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Introduction

The 10th edition of Quality Measures™ represents a milestone in more than a decade of EDC work with school districts and principal preparation programs across the country, working to prepare principals to lead chronically low performing schools, with an end goal of improving student achievement. Substantial changes in QM content, format, and methods are reflected in this edition and are in direct response to feedback from users as well as insights gleaned from our own observations of user implementation over the course of the past two years with a diverse pool of programs and school districts.

It is with sincere appreciation that we extend our thanks to The Wallace Foundation, whose generous funding supported the production of this 10th edition of QM as part of the launch of the University Principal Preparation Initiative (UPPI) in the fall of 2016. UPPI programs from Albany State University, Virginia State University, Florida Atlantic University, San Diego State University, University of Connecticut, Western Kentucky University, and North Carolina State University – engaged their self-study teams in the collection of baseline program data using Quality Measures™ tools and protocols in partnership with affiliated school district staff.

We would also like to acknowledge survey feedback received from school district identified preparation programs that conducted self-studies in partnership with their affiliated school districts as an initial step in their partner collaboration efforts.

Members of the National Training Provider-Principal Graduate Professional Learning Community (TPPG PLC) were another important contributing source to this edition of the Quality Measures™ toolkit. Contributions included, but were not limited to, careful review and feedback on Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, 2015) as part of a 2016 PLC session in Massachusetts.

Additional contributors included members of the first training cohort of QM Facilitators who co-facilitated self-studies with non-Wallace funded principal preparation programs as part of their training and provided feedback and suggestions for improving tools and processes.

Finally, it is with heartfelt gratitude that I acknowledge Melissa Lin. Her countless hours of tool editing and formatting, self-study meeting coordination and scheduling, information and materials management, and exemplar catalogue design and population have supported the evolution of Quality Measures™ since 2009. Her talented support has been a consistent source of both inspiration and aspiration to QM users, trainers, facilitators, and developers.

Cheryl L. King, QM Principal Investigator
Education Development Center, Inc.
Overview

Education Development Center, Inc., funded by The Wallace Foundation, is pleased to introduce the 10th edition of Quality Measures™ evidence-based tools and protocols. The QM toolkit is intentionally designed to be a self-led, analytic, and topic-specific resource for use in the critical self-examination, reflection, and peer review of principal preparation program effectiveness.

Highlights and New Resources

The 10th edition of the QM toolkit reflects several important changes that respond to new research findings, performance standards for education leaders, and feedback from QM program and school district partners. Among the more noticeable changes is a return (by popular demand) to a rubric format and developmental level continuum. Also incorporated, as part of the 10th edition, is more detailed guidance on assembling supporting evidence that includes: levels of evidence strength, types of evidence, descriptions for each type, and illustrative examples. In addition to these changes, this edition of the tool includes: selected references that are organized by domain, the QM theory of change, and an “at a glance” look at QM domains and indicators.

Research Base and Performance Standards

QM tools are grounded in the seminal research of Linda Darling-Hammond on exemplary principal preparation practices. QM rubric indicators and criteria describe the characteristics associated with effective practices from the literature and empirical research on adult transformational pedagogy. In addition, indicators and criteria are tightly linked to Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL).

Rubric Organization and Rating Continuum

This Quality Measures™ toolkit includes a rubric for each of the following program domains: 1) candidate admissions, 2) course content, 3) pedagogy-andragogy, 4) clinical practice, 5) performance assessment, and 6) graduate performance outcomes. Each domain identifies specific indicators of effective practice and criteria. Rubrics provide a detailed description of indicators and performance criteria for each program domain. A four-level performance continuum allows teams to examine their program practices against indicator criteria at each level of the continuum to determine the degree to which their program meets the stated criteria for a particular level.

Evidence-Based Protocol

QM uses an interactive facilitated process to complete the program self-study. Self-study teams are typically comprised of program faculty, affiliated school district representatives, and other program stakeholders. Beginning with a facilitated orientation session, the self-study typically consists of four parts: 1) a general information session that introduces Quality Measures™ to an audience of potential users; 2) an orientation session for teams, interested in completing a program self-study, to build a shared understanding of QM domains as well as indicators of effectiveness and criteria, and to brainstorm examples of evidence of effective practices; 3) the presentation of evidence and self-scoring session that is typically held when teams have completed preliminary self-ratings for each program domain and assembled supporting evidence and, following the presentation of evidence for each domain, the team makes final determinations about rating levels; and 4) a presentation of findings and recommendations for team consideration on where to focus intervention efforts.
The four parts of an effective self-study process are typically scheduled as follows:

- **The general information session** is typically a one-hour session designed for programs, districts, and policy makers interested in learning more about the QM self-study process as a way to support continuous improvement activities. This session is often conducted virtually in order to accommodate larger audiences of potential users who may be in different locations.

- **The orientation session** is usually a 2- to 3-hour meeting that is intended for programs, districts, and policy makers who have decided to participate in the QM self-study process and have assembled a self-study team to lead the process. The session is designed to familiarize teams with QM tools and protocols, indicators and rating criteria, and the process for assembling evidence and completing preliminary ratings. Teams also use this time to finalize plans for the evidence review and final rating session.

