

**Graduate Degree Program Assessment Plan Cover Sheet (rev. 07):**  
**UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK**

Plan No. 72

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Degree Program: _____                                   | Ed.D. - Educational Administration and Supervision |
| Department and College: _____                           | Educational Leadership - College of Education      |
| Degree Type (MA, MS, EdS, EdD, PhD, Certificate): _____ | Ed.D.  |
| Prepared by: _____                                      | Ibrahim Duyar, Ph.D.                               |

|   |
|---|
| Submitted to College Assessment Committee on _____      |
| _____ Approved on _____                                 |
| Submitted to Provost Assessment Advisory Group on _____ |
| _____ Approved on _____                                 |

Respond to all six questions, following the Degree Program Assessment Plan Form Instructions. Attach additional pages as needed.

**1. What are your student learning goals for this degree program?**

The goal of the Educational Administration and Supervision (EDAS) program is to prepare educational leaders who have the knowledge, skills, values, and abilities to promote success for all students. The Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) component of EDAS is an advanced graduate experience for professional educators who wish to specialize in selected aspects of educational administration and supervision. The EDAS Doctoral Program strives to: (1) develop the intellect of students; (2) discover and disseminate knowledge; (3) enhance awareness in the scientific, technical and cultural arena, and (4) instill a desire for lifelong learning. Although the doctoral program is not aligned with licensure requirements, when applicable, the curriculum, instruction, and assessment components of EDAS Doctoral Program are guided by the pertinent professional standards (i.e., the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders 1996 and Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008) and performance indicators (i.e., the Performance Expectations and Indicators 2008).

The Doctoral Program is designed to achieve *six goals* and accompanying *objectives*. These goals include: (1) vision of learning; (2) curriculum, instruction, and supervision; (3) professional and ethical leadership; (4) communication; (5) ethics; and (6) influence. These goals provide the common core as defined by the learning societies.

The curriculum of the Doctoral Program has been revisited and revised in 2006 and spring 2010. The program of study is currently compliant with the policies of the state

accreditation, national accreditation, and learned societies. These elements have been incorporated into the course syllabi and included in the assessment practices of the program. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) has established elements of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will be expected of graduates. The six core program goals are consistent with those required by the Educational Leadership Consortium Council (ELCC). Similarly, the ELCC standards are consistent with those required by the National Center for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE).

As it is stated above, the *six interconnected standards* of ADE, ELCC, and NCATE form the foundation and the goals for program curriculum, instruction, and assessment. These program goals and learning objectives are incorporated throughout the program of study and woven through the course *significant activities* that program students must successfully complete. These six program goals are explained in the attached "Curriculum and Assessment Matrix" and "Curriculum and Assessment Plan Grid." These program goals provide the common performance indicators as defined by the learning societies of this profession.

**2. What are your learning objectives or outcomes associated with each student learning goal?**

The learning outcomes associated with six standards are illustrated on the attached

- (a). *Curriculum and Assessment Matrix* and
- (b). *Learning Outcomes Grid*

Each program goal was targeted through the achievement of three to five learning objectives. A total of **21 learning outcomes** were identified for the six program goals.

**3. Where will the objectives be addressed in your program? In which courses and through which activities will they be assessed? (Curriculum Assessment Map.)**

The attached Curriculum and Assessment Matrix and Learning Outcomes Grid identify how each objective connects with one or more required "courses" in the program of study and at which points each learning outcome is assessed. Courses are only one of the several instruments for the assessment of program goals and objectives. A list of instruments for the data assessment is included in the item 4# of this report.

The program goals and learning outcomes are woven across the required courses with "significant activities" that students must successfully complete. The significant activities are the select assessment within each course. The emphasis of each required program course is weighted based on a three-point-scale (little, somewhat, and extensive). Only the courses with "extensive" emphasis pertaining to learning outcomes are selected for assessments. All 21 learning outcomes are accounted for the assessments and they are addressed by at least one course and its accompanying significant activity. Rubrics are created by the program faculty for the assessment of significant activities. The relevant data is gathered in the Chalk and Wire environment.

