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1. **Description of the Assessment and Its Use in the Program**

Key Licensure Assessment #3: Supervision and Change Intervention Plan is designed to assess a candidate’s skills in developing strategies for addressing the needs of struggling teachers. More specifically, the Assessment calls for the candidate to study the profile of a teacher and to then create a corrective plan which analyzes the challenges of the situation, honors the school vision, incorporates learnings from the leadership inventories studied, references best instructional practices, and aligns with a candidate’s leadership style.

Key Licensure Assessment #3 is carried out in EDUC 750: Developing Vision, and is then assessed by the course instructor.

To be admitted into the Internship at Gateway #2, a candidate must complete Key Licensure Assessments #3, #5, #6A, and #6B (Supervision and Change Intervention Plan, Instructional Improvement Plan, Financial Appropriations Plan, and Community Relations Project) with at least 80% of the elements of the ELCC standard elements across the four assessments rated at meets element and no element rated unacceptable.

2. **Description of How the Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards (2011)**

The following elements of the ELCC standards are evaluated through this key licensure assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELCC Standard Element Number</th>
<th>Standard Element Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>candidates understand and can develop and supervise instructional and leadership capacity of school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Assessment Instrument

Supervision and Change Intervention Plan Guidelines

As you complete the following, refer to the scoring guide for Key Licensure Assessment #3 to ensure that you include all expectations for this assessment.

Purpose of the Assignment: To assess your skills in developing strategies for addressing the needs of struggling teachers.

Directions:

(1) Read Teacher Profile A and Teacher Profile B.

(2) Select Teacher Profile A OR Teacher Profile B for which to develop your Supervision and Change Intervention Plan.

(3) Part 1 of Supervision and Change Intervention Plan: using the Profile you selected, describe and analyze the situation, clearly identifying what you believe to be the major challenges.

(4) Part 2 of Supervision and Change Intervention Plan: address the problem(s) by describing how you would:

  - ensure high-quality school instruction and student learning (ELCC Standard Element 3.5)
  - steward the school’s shared vision of learning (ELCC Standard Element 1.1)
  - supervise the instructional capacity of the teacher, referencing best instructional practices (ELCC Standard Element 2.3)
  - supervise the leadership capacity of the teacher team (ELCC Standard Element 2.3)
  - sustain an instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration (ELCC Standard Element 2.1)
  - develop school capacity for distributed leadership (ELCC Standard Element 3.4)
  - promote continual and sustainable improvement (ELCC Standard Element 1.3)

In addressing the above components, make sure to incorporate your learnings from the leadership inventories studied and how each aligns with your leadership style.

(5) Part 3 of Supervision and Change Intervention Plan: summarize your overall plan, articulating your rationale for the approaches you have taken, defending them based on the learnings from this course as well as other graduate classes.

(6) Organize your final document according to Parts 1, 2, and 3 above, making sure to label each component.
Teacher Profiles:

(1) **Teacher Profile A:**

Ellen Harris, a fourth grade teacher with 20 years of experience, is a faculty member in the K-4 building of a beginning elementary principal. She previously taught first grade for 11 years and requested a move to fourth grade after the birth of her daughter.

The building has been organized around grade level teams with five teachers per grade level and the new principal had prepared a similar schedule which allowed for common planning time for each grade level. The common time had paved the way for teachers to unwrap standards, write curriculum maps, review lesson plans, and create common assessments. As new textbooks had been reviewed, the meeting time had proven valuable for examination of the content and organization of texts.

Priscilla Poore, the new principal, was excited with her first principalship and once school was underway was eager to begin working with the different grade level teams. She had visited all but the fourth grade team meeting and the day arrived for their final team meeting. Midway into the meeting, she realized that only four team members were present. At a quiet moment, she commented that Ellen was not present and an awkward silence ensued. She delved a bit to learn if anyone knew any details and to her surprise learned that Ellen does not attend team meetings. Ms. Poore chose to not push further at that time and the meeting time expired.

At lunch time Ms. Poore approached Ellen to say she had missed her at the team meeting and wondered what had happened. Ellen replied that meetings were a waste of time and that she had more important things to do in her room, such as grading papers, redoing bulletin boards, etc. Ms. Poore asked if Ellen believed in the strength of collaborative teams and she replied that she preferred to do her own thing. Principal Poore asked about past years and team meetings and Ellen said she had never attended the meetings. The principal thanked her for her time and said she wanted to meet with her soon to further discuss the situation.

