

PRE POST SELF-ASSESSMENT STUDY:  
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION & LEADERSHIP: 2011-2013

Frances Kayona  
John Hoover  
Mohammed Quansah

PRE POST SELF-ASSESSMENT STUDY:  
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION & LEADERSHIP: 2011-2013

**Executive Summary**

The executive summary statements are arranged by licensure area. Initially, summary statements for the principalship are provided, followed by the special education director candidates and candidates for the superintendency.

***Principal candidates:***

1. The clear strength of the principalship program lies in competencies associated with *communication, leadership, diversity leadership, values/ethics, and K-12 leadership* [subpart].
2. The program improved candidate performance *most in safety and security, resource management, community relations, values/ethics, and instructional leadership*. Values and ethics [dispositions] must be considered a programmatic strength because (a) candidates rated themselves as performing well [at the time of completion] and (b) they evidenced considerable growth in this domain.
3. The lowest-scoring competences (possible areas for improvement) included political influence, and policy/law.

***Special Education Director candidates:***

1. Special Education Director candidates ranked themselves as performing well across the 13 core and 3 subpart domains, but most notably in *communication, organizational management, and values/ethics*. The most value was added to the following competencies: *community relations* and *safety/security*.
2. *Policy and law* proved the highest rated subpart domain.
3. Relatively speaking, the weakest domain was *political influence* while the lowest growth occurred in *judgment & problem analysis, communication, and policy and law*.

***Superintendent candidates***

1. Candidates rated themselves most prepared in *community relations, safety and security, political influence and governance, and policy/law*. The highest value-added (growth) data were for *human resource management* and *judgment/problem analysis*.
2. The lowest-rated competencies (though still quite high) were *human resource management* and *values/ethics*. Notice that though *resource management* was one of the lower-rated items, it scored at the top in improvement.
3. Among the subpart competencies for the Superintendency, *communication* and *judgment/problem analysis* scored extremely high.

**PRE-POST ASSESSMENT STUDY:  
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP & ADMINISTRATION: 2011-2013**

**Context/Method/Introduction**

Candidates are asked to self-evaluate on two lists of competencies. First candidates judge themselves upon admission on a list of 13 state licensure core competencies [for school administration preparation]. Second, the same candidates rate their incoming skills on a second set of competencies related to their aspiring licensure area; in this second instance, separate item sets are organized for principal candidates, special education director candidates, community education director, and superintendent candidates. No responses were provided for community education completers at the time of this study.

Results are organized in the following manner by discipline area. First, the 13 core competencies are arranged (sorted) by the 2013 values for scores upon completion, that is for the post-assessment trial (Table 1). Second, the same 13 variables are arranged in descending order by the mean gain—taken in this case as a value added metric (Table 2). These latter figures were calculated by subtracting the pre-assessment self-rating from the post-assessment self-rating.

In a second disaggregation, for each discipline area the subpart competencies for that domain are laid out twice. First, a table is provided listing the subpart competencies in descending rank order by mean for the post-assessment (Table 3). Second, the items are arranged in descending order by the value-added indicator (pre-assessment rating subtracted from post-assessment rating, labeled as Table 4).

The pre-post self-assessment rubric comprises of a **six-point scale** ranging from inefficient to exemplary.