#### **4. How will you assess each objective? (a) Methods; (b) Design; (c) Assessment cycle; (d) Stakeholder involvement.**

The EDAS Doctoral Program goals and learning outcomes for the academic year were assessed using the following instruments:

- I. Significant Activity Assessments
- II. Comprehensive Examinations
- III. Doctoral Dissertation Assessments
- IV. End of Program Surveys
- V. Praxis Assessments

I. Significant Activity Assessments: Student learning outcomes gained in program coursework are measured through the select significant activities for each course in the program. Program learning outcomes for the academic year were assessed through the use of a set of scoring rubrics. These rubrics were then used to create the Chalk and Wire rubrics for the program assessment. The data collected in the Chalk and Wire span the entire time period that extends from entry to exit of each doctoral program student. Students are required to develop e-portfolios which contain pertinent data on course significant activities. Assessment of student work is maintained in the Chalk and Wire e-portfolio for each student. Chalk and Wire data was used to assess each doctoral candidate. Chalk and Wire also has been and will be used extensively to assimilate data on program effectiveness and disaggregate specific areas of potential improvement regarding programmatic development. Each program faculty teaching a course has the responsibility for assuring data submission by the students and assessment of performance on the respective course significant activity.

Validity is an aspect of the program review addressed by faculty members in the creation and implementation of course syllabi and outlines. Validity has been assured through the consistent review and incorporation of appropriate ADE, ELCC, and NCATE standards. In this respect, the program faculty held regularly scheduled meetings to align content of all program courses to ADE, ELCC, and NCATE standards. Rubrics are used as validity and reliability measures. The program faculty is aware of the importance of consistency in data collection and data analyses processes. Therefore, when applicable, the interrater reliability, pretest and posttest, and subsequent scoring of previous artifacts were used for assessing reliability of the assessments.

Stakeholders are informed about the student coursework learning outcomes at the Annual Stakeholders Meeting. When applicable and appropriate, the program faculty considered the incorporation of suggestions articulated by stakeholders.

II. Comprehensive Examinations: Parallel with the efforts to increase the quality and rigor of the graduate program across the College of Education, EDAS doctoral program quality standards are increased through a variety of measures. As one of the two capstone experiences in the doctoral program, the comprehensive examination was restructured in fall 2010 to meet the program goals. The comprehensive examination results offer an

overall assessment of content knowledge acquirement by each program student. The comprehensive examination results also are and will be used extensively to assimilate data on program effectiveness and disaggregate specific areas of potential improvement regarding programmatic development. Comprehensive examinations are held in fall and spring semesters if one or more eligible candidate-s applies. The Doctoral Program coordinator who chairs the comprehensive examinations is responsible for gathering relevant data.

The comprehensive examinations are structured in two main sections: (a) EDAS section and (b) Research and Statistics section. In cases where the student has a co-emphasis in Gifted Education or Special Education, the first section is equally divided between EDAS concentration and co-emphasis areas. The EDAS section consists of (a) Content Application and (b) Theoretical Foundations. The content application section measures candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in (a) analysis of educational information; (b) evaluation of actions; and (c) problem solving skills. The theoretical foundations measures candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in managing and leading educational organizations from the perspective of relevant literature as well as self-reflections of the candidates. The research and statistics sections measure candidates' knowledge of and readiness for running qualitative and quantitative research and analyzing data. A rubric was developed for the comprehensive examinations and relevant data is collected in the Chalk and Wire environment.

III. Doctoral Dissertation Evaluation: College of Education initiated a college-wide effort to improve the quality of dissertation research in Spring 2009 and Fall 2010. Improving dissertation quality has been an ongoing initiative both by the College of Education and the EDAS program. Updated guidelines for doctoral students and faculty were the major outcomes of the most recent college-wide effort. The EDAS Doctoral Program use the student and faculty guidelines developed (2006) and later updated (2010) in college-wide initiatives.

Guided by the college and program level quality improvement efforts, the EDAS Doctoral Program developed Dissertation Evaluation Rubric to assess the student learning outcomes and performance. The assessments are carried out in the Chalk and Wire environment. The assessment reflects the collective evaluation of dissertation committees. Students' advisors chair the dissertation committees and are responsible for entering the assessment data in the Chalk and Wire environment.

IV. End of Program Survey: In fall 2010, an end of program (exit) survey was developed by the program faculty and it was administered by the dissertation chairs of graduating students. The surveys were administered in the doctoral candidate's last semester in the program. To prevent the confusion between program and college exit surveys, the college administration advised a manual application of EDAS exit surveys. The doctoral program faculty with the assistance of dissertation chairs gathers and stores the end of program survey for the EDAS Doctoral Program.