At the end of the day, Ms. Poore approached the most respected informal leader among the staff, a person who had been around for 28 years. Mrs. Leeland held the respect of every person in the building and had the knowledge of almost three decades of building history. Ms. Poore asked Mrs. Leeland to stop by her office at the end of the day to chat about the history of the building.

Mrs. Leeland confirmed that Ellen Harris had never attended team meetings and that her absence had been ignored. In part, most teachers felt that the team was better off because of her negative attitude. Two “bean counter” teachers labeled it “unfair” that they had to come to the meetings and Ellen was never punished for not coming. Mrs. Leeland indicated that the previous principal had never said the meetings were required but that most people felt the meetings were beneficial. Principal Poore learned that Mrs. Harris had posed many challenges to past principals and that parents annually request to not have their children placed in her class. She also shared that Mrs. Harris has been known to not use new textbook purchases but had kept and used her old materials. Mrs. Leeland shared that parents of students in Mrs. Harris’ classroom believed their children did not have as much
fun as the other students because of her rigid discipline which did not align with the building discipline plan.

In looking at past test data for the students in Ellen’s classes, it was clear that her students had not performed at the same levels as other fourth grade students in the building.

(2) **Teacher Profile B:**

Don Larson was a third-year teacher who was hired to teach freshman level general science. He moved from a district in which he had filled a position for a teacher who had been on a two-year medical leave and then returned to his position.

Don’s college transcript indicated excellent grades and he was a four year participant in the college Environment and Ecology organization, serving as secretary his senior year. In his interview, he cited his childhood love for science and an outstanding middle school science teacher as the driving forces behind his decision to become a science teacher. He grew up in a family where both parents were science teachers and his family was immersed in science.

Mr. Larson’s mentor was Karen McMasters who was the biology teacher with twenty years of experience and a master teacher by anyone’s standards. Prior to the opening of school she met with Don and shared building information, grading procedures, and introduced him to other science department members. They toured the building and spent much time in the general science classroom so he would understand where specimens, chemicals, and equipment were stored. She offered her assistance in organizing lessons and sharing ideas from past general science projects. While Don was polite and expressed appreciation of her gestures, he had no questions for her and began the school year without taking advantage of her willingness to help.

The principal, a five-year veteran, had three new teachers with the opening of school. It was his practice during the first week of school to spend at least five minutes in every classroom and five minutes a day in each new teacher’s classroom. With each visit to Mr. Larson’s room, the principal noted the noise level of students was somewhat elevated, and it took until the fourth day of classes for the textbooks to be distributed. In conversation with Mr. Larson, the principal commented on the noise level and Don acknowledged that he was not concerned by it and with students now having their textbooks and weekend homework, things would be much different.

The next week, the principal did not visit the classroom until Wednesday. Students had textbooks open and while Mr. Larson was discussing something from the textbook in monotone voice, the majority of students were not attending. They were involved in conversations, writing notes, sleeping, and making distracting noises which Mr. Larson was trying to ignore but found it difficult to do. In a conversation at the end of the day, Don explained that the kids were still getting used to him and he felt that they were learning the content he was presenting.

The principal indicated he would visit again next week and hoped to see students engaged in the content. At the end of the day, the principal asked Karen McMasters to drop by the office and asked her perceptions of how Mr. Larson’s classes were going. McMasters was frank in expressing her concerns that students were not respectful of Mr. Larson. She
indicated that she had offered to help him with lesson plans and other projects but that he had not acted on the offer. The principal asked Ms. McMasters to talk with Mr. Larson on Monday as a two week checkpoint and thus she did during their common prep period.

Mr. Larson expressed the belief that all was going well. Karen expressed concern surrounding student behavior and asked about his classroom rules. Don responded that he had one rule and it was that if students were bothering him he would let them know. She encouraged him to reconsider and perhaps to use the rules and discipline procedures that other teachers were using. Additionally, she shared with him that speaking louder would also help. The principal asked McMasters to check in daily with Mr. Larson and said he planned to monitor the classroom from the hallway to see if things were improving with Ms. McMasters’ mentoring. It appeared to Ms. McMasters that there had been no improvement.

Many students failed the chapter test, after which the principal and guidance counselor began receiving parent phone calls of unfair practices by a teacher who gives no homework, does not require students to pay attention, and teaches with no enthusiasm yet gives nightmare tests. They demanded that the principal do something.