EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Meeting – May 10, 2013

PRESENT: Warren Aller, Chair (WWU), Pam Estvold (WASA), Andrew Frost (AWSP), Leslie Harrington (WEA), Lynn Heimsoth (WSCA), Joseph Hunter (WWU), Diane Kirchner-Scott (WASA), Ted Klundt (AWSP), Don Larsen (WWU), Michelle McKeown (WWU, Student Representative), Wayne Robertson (WWU), and Ron Spanjer (WASA)

ABSENT: Arionda Feeney (WFIS), Crystal Knight (AWSP), Tom Venable (WASA), Chuck Lambert (WWU, Chair of Special Education – ex-officio), and Francisco Rios (WWU, Dean – ex-officio)

GUESTS: Sherry Anderson, Freda Evans, Brianna Pope, Elizabeth (Lisa) Roberts, and Scott Yingling (2012-2013 Administrative Interns)

SUPPORT: Judy Gramm (PEAB Support Staff) and Jamie Olson Peterson (Graduate Assistant)

SUMMARY:
1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of February 21, 2013, PEAB Minutes
3. Program Assessments (Jamie Olson Peterson)
   • Follow-up Assessment of 2011-2012 First-Year Administrators (Principal)
   • Follow-up Assessment of 2011-2012 Third-Year Administrators (Principal)
   • Formative Assessment of 2011-2012 Interns (Principal)
   • Formative Assessment of 2010-2011 Professional Certification Administrators
   • Formative Assessment of Winter 2011-Spring 2012 Initial Superintendent Interns
4. Student Survey Results (Principal & Superintendent Programs)
5. Using Assessment Data for Program Improvement
   • M.Ed. in Educational Administration
   • Residency Administrator (Principal) Certificate
   • Initial Superintendent Certificate
6. Principal Certification – Internship Planner (revised)
7. Enrollment Report
8. Where Are Our Graduates?
9. Review of Standard 4B – Program Design (Focusing on Recruitment)
10. PESB Standard I Proposed Rubrics (Don Larsen)
11. Director’s Report (Don Larsen)
    • Status of Ed.S. – Washington State
    • Principal Certification (2013-2014 Interns) (Warren Aller)
    • Administrator Professional Certification (program canceled)
    • Superintendent Certification (Wayne Robertson)
12. Intern Portfolio Presentations (Sherry Anderson, Lisa Roberts, Scott Yingling)
13. Election of PEAB Chair
14. PEAB Membership/Willingsness to Continue to Serve on PEAB
15. Items from the Board
    • Thursday, October 17, 2013
    • Thursday, February 20, 2014
    • Friday, May 16, 2014 (morning meeting followed by afternoon student portfolio presentations)
17. PEAB Satisfaction Question (distributed each meeting)
18. Adjournment
1. Welcome and Introductions
Chair Warren Aller called the meeting to order, welcomed PEAB members to the final meeting for academic year 2011-2012, and thanked the Board for their input and guidance this past year.

In addition, the Educational Administration Program faculty hope PEAB members will be able to remain for the afternoon portion of today’s activities—culminating activities/portfolio presentations by twenty-five of the 2012-2013 interns who are completing their programs this year. Five current interns: Sherry Anderson (Post Middle School, Arlington School District); Elizabeth (Lisa) Roberts (Hawkins Middle School, North Mason School District); and Freda Evans, Brianna Pope, and Scott Yingling (South Kitsap High School, South Kitsap School District) have joined us. Three of these guests (Sherry Anderson, Lisa Roberts, and Scott Yingling) will be making presentations to PEAB later in the meeting.

2. Approval of February 21, 2013, PEAB Minutes
MOTION: It was moved by Arionda Feeney and seconded by Lynn Heimsoth that the PEAB minutes of February 23, 2012, be approved as distributed. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Program Assessments (Jamie Olson Peterson)
Jamie Olson Peterson worked with the Educational Administration Program assessment projects during this past year. Survey Monkey was again used to administer the Follow-Up Assessments of 2011-2012 First-Year and Third-Year Administrators this year. As noted last year, the benefits of using this on-line survey tool include:
- quick data capture, quick turnaround
- response rate – usually can get above a 50% return
- increased confidentiality, which in turn should help produce honest responses and lead to program improvement

Jamie’s PowerPoint® presentation summarized the following five assessment reports that she compiled and submitted to the Educational Administration Program for review by PEAB (detailed qualitative and quantitative data, along with the summary of findings, are available in each of the distributed written reports):
- **Follow-up Assessment of 2011-2012 First-Year Administrators (Principal)**
  The Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) requires follow-up of Residency Principal’s Certificate Program graduates who hold beginning administrative appointments. To conduct the follow-up, Western Washington University (WWU) administers two parallel questionnaires to: (a) graduates who have completed one year of service as administrators; and (b) these first-year administrators’ supervisors, normally superintendents. These parallel surveys provide the opportunity to compare how program graduates assess themselves, and how their supervisors assess their knowledge and skills. This annual process is used to improve instruction, curriculum, and the internship experience within WWU’s Educational Administration program. We have been collecting similar data since 1976. This report reflects the information gathered as part of the fall 2012 survey to first-year administrators and their supervisors.