The results of this assessment are and will be used solely for the program improvement purposes. The end of program is composed of two sections which include Likert scale items on a five-point scale. The first section of the survey focuses on candidates' experience in the coursework. The second section is about candidates' experience in dissertation research under dissertation chairs. A rating of 1.0-2.0 for any item requires the program faculty to review course content and/or advising process. Based on the annual program assessment findings, the areas of improvement are identified and appropriate improvements are developed.

V. Praxis Assessment: This is a supplementary assessment for the doctoral program. The main reason for the supplementary status for this assessment is because of the fact that the doctoral program is not aligned with licensure requirements for practicing administrators. In EDAS program, the master's program is aligned with the school level praxis (principalship licensure) while the specialist program is aligned with district level praxis (superintendent and director of curriculum licensures). Therefore, doctoral program candidates are expected to complete licensure requirements prior to the EDAS Doctoral Program. In cases where students have not completed licensure requirements are required to develop independent licensure program of studies for respective licensure area. The doctoral program has decided to track the praxis scores of doctoral students who are following any licensure program along with their doctoral program.

## **5. What are the assessment findings? How did you analyze them?**

### **I. Significant Activity Assessments:**

Several years ago, there was not a Doctoral Program of Study. Students in master's, specialist, and doctoral programs were all taking similar courses. The only difference between the doctoral program and other EDAS degree programs was the number of credits hours of coursework required for graduation. Under this structure, the doctoral program students usually ended up not taking any doctoral level courses (with 8000 and 9000 codes). In 2007, the program faculty decided to independently structure degree programs, including doctoral program. Accordingly, program of studies were developed for each degree program. The doctoral program of study (POS) has been revised since then and improved it over the years. Currently, the EDAS doctoral program has its own independent program of study, which consists of courses with 8000 and 9000 codes.

Student learning outcomes for coursework are measured through the select significant activities. A total of 21 learning outcomes which address all six professional standards were identified via curriculum mapping. The program faculty participated in the curriculum mapping at the beginning of 2010 academic year. A new table of contents (TOC) reflecting the curriculum mapping were created over the Chalk and Wire environment. The new TOC included new rubrics with updated criteria and increased the measurement scale from three-point scale to five-point-scale.

The assessments of significant activities are displayed in **Appendix A**. The (a) *overall average score* and the (b) *average criteria score* (where available) were considered for the assessment of significant activities. Both assessment scores were based on a five-point Likert scale, where 1.0 was "below basic" and 5.0 "exemplary." The average criteria scores offer detailed student performance information about the different aspects of each significant activity. For the cases where data was available, the overall average and the average criteria scores were within the acceptable ranges. The "satisfactory" and "exemplary" ratings were considered as evidence of program effectiveness in reaching student learning outcomes. The program faculty discussed the significant activity learning outcomes (performances) in a dedicated faculty meeting. Both the overall average scores for each significant activity and average criteria scores for the criteria of respective significant activities were ranged between 3.5 and 5.0. This was a satisfactory result for the coursework related student performance. The faculty decided that several criteria which were below than the respective overall average scores are further examined and the appropriate actions are taken by the course instructors.

Stakeholders were informed about the student coursework learning outcomes at the Annual Stakeholders Meeting, which was held in UALR campus in 2012. Comments made by the stakeholder were further discussed in the faculty meetings. Adjunct faculty teaching doctoral courses were invited for the meetings for appropriate action.

Two main issues and/or limitations were observed in coursework-based significant activity assessments. First, enforcing significant activity assessments over the Chalk and Wire environment appeared to create confusion for both students and faculty members. Students also confused with the existence of both old and new TOC's on the Chalk and Wire. There were cases where both old and new TOC and their respective rubrics were used for the assessment of significant activities. Corrections were made on this issue in the 2011-2012 academic year. However, the implementation by the respective faculty members was still problematic in 2012. The faculty members from other programs who teach EDAS doctoral courses or chair doctoral dissertation research were particularly non-compliant with the Chalk and Wire based assessments. The College administration was informed about the issue since the EDAS program does not have any latitude on the (a) assignments of the doctoral courses or (b) assignment of doctoral dissertation chairing to faculty members from other programs. In cases of non-compliance, the manual assessments were collected from these faculty members.