**Principal Candidates**

**Table 1.P. Principals candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test, 2013 data).**

	2011 (N ~ 17)				2012 (N ~ 14)				2013 (N ~ 26)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Communication	5.2	.5	1.9	100.0	5.3	.6	1.6	100.0	5.4	.5	1.5	100.0
Leadership	5.1	.5	1.7	100.0	5.1	.6	1.3	100.0	5.2	.4	1.8	100.0
Diversity leadership	4.9	.8	1.8	94.1	5.0	.8	1.1	100.0	5.0	.6	1.6	100.0
Values & ethics of leadership	4.6	1.2	1.4	100.0	5.0	.7	1.5	100.0	5.0	.6	2.0	100.0
Judgment & problem analysis	4.9	.6	1.9	100.0	5.0	.6	1.5	100.0	4.9	.7	1.7	96.2
Organizational management	5.1	.5	2.0	100.0	4.6	.7	1.0	92.9	4.8	.8	1.8	92.3
Instructional management	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.9	.6	1.4	100.0	4.8	.7	1.7	96.2
Safety and security	4.8	.6	2.3	100.0	4.8	.6	1.9	92.9	4.8	.6	2.2	92.3
Curriculum planning and development	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.8	.8	1.3	100.0	4.7	.7	1.6	100.0
Human resources management	4.8	.7	2.2	94.1	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.7	.5	2.1	100.0
Community relations	4.3	1.2	1.9	93.8	4.9	1.0	1.5	92.9	4.6	1.0	2.0	84.8
Policy and law	4.7	.8	2.3	94.1	4.4	.6	1.7	92.9	4.3	.6	1.9	92.3
Political influence and governance	4.6	.6	2.0	100.0	4.4	.9	1.9	85.7	4.0	.8	1.8	80.8
Total Score	4.8	---	1.9	98.2	4.8	---	1.5	96.7	4.8	---	1.8	95.0

Table 2.P. Principals candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.

	2011 (N ~ 17)				2012 (N ~ 14)				2013 (N ~ 26)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Safety and security	4.8	.6	2.3	100.0	4.8	.6	1.9	92.9	4.8	.6	2.2	92.3
Human resources management	4.8	.7	2.2	94.1	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.7	.5	2.1	100.0
Community relations	4.3	1.2	1.9	93.8	4.9	1.0	1.5	92.9	4.6	1.0	2.0	84.8
Values & ethics of leadership	4.6	1.2	1.4	100.0	5.0	.7	1.5	100.0	5.0	.6	2.0	100.0
Policy and law	4.7	.8	2.3	94.1	4.4	.6	1.7	92.9	4.3	.6	1.9	92.3
Leadership	5.1	.5	1.7	100.0	5.1	.6	1.3	100.0	5.2	.4	1.8	100.0
Organizational management	5.1	.5	2.0	100.0	4.6	.7	1.0	92.9	4.8	.8	1.8	92.3
Political influence and governance	4.6	.6	2.0	100.0	4.4	.9	1.9	85.7	4.0	.8	1.8	80.8
Instructional management	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.9	.6	1.4	100.0	4.8	.7	1.7	96.2
Judgment & problem analysis	4.9	.6	1.9	100.0	5.0	.6	1.5	100.0	4.9	.7	1.7	96.2
Diversity leadership	4.9	.8	1.8	94.1	5.0	.8	1.1	100.0	5.0	.6	1.6	100.0
Curriculum planning and development	4.8	.6	1.8	100.0	4.8	.8	1.3	100.0	4.7	.7	1.6	100.0
Communication	5.2	.5	1.9	100.0	5.3	.6	1.6	100.0	5.4	.5	1.5	100.0
Total Score	4.8	---	1.9	98.2	4.8	---	1.5	96.7	4.8	---	1.8	95.0

Table 3.P. Principals candidate performance on The *Principal Subpart* (3 items): Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test).

	2011 (N ~ 17)				2012 (N ~ 14)				2013 (N ~ 26)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
K-12 Leadership	5.0	.7	1.7	94.1	4.9	.5	1.4	100.0	4.9	.6	2.0	100.0
Monitor Student Learning	5.0	.4	2.2	100.0	5.1	.7	1.6	100.0	4.8	.6	1.9	100.0
Instructional Leadership	4.8	.7	2.2	100.0	4.6	.6	1.5	100.0	4.6	.7	2.2	96.2
Total Score	4.9	---	2.0	98.0	4.9	---	1.5	100.0	4.8	---	2.0	98.7

Table 4.P. Principals candidate performance on The *Principal Subpart* (3 items): Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test): Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.