Graduates were asked to rate their administrative performance across six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, comprising a total of thirty-eight (38) outcome strands. These are outlined and required in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC), section 181-78A-270, items two (a)-(b). In addition, graduates were asked to rate themselves on her/his overall performance. Each graduate’s supervisor was asked to rate the graduate across identical strands. One open-ended question asked each graduate and supervisor to provide suggestions to improve the program and any other general comments they would like to leave.
This report (a) outlined each of the thirty-eight (38) outcome strands that were included in the survey, (b) described the Residency Principal’s Certificate Program at WWU, (c) summarized the overall findings, (d) described and analyzed the quantitative results in detail, and (e) provided the qualitative results in the form of verbatim narrative comments.

**Summary of Findings**
Of our Residency Principal’s Certificate Program graduates, we were able to identify 25 who had accepted administrative positions and began as first-year administrators during the 2011-2012 academic year.

**Response Rates**
- 10 of the graduates responded
- 16 of the graduates received feedback responses from their supervisors

**Overall Performance Rates**
Of the 10 responding members of the cohort,
- 1 rated herself/himself as outstanding
- 9 rated themselves as good

Of the 16 graduates who were rated by their supervisors,
- 13 were rated as outstanding
- 3 were rated as good

**Quantitative Assessment Results**
This section described the quantitative assessment results, including graduates’ and supervisors’ overall ratings, as well as ratings within specific ISLLC Standards.

**Ratings Across the ISLLC Standards**
Program graduates and superintendents were asked to rate the degree to which graduates demonstrated successful outcomes across the six ISLLC Standards (38 total strands) and four additional outcome strands. Graduates were rated on a five-point scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Since several graduates and superintendents skipped questions, a “N/A” or not applicable category has been added with those un-selected responses considered non responses and not counted toward the total percentage.

**Highest Scoring Standard: For Graduates**
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader – average score: 4.63
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader – average score: 3.98

**Highest Scoring Standard: For Supervisors**
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader – average score: 4.70
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader – average score: 4.69

**Highest Scoring Strands: For Graduates**
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Ethics – average score: 4.70
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Interpersonal Relationships – average score: 4.70

**Highest Scoring Strands: For Supervisors**
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Ethics-average score: 4.81
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Interpersonal Relationships – average score: 4.81
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader: Parent Involvement – average score: 4.81
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader: Community/Business – average score: 4.81
Lowest Scoring Standards: For Graduates
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader - average score: 3.47
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager - average score: 3.85

Lowest Scoring Standards: For Supervisors
- ISSLC Standard 6: Advocate for Public Policy – average score: 4.34
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager – average score: 4.38

Lowest Scoring Strand: For Graduates
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader: Learning Technology – average score: 2.60
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Food Services– average score: 2.80

Lowest Scoring Strand: For Supervisors
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader: Supervision of Extra/Co-curricular Education– average score: 3.92
- ISSLC Standard 6: Advocate For Public Policy: Federal Programs Administration – average score: 4.06

Qualitative Assessment Results
Individual verbatim comments, including both graduates’ and supervisors’ comments regarding suggested program improvements, are contained in the written report.

- Follow-up Assessment of 2011-2012 Third-Year Administrators (Principal)
The Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) requires follow-up of Residency Principal’s Certificate Program graduates who hold beginning administrative appointments. To conduct the follow-up, Western Washington University (WWU) administers two parallel questionnaires to: (a) graduates who have completed three years of service as administrators; and (b) these third-year administrators’ supervisors, normally superintendents. These parallel surveys provide the opportunity to compare how program graduates assess themselves, and how their supervisors assess their knowledge and skills. This annual process is used to improve instruction, curriculum, and the internship experience within WWU’s Educational Administration program. We have been collecting similar data since 1976. This report reflects the information gathered as part of the fall 2012 survey to third-year administrators and their supervisors.

Graduates were asked to rate their administrative performance across six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, comprising a total of thirty-eight (38) outcome strands. These are outlined and required in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC), section 181-78A-270, items two (a)-(b). In addition, graduates were asked to rate themselves on her/his overall performance. Each graduate’s supervisor was asked to rate the graduate across identical strands. One open-ended question asked each graduate and superintendent to provide suggestions to improve the program and any other general comments they would like to leave.

This report (a) outlined each of the thirty-eight (38) outcome strands that were included in the survey, (b) described the Residency Principal’s Certificate Program at WWU, (c) summarized the overall findings, (d) described and analyzed the quantitative results in detail, and (e) provided the qualitative results in the form of verbatim narrative comments.