## **II. Comprehensive Examinations:**

Parallel with the efforts to increase the quality and rigor of the Doctoral Program, comprehensive examinations were restructured in fall of 2010 to meet the program goals. The comprehensive examinations included written examinations and additional oral examinations. The written exams comprised of four sections. The first two sections address the educational administration concentration and co-emphasis areas. The last two sections address the Educational Foundation (EDFN) in research and statistics.

An informational session was offered to students who expressed an interest in sitting the comps. Student advisors and the doctoral program coordinator offered students additional advising on the comprehensive examinations. Students were encouraged to form study peer support groups toward the preparation for comps.

The data about student performance on comprehensive examination was gathered from the database maintained by the doctoral program coordinator. The comprehensive examinations were assessed through the utilization of "Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Review Form," which was posted on Chalk and Wire.

**Appendix B** demonstrates the written examination results. Passing score was set as 3.75 and above on a five-point Likert scale for the concentration and co-emphasis areas. Similarly, a passing score of 75 points on a 100 points set for the research and statistics sections. Inter-rater reliability for the assessment of each section was calculated and discussed at the committee meetings. Inter-reliability scores were low, indicating no significant differences among individual raters.

A total of three (3) students sat in the comprehensive examination in 2012. Two of the three students failed in both EDAS and EDFN sections in their first attempt. The third student was successful in all sections in the first attempt. One of students who failed in both sections retook the comps in spring and successfully passed from both sections. The second student who failed in both sections is following a remediation plan. Unfortunately, this student had to drop the suggested course for remediation because of the health issues in the family.

### **III. Doctoral Dissertation Assessments:**

The College of Education has completed a year long initiative to improve dissertation quality in Fall of 2010. The EDAS program faculty who chair doctoral dissertations actively participated in these efforts and served on the committee and sub-committees. The current guidelines are in the process of improvement as part of this second round of dissertation quality improvement initiative. The EDAS doctoral program has developed a Dissertation Research Assessment rubric made it available in the Chalk and Wire environment. Dissertation chairs are required to use this rubric for the assessment of their advisee's performance in dissertation research.

A total of two (2) doctoral students successful defended their dissertation research in 2012. Unfortunately, the faculty members from other programs who chaired the EDAS doctoral dissertations were incompliant with the assessments. Manual evaluations were performed by the EDAS doctoral program coordinator. The overall average score of the Dissertation Evaluation was 4.3 on a 5.0 point scale. The results of dissertation research assessment are presented in **Appendix C**. These results and low compliance by the dissertation chairs were discussed in the EDAS program faculty meetings. The apparent low performance on "Writing quality" was conceived of presence of a significant issue and possible strategies were discussed at a program faculty meeting. The program faculty

members have reaffirmed the continuous program development efforts and discussed possible strategies for collaboration with other program faculty chairing EDAS program.

#### **IV. Praxis Assessments:**

Only one (n= 1) doctoral candidate who is also independently following licensure program took the praxis test for licensure in 2012. This candidate successfully passed building level licensure praxis test. The overall scores and criterion scores for this graduate are displayed in **Appendix D**. The student received 177 in the School Leaders Licensure Assessment. The examination of performance "elements" showed that the candidate presented strength in almost all elements. Sub-scores for "Management of Organizational Systems/Safety and "Education System" elements were particularly high. Interesting, the candidate received the lowest scores in "Vision/mission" element. Faculty members discussed the results and agreed to address this area in their coursework.

#### **V. End of Program (Exit) Survey:**

In lieu with the doctoral assessment plan, an end of program/exit survey was developed. The exit survey is completed by all doctoral program completers immediately upon successful defense of their dissertation. The survey is composed of two sections: (a) the quality of advising provided and (b) the level of preparation received in the doctoral program. Using a four-scale, graduates are asked to respond 16 items. An additional "no opinion" item also was provided. The assessment of exit survey was provided in **Appendix E**.

There were two (2) graduates in 2011-2012 academic year. Both graduates completed the exit survey. One of the graduates works as the district level coordinator of Gifted Education. The other graduate is a teacher in a neighboring school district. Overall, the results of exit survey demonstrated that our graduates are well prepared to assume the responsibilities of leadership in their work. The average score of the level of preparation was 3.6. The criterion scores ranged from 3.3 to 4.0. Graduates also indicated that they were satisfied with the advising provided during their doctoral study. The average score of "advising during the coursework" was 3.5/4.0. The program faculty noted this as an area of improvement. Graduates highly rated (4.0/4.0) the advising they received during their dissertation research.