	2011 (N ~ 17)				2012 (N ~ 14)				2013 (N ~ 26)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Instructional Leadership	4.8	.7	2.2	100.0	4.6	.6	1.5	100.0	4.6	.7	2.2	96.2
K-12 Leadership	5.0	.7	1.7	94.1	4.9	.5	1.4	100.0	4.9	.6	2.0	100.0
Monitor Student Learning	5.0	.4	2.2	100.0	5.1	.7	1.6	100.0	4.8	.6	1.9	100.0
Total Score	4.9	---	2.0	98.0	4.9	---	1.5	100.0	4.8	---	2.0	98.7

## **Special Education Director Candidates**

**Table 1.SPED.. Special Education Director candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test, 2013 data).**

	2011 (N ~ 10)				2012 (N ~ 4)				2013 (N ~ 7)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Communication	5.3	.4	1.9	100.0	5.3	.6	1.3	100.0	5.6	.5	1.6	100.0
Organizational management	4.6	.7	2.1	90.0	4.7	.6	1.0	100.0	5.3	.5	2.3	100.0
Values & ethics of leadership	4.6	.5	1.8	100.0	4.7	.6	1.3	100.0	5.3	.8	2.3	100.0
Leadership	4.8	.5	1.6	100.0	4.7	.6	.7	100.0	5.1	.4	1.7	100.0
Judgment & problem analysis	4.6	.5	1.9	100.0	5.0	.0	1.3	100.0	5.1	.7	1.6	100.0
Community relations	4.1	.7	2.3	80.0	4.7	.6	1.0	100.0	5.0	1.0	2.5	85.7
Diversity leadership	4.8	.6	1.7	100.0	4.3	.6	.3	100.0	4.9	.7	1.6	100.0
Policy and law	4.2	.6	2.3	90.0	4.3	.6	.7	100.0	4.9	.4	1.6	100.0
Instructional management	4.6	.5	1.7	100.0	4.7	.6	1.3	100.0	4.8	.8	1.9	100.0
Human resources management	4.5	.7	2.6	90.0	4.7	.6	2.0	100.0	4.7	.5	2.2	100.0
Safety and security	4.5	.5	2.3	100.0	5.0	.0	2.0	100.0	4.7	.5	2.4	100.0
Curriculum planning and development	4.5	.5	1.7	100.0	4.7	1.2	1.0	100.0	4.6	.9	1.9	100.0
Political influence and governance	4.3	.6	1.8	90.0	4.7	.6	1.7	100.0	4.4	.5	2.0	100.0
Total Score	4.6	---	2.0	95.4	4.7	---	1.2	100.0	5.0	---	2.0	98.9

**Table 2.SPED. Special Education Director candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.**

	2011 (N ~ 10)				2012 (N ~ 4)				2013 (N ~ 7)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Community relations	4.1	.7	2.3	80.0	4.7	.6	1.0	100.0	5.0	1.0	2.5	85.7
Safety and security	4.5	.5	2.3	100.0	5.0	.0	2.0	100.0	4.7	.5	2.4	100.0
Organizational management	4.6	.7	2.1	90.0	4.7	.6	1.0	100.0	5.3	.5	2.3	100.0
Values & ethics of leadership	4.6	.5	1.8	100.0	4.7	.6	1.3	100.0	5.3	.8	2.3	100.0
Human resources management	4.5	.7	2.6	90.0	4.7	.6	2.0	100.0	4.7	.5	2.2	100.0
Political influence and governance	4.3	.6	1.8	90.0	4.7	.6	1.7	100.0	4.4	.5	2.0	100.0
Curriculum planning and development	4.5	.5	1.7	100.0	4.7	1.2	1.0	100.0	4.6	.9	1.9	100.0
Instructional management	4.6	.5	1.7	100.0	4.7	.6	1.3	100.0	4.8	.8	1.9	100.0
Leadership	4.8	.5	1.6	100.0	4.7	.6	.7	100.0	5.1	.4	1.7	100.0
Diversity leadership	4.8	.6	1.7	100.0	4.3	.6	.3	100.0	4.9	.7	1.6	100.0
Policy and law	4.2	.6	2.3	90.0	4.3	.6	.7	100.0	4.9	.4	1.6	100.0
Communication	5.3	.4	1.9	100.0	5.3	.6	1.3	100.0	5.6	.5	1.6	100.0
Judgment & problem analysis	4.6	.5	1.9	100.0	5.0	.0	1.3	100.0	5.1	.7	1.6	100.0
Total Score	4.6	---	2.0	95.4	4.7	---	1.2	100.0	5.0	---	2.0	98.9