Summary of Findings
Of our Residency Principal’s Certificate Program graduates, we were able to identify 10 who had accepted administrative positions and began as third-year administrators during the 2011-2012 academic year.
Response Rates

- 8 of the graduates responded
- 6 of the graduates received feedback responses from their supervisors

Overall Performance Rates

Of the 8 responding members of the cohort,

- 2 rated themselves as outstanding
- 6 rated themselves as good

Of the 6 graduates who were rated by their supervisors,

- 3 rated as outstanding
- 3 rated as being good

Quantitative Results

This section described the quantitative assessment results, including graduates’ and supervisors’ overall ratings, as well as ratings within specific ISSLC Standards.

Ratings Across the ISSLC Standards

Program graduates and superintendents were asked to rate the degree to which graduates demonstrated successful outcomes across the six ISLLC Standards (38 total strands) and four additional outcome strands. Graduates were rated on a five-point scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Since several graduates and superintendents skipped questions, a “N/A” or not applicable category has been added with those un-selected responses considered non responses and not counted toward the total percentage.

Highest Scoring Standards: For Graduates

The following ISLLC standards are ranked as being the highest scoring standard based on the highest average score given by graduates. The highest average score is based on a five-point scale:

- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader – average score: 3.97
- ISSLC Standard 1: Steward of Vision – average score: 3.80

Highest Scoring Standards: For Supervisors

The following ISLLC standards were the highest scored based on supervisors assessing the work of their principals. The highest average score is based on a five-point scale:

- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader – average score: 4.71
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader – average score: 4.58

Highest Scoring Strands: For Graduates

- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Collaborative Decision making – average score: 4.30
- ISSLC Standard 1: Steward of Vision: Effective Communication – average score: 4.25

Highest Scoring Strands: For Supervisors

- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader: Supervisor of Extra/Co-Curricular Education – average score: 5.0
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Ethics – average score: 4.83
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Position Goals/Requirements – average score: 4.83

Lowest Scoring Standards: For Graduates

- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader – average score: 3.56
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader – average score: 3.56
Lowest Scoring Standards: For Supervisors

- ISSLC Standard 6: Advocate for Public Policy – average score: 4.36
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager – average score: 4.35

Lowest Scoring Strand: For Graduates

For graduates, the following ISLLC standard strand had the lowest average score based on a five-point scale:

- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Food Services – average score: 2.80
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader: Community/Business – average score: 3.12

Lowest Scoring Strand: For Supervisors

For Supervisors, the following ISLLC standard strand had the lowest average score based on a five-point scale:

- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader: Analyzing the Curriculum – average score 4.16
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Student Transportation – average score 4.16
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Personnel Procedures – average score 4.16

Qualitative Assessment Results

Individual verbatim comments, including both graduates’ and supervisors’ comments regarding suggested program improvements, are contained in the written report.

- Formative Assessment of 2011-2012 Interns (Principal)

The Residency Principal's Certificate is defined in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) as a 540 clock-hour experience in which the certificate candidate demonstrates competency across six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards which are specified in the WAC. The Educational Administration Program requires that prior to beginning the internship, each certificate candidate must complete forty (40) clock hours in observation of a principal performing these Standards. In addition, the university requires 36 credits of course work in the educational administration concentration plus the twelve (12) credit, year-long internship for the certificate. Admission to the internship comes after the candidate has successfully completed most course work and with appropriate recommendations from the prospective intern's superintendent and supervising principal.

The university's intent in offering the internship is to apply course-based theory to school-based field experience. The university's program includes compliance with the State's WAC requirements and is based on the current research literature on optimal preparation programs for school principals. At the end of each academic year, students in Educational Administration who finish their Residency Principal's Certificate internship are asked to complete a questionnaire about their overall course work and internship experience through Western. This holistic approach determines whether each candidate has acquired (through course work and/or the internship) what she/he sees as being a satisfactory preparation for a building leadership position. The goal of the assessment is program improvement. This report reflects information gathered as part of the spring 2012 survey of 2011-2012 program graduates.

Graduates were asked to rate their administrative performance across the six ISLLC Standards, comprising a total of thirty-eight (38) outcome strands. These are outlined and required in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC), section 181-78A-270, items two (a)-(b) and three (a)-(d). In addition, graduates were asked to rate themselves on four additional outcome strands, as well as respond to six program evaluation questions and three open-ended questions.
This report (a) outlined each of the forty-two (42) outcome strands that were included in the survey, (b) described the Residency Principal’s Certificate Program at WWU, (c) summarized the overall findings, (d) described and analyzed the quantitative results in detail, and (e) provided the qualitative results in the form of verbatim narrative comments.

**Summary of Findings**

**Response Rates**
- 25 out of 25 graduates responded

**Quantitative Assessment Results**
This section described the quantitative assessment results, including graduates’ overall ratings, as well as ratings within specific ISSLC Standards.

**Ratings Across the ISSLC Standards**
Program graduates were asked to rate the degree to which graduates demonstrated successful outcomes across the six ISLLC Standards (38 total strands) and four additional outcome strands. Graduates rated themselves on a five-point scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.