**What conclusions were drawn and what decisions were made as a result? How were stakeholder groups involved?**

#### **Significant Activity Assessments**

Assessment results showed that the new TOC and rubrics were not fully utilized for the assessment of student learning outcomes. In fact, the data gathering about course significant activities was abandoned in the last several years. A meeting with the College



and department administration has resulted in reactivating the TOC and rubrics in Chalk and Wire environment. These efforts resulted in increased use of significant activities in 2011. Unfortunately, there was relatively a backward trend in 2012. Some of the assessments were manually made after the assessment period. These developments were presented to College Administration through this assessment report. It is expected that the transition may be fully realized and enforced in the coming years.

### Comprehensive Examinations

Two of the students, one in the first attempt and the other in the second attempt, successfully passed the comprehensive examinations in 2012. The program has a tradition to offer a remediation plan to those students who are not successful in comprehensive examinations. Student advisors play a key role on in guiding the student for the remediation. The remediation plan which was finalized by the comprehensive examination committee did not require this particular student to take additional courses. Instead, student asked to take an intensive independent reading class with the advisor. The third student was advised to take EDAS and EDFN courses as this particular student transferred significant amount of coursework from another program. Although the student enrolled one EDAS class, she had to drop the course because of the family health issues.

EDAS program faculty discussed the nature and the format of the comps with EDFN program faculty. One of the changes proposed was to transform EDAS doctoral program comps from content knowledge-based examinations to development of a dissertation proposal draft or develop a publishable journal article. Although the program faculty decided to not to make any changes in 2012, the tendency to change comps has gained momentum. Since the purpose of the comprehensive examinations is to measure students' readiness for the dissertation research, the proposed changes seemed reasonable to the majority of the faculty members. One of the decisions was made was to inquire student input about the proposed changes in the comps. The preliminary findings showed that students appear to favor of the new format at least for the EDFN section of the comprehensive examinations. The student performance in this category is expected to rise in the following years.

### Dissertation Evaluations

The increasing the quality of doctoral dissertation research has been a priority both by the College of Education and the EDAS Doctoral Program. The program faculty have been actively involved in the college-wide dissertation quality improvement efforts by serving in the subcommittees. In order to increase the quality, program added GRE "Analytical Writing" section as one of the admission requirements to the doctoral program. To increase the quality in research methods and writing quality, candidates are assigned with methodologists. Dissertation chairs and methodologists actively collaborate in every step of dissertation proposal development as well as dissertation reports.

To address the issues of compliance, the program faculty has asked the College administration for not to sign off EDAS doctoral program students' graduation unless all assessments listed in the early pages of this report are completed. The faculty also requested to assignment of other program faculty as dissertation advisors without the knowledge of EDAS faculty.

#### End of Program (Exit) Surveys

Completion of end program surveys is expected to be fully enforced in the years to come. Dissertation chairs have the primary responsibility to have their students to complete the exit survey, as part of their graduation process.

*Appendix A*

**2012 Significant Activity Assessments for  
EDAS Doctoral Program**

| <b>Significant Activity</b>   | <b>n/N</b>      | <b>Average</b>   |
|---|-----------------|--|
| EDAS 8303<br>Case Studies in advanced law and ethics<br>(Five point scale - no criterion is identified)   | 0/13            | NA   |
| EDAS 8307<br>Research Document<br>(Five point scale - no criterion is identified)   | 0/5             | NA   |
| EDAS 8317<br>Policy Issue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significance of the policy Issue</li> <li>• Policy development process</li> <li>• Policy analysis</li> <li>• Policy response</li> <li>• Impact and implications</li> </ul> <b>Average</b>  | 8/8             | 4.3/5.0<br>4.4/5.0<br>4.5/5.0<br>4.2/5.0<br>4.1/5.0<br><b>4.3/5.0</b>  |
| EDAS 8320<br>Leadership Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displays a clear vision</li> <li>• Displays appropriate knowledge to complete project</li> <li>• Properly organized and structured</li> <li>• Demonstrates the acquired knowledge to work cooperatively with others</li> <li>• Communicated efforts effectively</li> <li>• Demonstrates ability to understand leadership styles and traits</li> <li>• Demonstrates use of technology</li> <li>• Demonstrates acquired knowledge of technology</li> </ul> | 3/3             | 3.4/5.0<br>4.8/5.0<br>3.4/5.0<br>4.9/5.0<br>4.5/5.0<br>4.5/5.0<br>4.8/5.0<br>4.1/5.0<br>4.5/5.0<br>4.4/5.0<br><b>4.3/5.0</b> |
| EDAS 8330<br>Organizational Analysis Project  | Was not offered | NA   |

