number 5, “interviewing policy makers.” And activity number 1, the “handbook,” can be done at home with no contact with the school. Activity number 6 is too extensive and too academic. Let me illustrate where I think you can go here.

Take activity number 6 and sharpen it and make it authentic. (1) Find a real school with a real problem that wants to improve (e.g., too many suspensions, an unacceptably high dropout rate). (2) Investigate everything that can be learned about the causes of the problem and best practices in solving it—from the research. (3) Using the research as a template, assess the sources of the problem in this particular school. (4) Based on actual school findings (from interviews, observations, surveys, and documents) and best practices from the research, prepare a plan of action for this specific problem in this specific school.

Program Evaluation

X The tools to assess questions 1 and 2 are good. On question 3, however, you need tools that assess “using what was taught in the program” after your students are employed as school leaders in real jobs. The “action projects” do not work here. Good start on question 4, but more information is required on: (1) what specific information is being collected, (2) how it will be analyzed, and (3) how it will be used to engage in improvements to the program.