**Highest Scoring Standards: For Graduates**
The following ISLLC standard is ranked as being the highest scoring standard based on the highest average score given by graduates. The highest average score is based on a five-point scale:
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader- average score: 4.81
- ISSLC Standard 6: Advocate for Public Policy- average score: 4.41

**Highest Scoring Strands: For Graduates**
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader – Interpersonal relationships – average score: 4.92
- ISSLC Standard 5: Ethical Leader - Ethics – average score: 4.88

**Lowest Scoring Standards: For Graduates**
For graduates, the following ISLLC standard had the lowest average score based on a five-point scale, one being the highest:
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader – average score: 4.13
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager – average score: 4.16

**Lowest Scoring Strands: For Graduates**
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader- Learning Technology – average score: 3.36
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager – Food Services – average score: 3.60

**Qualitative Assessment Results**
Individual verbatim comments, including both graduates’ and supervisors’ comments regarding suggested program improvements, are contained in the written report.

- **Formative Assessment of 2010-2011 Professional Certification Administrators**
The mission of Western Washington University (WWU) Educational Administration program is to prepare exemplary leaders to meet the demands of school and district leadership focused on optimal achievement for all P-12 students. We accomplish this through the following commitments:
- Ensure a rich balance of theory and practice.
- Support candidates throughout the program and their administrative careers.
- Provide extensive training in the job search process.
- Assist those seeking administrative positions in their placement.
- Develop and sustain collaborative relationships with school districts in western Washington.
• Actively recruit high-quality, diverse candidates.
• Prepare candidates to effectively lead in a diverse society.
• Utilize data to inform continuous program improvement.
• Actively participate in P-12 and University-level professional associations.
• Continuously demonstrate our commitment to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

The WWU Professional Administrator Certificate Program meets all certification requirements as outlined in WAC 181-78A-520 through 540 and was approved by the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) July 12, 2007. The first cohort of students entered the program in Fall 2007.

Western Washington University (WWU) administers a questionnaire to Professional Administrator Certification program completers as the final step before recommendation for the Professional Administrator Certificate. This annual process is used to improve instruction, curriculum, and student learning and to inform the Administrator Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) on the efficacy of the program. This report reflects information gathered as part of the summer 2010 survey to program completers.

Graduates were asked to rate their administrative performance across the six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards benchmarked at sixteen (16) minimum performance indicators for professional administrators as required by WAC 181-78A-540. Two open-ended questions asked each graduate to provide suggestions to improve the program and any other general comments they would like to make.

This report (a) outlined each of the sixteen (16) minimum performance indicators that were included in the survey, (b) described the Professional Administrator Certification Program at WWU, (c) summarized the overall findings, (d) described and analyzed the quantitative results in detail, and (e) provided the qualitative results in the form of verbatim narrative comments.

Summary of Findings
Admission to this program was put on moratorium Fall 2011. These eight (8) respondents were among the final candidates who finished the program as of December 2012.

Response Rates
• 8 out of the 8 completers responded, 100% response rate

In addition to graduates rating how well they felt they were prepared, graduates also rated the overall quality of instruction and mentoring they received from individuals involved in the Administrator Professional Certificate Program.

Overall rating for advising: average score 3.94
• 6 graduates rated their overall advising as excellent.
• 2 graduates rated their overall advising as very good.
• 0 graduates rated their overall advising as good.
• 0 graduates rated their overall advising as fair
• 0 graduates rated their overall advising as poor.

Overall rating for the University professional certification coordinator: average score 4.0
• 6 graduates rated the University professional certification coordinator as excellent.
• 2 graduates rated the University professional certification coordinator as very good.
• 0 graduates rated the University professional certification coordinator as good.
• 0 graduates rated the University professional certification coordinator as fair.
0 graduate rated the University professional certification coordinator as poor.

Quantitative Results
This section described the quantitative assessment results, including graduates’ overall ratings, as well as ratings within specific ISSLC Standards.

Ratings Across the ISSLC Standards
Program graduates were asked to rate the degree to which they demonstrated successful outcomes across the six ISLLC Standards (16 total minimum performance indicators). Graduates rated themselves on a five-point scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.