*Appendix B*

**2011 Comprehensive Examination Assessments for  
EDAS Doctoral Program**

| <b>Criterion</b>             | <b>*N=3</b> | <b>**Average</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| EDAS Content Application     | 3           | 4.1/5.0          |
| EDAS Theoretical Foundations | 3           | 4.2/5.0          |
| EDFN Research                | 3           | 4.5/5.0          |
| EDFN Statistics              | 3           | 4.0/5.0          |
| <b>Average</b>               | <b>3</b>    | <b>4.2/5.0</b>   |

\*One of the two students retook the comps the second time.

\*\* Scores do not include the failed attempts of two students.

*Appendix C*

**2012 Dissertation Evaluation Assessments for  
EDAS Doctoral Program**

| <b>Criterion</b>                         | <b>n/N<br/>2/2</b> | <b>Average</b> |
|--|--------------------|----------------|
| Writing Quality                          | 2                  | 4.5/5.0        |
| Format and Style                         | 2                  | 4.5/5.0        |
| Significance of the Study                | 2                  | 5.0/5.0        |
| Focus of the Study                       | 2                  | 5.0/5.0        |
| Literature Review                        | 2                  | 4.5/5.0        |
| Research Design, Methods, and Procedures | 2                  | 4.0/5.0        |
| Findings                                 | 2                  | 5.0/5.0        |
| Implications and Conclusions             | 2                  | 4.0/5.0        |
| Presentation and Oral Defense            | 2                  | 5.0/5.0        |
| <b>Average</b>                           | <b>2</b>           | <b>4.6/5.0</b> |

*Appendix D*

**2012 Praxis Assessments for  
EDAS Doctoral Program**

| <b>School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)</b> | <b>177</b> |                  | <b>Pass</b>          |                     |
|---|------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|   | Score      | Points Available | Min. Average Perform | Max Average Perform |
| Vision/Goals                                      | 10         | 14               | 9                    | 11                  |
| Teaching/Learning                                 | 16         | 21               | 15                   | 18                  |
| Management of Organizational Systems/Safety       | 12         | 13               | 8                    | 10                  |
| Collaboration With Key Stakeholders               | 12         | 16               | 10                   | 13                  |
| Ethics/Integrity                                  | 11         | 15               | 11                   | 13                  |
| Education System                                  | 11         | 12               | 6                    | 10                  |
| Vision/Goals(CR)                                  | 7          | 12               | 6                    | 9                   |
| Teaching/Learning (CR)                            | 12         | 18               | 11                   | 15                  |

*Appendix E*

**2012 Exit Survey Assessments for  
EDAS Doctoral Program**

| <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>n/N</b><br><b>2/2</b> | <b>Average</b>     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Advising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advising during the coursework</li><li>• Advising during the dissertation research</li></ul> | 2<br>2                   | 3.0/4.0<br>4.0/4.0 |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Preparation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared in the central concepts and structure of my discipline</li> <li>• Whether preparation is applicable to my current position</li> <li>• Prepared to be a skilled communicator in my discipline</li> <li>• Gained information necessary to continue to develop professionally</li> <li>• Gained knowledge and appropriate use of the standards and/or frameworks central to my discipline</li> <li>• Prepared to effectively accommodate learners'/clients' culturally diverse backgrounds, special needs, and different learning styles</li> <li>• Prepared to utilize technology appropriate for my discipline.</li> <li>• prepared to assess learners'/clients' needs and abilities</li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">4.0/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3.5/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4.0./4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3.0/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3.5/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4.0/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4.0/4.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4.0/4.0</p> |
| <p><b>Average</b></p>  | <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.6/4.0</b></p>  |