

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION & LEADERSHIP: STUDY

SITUATIONAL PANELS ASSESSMENT DATA

Frances Kayona
John Hoover
Mohammed Quansah

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION & LEADERSHIP:
SITUATIONAL PANELS ASSESSMENT DATA

Executive Summary

1. The scales for all three programs represented here are moderately internally consistent, suggesting evidence for reliability.
2. It appears that an orientation or short training for field supervisors on use of the instrument might prove beneficial.
3. For all three fields, candidates, as rated internally and externally, performed very well. In only two cases did ratings ever drop below three (and in these cases, special education directors) only one rater listed a level of 2. Performance proved very strong across ratings and raters.
4. It is not clear, except for the case of principal candidate ratings that small mean differences reflected true differences as no statistical tests were run. With this interpretational caveat, however, it appears that for special educators *resource allocation* proved a relative strength and that [preparation in] *policy and law* could be tightened. Note, however, that it would be a mistake to list *policy and law* as a true weakness—it stands as a relative weakness only—performance was actually quite high.
5. For superintendent candidates, *policy and law* proved a relative strength as judged both internally and externally. *Political influence and governance* (both groups of raters) and *organizational management* (internal raters) were rated slightly lower.
6. The clear strength for the principalship program proved to be *monitoring of student learning*. Though only a relatively weakness, performance in *instructional leadership* received lower ratings from both groups.
7. No systematic differences accrued across years.
8. The situational Panel Assessment rubrics comprise a four-point rating scale:

No Evidence: Responses indicate <u>no understanding</u>	Limited Evidence: Responses indicate <u>rudimentary understanding</u>	Adequate Evidence: Responses indicate <u>sufficient understanding</u>	Ample Evidence: Responses indicate <u>proficient understanding</u>
1	2	3	4

Context/ Method/Introduction

At the end of programs, dyads are empanelled to evaluate candidates for licensure in Educational Administration and Leadership, a subdivision of the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education. One on-site field supervisor (FS) and one representative of the department (university supervisor (US), complete a three-to-five element rubric with four evaluation levels.

The four evaluation levels run from 1 = no evidence/ no understanding (of the skill or knowledge in question) to 4 = ample evidence/ proficient understanding. For the data tables provided below, the assumption was made that levels 3 (adequate/sufficient) and 4 represented the level of skill representative of appropriate entry levels for the disciplines in question. In Tables 1-3 the right-most column reflects the levels of 3 and 4 (combined) and are labeled “Percent Prepared.”

The data are divided as follows: Each table represents one of the licensure areas within programs (Table 2 = Special Education Director Candidates, Table 3 = Superintendent Candidates, Table 4 = Principals). We could locate no data for Director of Community Education candidates. Each table is divided into data provided by on-site field supervisor ratings. In order to provide a sense of temporal change, Tables 2 and 4 are also divided by data for the past three academic years. Table 3, Superintendent candidates, is aggregated across the three years because of a small N.

In order to assess whether or not, or to what degree, the three (or five) metrics, assessed by each licensure domain, could be combined to form scales, internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha, 1951) was calculated separately for raters, but across years. These data, shown in Table 1, suggest that the instrument is generally reliable in the sense that it is moderately internally consistent. Clearly, field supervisors would benefit from the receipt of a brief training on use of the instrument.

Table 1. Reliability data Cronbach’s alpha (α).

Raters	Candidate Category		
	SPED Director	Superintendent	Principal
Field Supervisors (α)	.43	.27	.62
University Supervisors (α)	.71	.55	.65

Table 2. Situational panel assessment: *Special Education Director* candidate performance, descending order by mean rating (2013).