Highest Scoring Standards For Graduates
The following ISLLC standards are ranked as being the highest scoring standard based on the highest average score given by graduates. The highest average score is based on a five-point scale:
- ISSLC Standard 2: Instructional Leader- average score 4.77
- ISSLC Standard 6: Advocate for Public Policy – average score 4.75

Highest Scoring Strands For Graduates
The following ISLLC strands are ranked as being the highest scoring strands based on the highest average score given by graduates. The highest average score is based on a five-point scale:
- ISSLC Standard 2, Strand 1: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture – average score: 4.87
- ISSLC Standard 2, Strand 2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining student learning – average score: 4.87

Lowest Scoring Standards For Graduates
The following ISLLC standards are ranked as being the lowest scoring standard based on the lowest average score given by graduates. The lowest average score is based on a five-point scale:
- ISSLC Standard 4: Community Leader – average score: 4.50
- ISSLC Standard 3: Organizational Manager – average score: 4.56

Lowest Scoring Strands For Graduates
The following ISLLC strands are ranked as being the lowest scoring strands based on the lowest average score given by graduates. The lowest average score is based on a five-point scale:
- ISSLC Standard 4, Strand 3: Mobilizing community resources – average score: 4.37
- ISLLC Standard 3, Strand 1: Uses a continuous cycle of analysis to ensure efficient and effective systems – average score 4.37

Qualitative Assessment Results
Individual verbatim comments, including both graduates’ and supervisors’ comments regarding suggested program improvements, are contained in the written report.

Formative Assessment of Winter 2011-Spring 2012 Initial Superintendent Interns
This report provided (a) a brief overview of Western Washington University’s Superintendent Certification program, as described in the 2011-2012 Candidate Handbook, (b) a description of the current state of the program and characteristics of its 2011-2012 interns, (c) a description and analysis of the quantitative results of the survey taken by program graduates, and (d) a list of the verbatim narrative comments provided by graduates, the qualitative results.

Mission
The Mission of Western Washington University’s Superintendent Certification Program is to recruit and train exemplary leaders to meet the demands of school district leadership focused on optimal student achievement.
**Foundation**
The program meets all certification requirements as outlined in WAC 181-78A-270(3) and was approved by the State Board of Education, August 2004.

The most current and directly applicable standards for the superintendency come from the work of the Washington Advisory Council for Professional Administrator Standards (WACPAS). Essentially, they are the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) Standards with two added to specifically address the superintendency.

1) Steward of Vision  
2) Instructional Leader  
3) Organizational Manager  
4) Community Leader  
5) Ethical Leader  
6) Advocate for Public Policy  
7) Advisor to the Board  
8) Change Agent

**Program Design**
The program is designed so that it may be completed within two years. It includes six (6) seminar courses and a six-quarter internship for a total of thirty-two (32) credits.

Of those surveyed for this report: 20 candidates were given surveys.

**Response Rate**
- 20 out of 20 candidates responded

**Gender:**
- 13 are female  
- 7 are male

**Summary of Findings – Quantitative Assessment Results**
This section described the quantitative assessment results. The following WACPAS standards had the highest and lowest average score based on a five-point scale:

**Highest Scoring Standards**
- WACPAS Standard 5: Ethical Leader – average score – 4.95  
- WACPAS Standard 2: Instructional Leader – average score – 4.87

**Lowest Scoring Standards**
- WACPAS Standard 7: Advisor to the Board – average score – 4.51  
- WACPAS Standard 4: Community Leader – average score – 4.57

**Highest Scoring Strands**
- WACPAS Standard 2: Instructional Leader: Strand 4 – average score – 5.0  
- WACPAS Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Strand 1 – average score – 5.00  
- WACPAS Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Strand 2 – average score – 5.00  
- WACPAS Standard 5: Ethical Leader: Strand 3 – average score – 5.00

**Lowest Scoring Strands**
- WACPAS Standard 7: Advisor to the Board: Strand 3 – average score – 4.40  
- WACPAS Standard 7 Advisor to the Board: Strand 4 – average score – 4.40  
- WACPAS Standard 3: Organizational Manager: Strand 4 – average score – 4.40
Overall experience with the program:
- 100% rated the instructors in Educational Administration as excellent or very good
- 100% rated the advising they received as excellent or very good
- 100% rated their university internship supervisor as excellent or very good
- 95% rated the mentoring of their superintendent in regard to his/her availability for them for discussion and processing of issues which arose on site as excellent or very good
- 90% rated the advice and guidance they received from their mentoring superintendent as excellent or very good
- 90% rated their overall mentoring supervisor as excellent or very good

Summary of Findings – Qualitative Assessment Results
Individual verbatim comments regarding suggested program improvements are contained in the written report.

The question was raised regarding what do these graduates need and what can the Educational Administration program provide that will improve their rating on areas that have the lowest scores.

It was noted that overall, the Educational Administration Program continues to do an excellent job preparing exemplary leaders to meet the demands of school and district leadership. Thanks and congratulations were extended to Jamie for her hard work in compiling these reports and preparing a PowerPoint presentation that synthesized the information that needed to be communicated and shared with PEAB. We very much appreciate the job she has done this past year as the Graduate Assistant for Educational Administration.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Leslie Harrington and seconded by Diane Kirchner-Scott to approve these five program assessments as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

4. **Student Survey Results (Principal & Superintendent Programs)**
Spring Quarter 2013, a brief (four question) survey on “Why I chose Western for my principal certification program” was distributed to current students in the M.Ed./Principal and Superintendent certification programs. The student survey results were summarized and shared with PEAB (see Attachment A)

5. **Using Assessment Data for Program Improvement**
An assessment plan (data) is created, collected data is compiled, and Closing the Loop allows the program to use the data for program or operational improvements.