**Table 3.SPED. Special Education Director candidate performance on The SPED subpart (3 items): Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test).**

	2011 (N ~ 10)				2012 (N ~ 4)				2013 (N ~ 7)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Policy and law	4.5	.5	2.3	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	100.0	4.8	.4	1.6	100.0
Organizational management	4.5	.5	2.4	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.3	100.0	4.7	.8	2.2	100.0
resource allocation	4.6	.5	2.2	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	100.0	4.7	1.0	1.7	100.0
Total Score	4.5	---	2.3	100.0	5.0	---	1.1	100.0	4.7	---	1.8	100.0

**Table 4.SPED. Special Education Director candidate performance on The SPED subpart (3 items): Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.**

	2011 (N ~ 10)				2012 (N ~ 4)				2013 (N ~ 7)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Organizational management	4.5	.5	2.4	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.3	100.0	4.7	.8	2.2	100.0
resource allocation	4.6	.5	2.2	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	100.0	4.7	1.0	1.7	100.0
Policy and law	4.5	.5	2.3	100.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	100.0	4.8	.4	1.6	100.0
Total Score	4.5	---	2.3	100.0	5.0	---	1.1	100.0	4.7	---	1.8	100.0

**Superintendent Candidates**

**Table 1.S. Superintendent candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test).**

	2011-1013 (N ~ 8)			
	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	Percent Prepared
Community relations	5.0	.8	1.4	100.0
Safety and security	5.0	.5	1.6	100.0
Political influence and governance	5.0	.8	1.0	100.0
Policy and law	5.0	.5	1.3	100.0
Curriculum planning and development	4.9	.6	1.7	100.0
Instructional management	4.9	1.0	1.7	100.0
Communication	4.8	.9	1.6	100.0
Leadership	4.7	1.0	1.2	100.0
Judgment & problem analysis	4.6	.9	1.9	87.5
Organizational management	4.5	.8	1.4	100.0
Diversity leadership	4.5	.9	1.7	87.5
Human resources management	4.4	.5	1.9	100.0
Values & ethics of leadership	4.1	.8	1.5	75.0
Total Score	4.7	0.8	1.5	96.2

Table 2.S. Superintendent candidate performance on 13 core competencies: Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.

	2011-1013 (N ~ 8)			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean Gain</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Human resources management	4.4	.5	1.9	100.0
Judgment & problem analysis	4.6	.9	1.9	87.5
Curriculum planning and development	4.9	.6	1.7	100.0
Instructional management	4.9	1.0	1.7	100.0
Diversity leadership	4.5	.9	1.7	87.5
Safety and security	5.0	.5	1.6	100.0
Communication	4.8	.9	1.6	100.0
Values & ethics of leadership	4.1	.8	1.5	75.0
Community relations	5.0	.8	1.4	100.0
Organizational management	4.5	.8	1.4	100.0
Policy and law	5.0	.5	1.3	100.0
Leadership	4.7	1.0	1.2	100.0
Political influence and governance	5.0	.8	1.0	100.0
Total Score	4.7	0.8	1.5	96.2

Table 3.S. Superintendent candidate performance on *Superintendent sub-part* items: Presented in rank order by mean at end of program (post-test).

	2011-1013 (N ~ 8)			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean Gain</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Communication	4.6	1.1	1.2	100.0
Judgment and policy analysis	4.6	.9	1.6	100.0
Political influence & governance	4.3	.9	1.1	100.0
Organizational management	4.3	1.1	1.8	100.0
Policy and law	4.1	1.0	1.3	100.0
Total Score	4.4	---	1.4	100.0

Table 4. S. Superintendent candidate performance on *Superintendent sub-component* items: Presented in rank order by value added indicator—post-pre difference.

	2011-1013 (N ~ 8)			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean Gain</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Organizational management	4.3	1.1	1.8	100.0
Judgment and policy analysis	4.6	.9	1.6	100.0
Policy and law	4.1	1.0	1.3	100.0
Communication	4.6	1.1	1.2	100.0
Political influence & governance	4.3	.9	1.1	100.0
Total Score	4.4	---	1.4	100.0