	Completed 2011 N ~ 8			Completed 2012 N ~ 6			Completed 2013 N ~ 9		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Field Supervisor Ratings									
Resource Allocation: Demonstrate understanding of special education programming including needs assessment, design & evaluation.	3.6	.5	100.0	3.3	.5	100.0	3.6	.5	88.9
Organizational Management: Demonstrate knowledge of statutory regulations affecting board meetings, communication, procedures and practices...	3.5	.5	100.0	3.7	.5	100.0	3.3	.5	100.0
Policy & Law: Demonstrate an understanding of state and federal laws and rules and procedures governing and monitoring special education finance...	3.4	.5	100.0	3.3	.5	100.0	2.9	.3	100.0
Mean Across Variables	3.5	.3	100.0	3.4	.5	100.0	3.3	.3	96.3
University Supervisor Ratings									
Resource Allocation: Demonstrate understanding of special education programming including needs assessment, design & evaluation.	3.7	.5	100.0	3.71	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0
Organizational Management: Demonstrate knowledge of statutory regulations affecting board meetings, communication, procedures and practices...	3.3	.5	100.0	3.71	.5	100.0	3.0	.5	100.0
Policy & Law: Demonstrate an understanding of state and federal laws and rules and procedures governing and monitoring special education finance...	3.2	.4	100.0	3.14	.4	100.0	3.0	.5	87.5
Mean Across Variables	3.4	.4	100.0	3.52	.3	100.0	3.2	.5	95.8

Table 3. Situational panel assessment: *Superintendent* candidate performance, descending order by mean rating (2013).

	Completed 2011-2013 N ~ 8		
Field Supervisor Ratings			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Policy and law: Demonstrate an understanding the role of policy and statutory regulations in school district governance, administration, and school board issues...	3.8	.5	100.0
Organizational management: Demonstrate knowledge of factors that affect school finance, including sources of revenue, expenditure classifications, Generally Accepting Accounting Principles...	3.7	.5	100.0
Judgment and problem analyses: Demonstrate knowledge of how to balance varied and competing interests to ensure the mission and vision of the school district...	3.6	.8	85.7
Communication: Demonstrate knowledge of cultivating positive relationships between and with school board members and district and community	3.3	.5	100.0
Political influence and governance: Demonstrate an understanding of the role the political process plays in public education...	3.3	.5	100.0
Mean Across Variables	3.5	.5	97.1
University Supervisor Ratings			
Policy and law: Demonstrate an understanding the role of policy and statutory regulations in school district governance, administration, and school board issues...	4.0	.0	100.0
Judgment and problem analyses: Demonstrate knowledge of how to balance varied and competing interests to ensure the mission and vision of the school district...	3.8	.5	100.0
Communication: Demonstrate knowledge of cultivating positive relationships between and with school board members and district and community	3.5	.6	100.0
Political influence and governance: Demonstrate an understanding of the role the political process plays in public education...	3.3	.5	100.0
Organizational management: Demonstrate knowledge of factors that affect school finance, including sources of revenue, expenditure classifications, Generally Accepting Accounting Principles	3.3	.5	100.0
Mean Across Variables	3.6	.3	100.0

Table 4. Situational panel assessment: *Principal* Candidate performance, descending order by mean rating (2013).

	Completed 2011 N ~ 14			Completed 2012 N ~ 22			Completed 2013 N ~ 36		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Prepared</u>
Field Supervisor Ratings									
<i>Monitor Student Learning:</i> Demonstrate the ability to create a culture that fosters a community of learners through support services, discipline plans...	3.7	.5	100.0	3.8	.4	100.0	3.7	.5	100.0
<i>K-12 Leadership:</i> Demonstrate understanding of the articulation and Alignment of curriculum from preschool through grade 12 at all organizational levels...	3.6	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0
<i>Instructional Leadership:</i> Understand and apply school-wide and district-wide literacy and numeracy systems.	3.6	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0
<i>Mean Across Variables</i>	3.6	.4	100.0	3.6	.4	100.0	3.6	.4	100.0
University Supervisor Ratings									
<i>Monitor Student Learning:</i> Demonstrate the ability to create a culture that fosters a community of learners through support services, discipline plans...	3.7	.5	100.0	3.7	.5	100.0	3.7	.5	100.0
<i>K-12 Leadership:</i> Demonstrate understanding of the articulation and Alignment of curriculum from preschool through grade 12 at all organizational levels...	3.5	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0	3.6	.5	100.0
<i>Instructional Leadership:</i> Understand and apply school-wide and district-wide literacy and numeracy systems.	3.6	.5	100.0	3.5	.5	100.0	3.6	.5	100.0
<i>Mean Across Variables</i>	3.6	.4	100.0	3.6	.4	100.0	3.6	.4	100.0

Figure 1: Mean (across ratings by academic year.