Documents summarizing Assessment Plans for Educational Administration’s three active programs were distributed to PEAB members (please refer to Attachments B, C, and D for detailed information):

- M.Ed. in Educational Administration – The M.Ed. in Educational Administration program assessment plan is comprised of two components: **Program Alignment with Conceptual Framework & State Standards** and **Transition Point Assessments & Requirements**. Our assessment plan defines candidate learning outcomes relative to state standards and the conceptual framework, aligns curriculum with the learning outcomes, and identifies sources of evidence of candidate proficiency collected through multiple assessment measures at major transition points.

The majority of M.Ed. in Educational Administration candidates complete an administrator internship for residency principal certification. Refer to the Principal Certification Assessment Plan for applicable transition point assessments and key assessments.
• Residency Administrator (Principal) Certificate – The Principal Certification program assessment plan is comprised of two components: Program Alignment with Conceptual Framework & State Standards and Transition Point Assessments & Requirements. Our assessment plan defines candidate learning outcomes relative to state standards and the conceptual framework, aligns curriculum with the learning outcomes, and identifies sources of evidence of candidate proficiency collected through multiple assessment measures at major transition points.

• Initial Superintendent Certificate – The Superintendent Certification program assessment plan is comprised of two components: Program Alignment with Conceptual Framework & State Standards and Transition Point Assessments & Requirements. Our assessment plan defines candidate learning outcomes relative to state standards and the conceptual framework, aligns curriculum with the learning outcomes, and identifies sources of evidence of candidate proficiency collected through multiple assessment measures at major transition points.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tod Klundt and seconded by Leslie Harrington that the assessment plans and data for improvement are continuously reviewed by PEAB and that PEAB is substantively involved in discussion and recommendations for program or operation improvements. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Principal Certification – Internship Planner (revised)

The Internship Planner for the Residency Principal Certification program has been recently revised and updated to reflect the new ISLLC 2008 Standards. The planner was shared with PEAB and approved.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Don Larsen and seconded by Lynn Heimsoth to support and approve the newly revised Residency Principal Internship Planner (based on the ISLLC 2008 Standards). The motion passed unanimously.

7. Enrollment Report

The following chronological summary of the Educational Administration Program enrollment history and projections for the past ten years was provided and discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>History &amp; Projections</th>
<th>(updated 5/9/2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE</strong></td>
<td><strong>03-04</strong></td>
<td><strong>04-05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MED &amp; Principal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 MED 35 PM</td>
<td>17 MED 43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 MED 11 PM</td>
<td>9 MED 11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 MED 42 PM</td>
<td>12 MED 38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reported in the past, enrollments have been slightly down (a reflection of the bleaker times we have all been facing in the state and nationally). However, we are continuously and consistently recruiting new candidates for our programs, and we are pleased to report our enrollment is slowly, but steadily increasing (reversing the trend of the last six years). As demonstrated by the latest statistics, we currently have 87 students in our master’s and residency principal certification programs and our prediction is that our numbers next year should reach the 90s.

8. Where Are Our Graduates?
According to the 2012-2013 Washington Education Directory, Western Washington University’s Educational Administration alumni currently hold 504 administrative positions in 100 Washington State school districts and 6 private schools. In addition, 6 graduates are administrators in out-of-state schools/districts. Even with the recession, retirements and attrition, placements of our graduates have increased by 39 administrators since 2006; this is an increase of approximately 7.7%. The table below compares known administrative positions held by our alumni during 2012-2013, 2005-2006, 2004-2005, 2002-2003 and 2000-2001 in Washington State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate/Deputy Superintendents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous District Administrators (Directors, Executive Directors, Assistant Directors, Administrative Assistants, and Coordinators)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate/Vice Principals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Review of Standard 4B – Program Design (Focusing on Recruitment)
In an email dated September 21, 2012, from PESB, PEABs have been asked to continue to reflect and comment on Standard IV (Program Design), with a concentration on recruitment, as follows:

Standard 4B (formerly 4.2) requires that:
(3) Faculty regularly review recruitment and retention data for effectiveness of program in meeting the diversity and content goals of the state, program, and partner districts.
   (i) Programs create and implement a recruitment and retention plan in response to data;
   (ii) Programs annually report the data, the plan, and proposed modifications to the Professional Educator Advisory Board and other stakeholder groups supporting the program’s effort.

This year we are asking PEABs to review recruitment, including but not limited to:

- The program’s recruitment plan in response to regional workforce needs and state/regional shortage areas.
  1. Program aims include an intentional and ongoing focus on recruiting and retaining students who represent cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity. Program faculty members meet at least monthly to address an agenda that consistently includes recruitment. In addition, during the 2012-13 school year, faculty met at least three times for a day-long retreat during which recruitment strategies were introduced and discussed. In Spring 2013, program faculty began developing a strategic plan for Educational Administration that incorporates goals and strategies for recruiting students from diverse backgrounds. That strategic plan will be completed and forwarded to the Dean of Woodring College in July 2013.

  2. Also in Spring 2013, the Educational Administration faculty initiated a Diversity Task Force, consisting of graduates of the principal and superintendent certification programs, current candidates in these programs, and adjunct faculty who have taught courses in the program. Those who attended the first meeting of the task force included two African-Americans, five Asian-Americans/Pacific Islanders, one Native American, and one Latino. All pledged to participate on the task force for the 2013-14 school year. In addition, one African-American and one Native American who were unable to attend the first meeting have committed to be members of the task force. Among the topics discussed at the initial meeting of the task force were:
   - Why did you choose the WWU program over another university program, potentially with much more diversity?
• What did you like about the program that spoke to your individual needs as a person of color?
• What parts of the program honored your diversity?
• What parts of the program did not honor your diversity?
• What parts the program would you highlight for a person of color were you to recruit them to this program?
• What suggestions do you have to improve the program?
• Would you be willing to serve on a diversity advisory group over the next year?

Responses to the question as to why current and former students chose Western’s program included the following:
• There was a person who looked like me on the Western brochure
• High support during coursework and during internship
• Heard from a colleague who was in the program
• Relationships developed by faculty with candidates
• Sense of respect by faculty for students
• Accessibility
• Practical application to anticipated administrative role
• Relevance
• Time
• Cost
• Flexibility (not cohort)
• Welcoming

3. Program faculty have also reached out to the Native American community in an effort to recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds. In Spring 2013, faculty members met with the Superintendent of the Suquamish Tribal School with the aim of discovering how Western’s Educational Administration Program might engage teachers in that school setting in seeking principal or superintendent certification. This represents an initial contact with tribal groups; additional meetings will be sought with other tribal schools in 2013-14.

4. Each year, program faculty members seek nominations for new candidates to the principal and superintendent programs from administrators across the State of Washington, particularly in Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Jefferson, Clallam, and Kitsap Counties. To this end we send approximately 200 letters to administrators and enclose two or three nomination postcards. Each returned postcard results in a direct contact, either by telephone or email—or both—with the person nominated. Frequently a faculty member will arrange to meet the person nominated over coffee for the purpose of explaining the program and answering questions. We have found that, particularly for nominees who are people of color, a conversation with a graduate who is a person of color helps establish an important and credible link between the nominee and the program.

5. In the Spring of 2012, the Educational Administration program conducted a successful search for a tenure-track faculty member. The individual whom we selected for that role, Dr. Joseph Hunter, in addition to being a highly qualified professional educator with 30 years of experience as a teacher, principal, and superintendent, is a Native American. He has taken a leading role in guiding program faculty in the development of a strategic plan for the program and in framing ideas that focus on recruitment and retention of candidates representing diverse backgrounds.

• Program success at meeting recruitment plan goals (trend data).

Data from the Woodring Information System (WIS) at Western reflects the following information about the program’s efforts and successes with regard to recruiting and retaining candidates of color:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014 (fall only)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDAD Masters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or AK Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or AK Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican/Mexican Amer/Chicano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **How might the program improve its recruitment strategies?**
  We anticipate that the Diversity Task Force empaneled in Spring 2013 will guide the Administration Professional Advisory Board (PEAB) in framing recommendations that relate to improvement of Western’s recruitment strategies. The information articulated under “The program’s recruitment plan...” above offers a sense of initiatives that have been set forth to date.

10. PESB Standard I Proposed Rubrics (*Don Larsen*)
The Standard I proposed rubrics developed by PESB were shared with PEAB. The following comments were made:
   - They are asking us to respond in numbers to that which cannot be expressed (reduced) in numbers.
   - It seems redundant—how do you get better without recommendations.
   - Where is the statistical matrix from which you create the significance of this rating system?
   - WCEAP is planning to develop a position paper to be presented to PESB outlining their concerns.

11. Director’s Report (*Don Larsen*)
   Western’s legislative liaison believes that the current legislative session will result in the approval of an EDS degree for both Western Washington University and Central Washington University.

   Dean Francisco Rios has initiated a conversation with Dean Trevison (Washington State University) about the possibility of developing a joint doctorate. It is hoped that additional conversations on this matter will occur during Summer/Fall 2013.

b. Principal Certification (2013-2014 Interns) (*Warren Aller*)
   We anticipate having approximately 30 residency principal certification interns next year (10 at each of the three sites); supervisors will be assigned in late July/early August.

c. Administrator Professional Certification (*program canceled*)
   As you know, the Professional Administrator Certificate program has been in moratorium since Fall 2011. On May 6, 2013, it was recommended this program be canceled. Currently WWU’s Educational Administration program does not have the resources needed to continue to offer this certification program. Therefore, the decision has been made by the Woodring College of Education to cancel the program due to lack of funding. Cancellation of related graduate courses was also initiated at that time.
d. Superintendent Certification (Wayne Robertson)
   With the support of Dean Rios, our Superintendent Certification program has changed to a rolling cohort, with annual (Fall) admission. Faculty are comprised of three experienced superintendents each teaching two courses over the two-year program.

   As indicated in the current enrollment figures shared with PEAB earlier, 13 students joined our new 2012-2014 cohort of candidates for the initial superintendent certificate. In addition, we expect an additional 4-6 new students will be joining the program Fall 2014.

12. Intern Portfolio Presentations (Sherry Anderson, Lisa Roberts, Scott Yingling)
Sherry Anderson (Post Middle School, Arlington School District); Elizabeth (Lisa) Roberts (Hawkins Middle School, North Mason School District); and Scott Yingling (South Kitsap High School, South Kitsap School District) provided overviews of the personal/professional portfolios they have been creating/developing. Each shared the notebooks they have been compiling this year and briefly recounted what the program has meant to each of them and a major lesson they have learned.

   It was noted that interns create their portfolios in different formats (some are electronic, others are in notebooks and hard copy binders) while in the administrative certification program and as part of their individual Professional Growth Plans. Their presentations were meaningful to the individuals and not restrictive; they indicated that this process gave them an opportunity to define their core values. Among other lessons they have learned, this experience helped them realize it is a matter of “balance” (to be a good administrator and a good teacher); emphasis is on the “human” side of being an administrator; they have developed a strong sense of who they are and what they want to be and to accomplish; although content is important, dialogue of peers is invaluable. Candidates craft portfolios as they go through the program; these portfolios provide an opportunity for review of a product (artifacts) while continuing to build the portfolios with work in progress. They have found that the portfolio is extremely useful/helpful and that it is a “working” document; it is a tool for the candidate and represents what they are involved in and are doing. The candidates stated they found that artifacts cross-over into multiple standards.

   PEAB thanked Sherry, Lisa and Scott, and indicated their appreciation for their effective presentations.

13. Election of PEAB Chair
Ron Spanjer was nominated to serve as the new Chair of PEAB.

   MOTION: It was moved by Pam Estvold and seconded by Tod Klundt that the nominations be closed and Ron Spanjer serve as Chair of PEAB during 2013-2014. The motion passed unanimously.

14. PEAB Membership/Willingness to Continue to Serve on PEAB
PEAB members were polled regarding their willingness to continue to serve on PEAB for another year (Bylaw 4, Section 1: Attendance policy. During the last meeting of each year, Board members will be polled individually and asked whether they wish to remain on the Board). All members present indicated their willingness to continue serving on PEAB. Warren Aller and/or Don Larsen will contact those members not present regarding their continued participation.

15. Items from the Board
Pam Estvold briefly spoke about the Teacher Leadership Certification Program at the University of Washington. This program certifies teacher leaders on “how to be a teacher/leader in your district” (emphasis on common core leadership or the new evaluation system).
The Educational Administration Program is incorporating information about the three state-adopted frameworks in relevant courses:
- Danielson
- Marzano
- CEL

The TPEP website includes crossovers between the three models.

The AWSP/WASA summer conference in June 2013 will include training related to these three frameworks.

It was suggested Western contact individual school districts and ask to be included as participants in their TPEP training. In addition to teacher evaluation, Western candidates should be aware of TPEP criteria for principals.

   - Thursday, October 17, 2013
   - Thursday, February 20, 2014
   - Friday, May 16, 2014 (morning meeting followed by afternoon student portfolio presentations)

   Due to a conflict on October 17, it was recommended the first PEAB meeting for 2013-2014 be moved to October 24.

   **MOTION:** It was moved by Tod Klundt and seconded by Leslie Harrington that the PEAB meeting schedule for academic year 2013-2014 be approved as revised. The motion passed unanimously.

17. PEAB Satisfaction Question (distributed each meeting)

   In an email dated October 5, 2012, from Brandon O’Connor (PESB), we were notified there is a new PEAB Satisfaction Question; data from that question will be incorporated in our annual PEAB report at the end of the year. At the end of every meeting the PEAB will take a survey that includes a PEAB (data) Satisfaction Question. This reports the average of the attending voting members’ scores. If no data was presented at this meeting, we are to leave this item blank.

   **PEAB Satisfaction Question**
   The PEAB is welcome to add any relevant questions to this survey, but the survey will include the question below. This survey will take place at the end of each meeting.

   “Were you satisfied with the amount of actionable data (relevant, timely, and important) that was provided by the program at this meeting?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Actionable data provided was relevant, timely, and important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>Actionable data provided was somewhat relevant, timely, and important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied</td>
<td>Data provided but not useful in resulting in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Partial data provided but not useful in resulting in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Data was outdated, irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Adjournment

**MOTION:** It was moved by Leslie Harrington and seconded by Andrew Frost that the meeting be adjourned at 11:50 am. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Gramm