- **The evidence review and rating session** is often divided into more than one sitting in order to allow adequate time for teams to review evidence and rate each domain (suggest a minimum of 1-2 hours for each domain). For example, teams may choose to review all six domains in one day, or divide the review into two half-day sessions and review three domains on one ½ day and three on another ½ day.

- **The report of findings and improvement planning session** is most effective if agendas are planned to allow time for a discussion of findings, targeting areas for intervention, and conducting some preliminary planning for next steps.

**QM Process Facilitation**

Quality Measures offers users the option of having a trained QM facilitator to moderate the process for conducting the complete program self-study from a position of neutrality. Based on responses from QM users, choosing to use a trained QM process facilitator to support the program self-study has proven to be an invaluable resource in helping self-study teams to:

- Understand the goals, objectives, and process for conducting a QM program self-study
- Plan how to accomplish objectives within a specified timeframe (roles, responsibilities, logistics, group process norms)
- Manage difficult conversations and differences of opinion using specific protocols
- Submit self-study data for organization and interpretation using QM electronic platform
- Understand initial reports of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for next steps
- Access examples of exemplary practices electronically using the QM Exemplar Catalogue

Under certain conditions, a program may opt to independently use the QM toolkit to engage in a program self-study without the support of a trained QM facilitator. For example, a program may have already completed a professionally facilitated process and is interested in using the tool as a resource for team discussions of selected program domains. The tool can also be used effectively as a framework for program design/redesign. The complete Quality Measures Toolkit is an open source document that can be downloaded from www.edc.org or www.wallacefoundation.org for independent use by program teams.

For more information about enlisting the support of a trained QM facilitator to work with your self-study team, please contact the Quality Measures Center at qmcenter@edc.org.
Operating Theory of Change

**INPUTS**

1. Selecting the "Right" Candidates
2. Standards-Based Course Content
3. Active Learning Experiences
4. Clinical Practice in Real Schools
5. Performance-Based Assessments
6. Graduate Performance Outcomes

**OUTCOMES**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS
- Highly Effective Teachers
- High Performing Students

**OUTCOMES**

1. Mission, Vision, and Core Values
   - Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and wellbeing of each student.

2. Ethics and Professional Norms
   - Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

3. Equity and Cultural Responsiveness
   - Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

4. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
   - Effective educational leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

5. Community of Care and Support for Students
   - Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and wellbeing of each student.

6. Professional Capacity of School Personnel
   - Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

7. Professional Community for Teachers and Staff
   - Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

8. Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community
   - Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

9. Operations and Management
   - Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.

10. School Improvement
    - Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s academic success and wellbeing.
Program Domains and Indicators at a Glance

**CANDIDATE ADMISSIONS**
1. Marketing Strategy
2. Recruitment Practices
3. Admission Standards
4. Applicant Screening
5. Predictor Assessments
6. Candidate Selection

**COURSE CONTENT**
1. Standards
2. Learning Goals
3. Course Design
4. Course Evaluation
5. Course Coherence

**PEDAGOGY-ANDRAGOGY**
1. Active Learning Strategies
2. Experiential Learning Activities
3. Reflective Practices
4. Formative Feedback
5. Performance Benchmarking
6. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

**CLINICAL PRACTICE**
1. Clinical Design
2. Clinical Quality
3. Clinical Coaching
4. Clinical Supervision
5. Clinical Placements
6. Clinical Evaluation

**PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**
1. Assessment Purpose
2. Candidate Performance Targets
3. Assessment Quality
4. Assessment Methods
5. Communication of Assessment Results
6. Assessment Impact

**GRADUATE OUTCOMES**
1. Exit Competencies
2. State Certification
3. School District Eligibility
4. School District Hiring
5. Job Placement and Retention
6. Job Performance
QM Evidence Strength Continuum

Indicators for each domain are rated on a four-point scale. A rating of 4.0 indicates that the program meets ALL of the criteria for the specific indicator. A rating of 3.0 indicates that the program meets MOST of the criteria for the specific indicator (quality threshold 75% or more). A rating of 2.0 indicates that the program meets SOME of the criteria for the specific indicator (more than 50%, but less than 75%). A rating of 1.0 indicates that the program meets FEW/NONE of the criteria for the specific indicator (less than 50%). Ratings of 3.0 and 4.0 require supporting evidence at a specific strength level (see table below).

The QM Evidence Strength Continuum (ESC) below provides programs with an objective set of criteria to assist self-study teams in examining and self-rating their programs’ supporting evidence. The ESC also serves as an effective benchmark for guiding continuous improvement efforts with the optimal aspiration being system-wide implementation. The table below displays two types of evidence – evidence of design and evidence of design implementation – along four levels of evidence strength with a short description for each strength level, including the evidence strength required for highest self-ratings of 3 and 4. Illustrative examples for each strength level are included for reference purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 4</strong></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain</td>
<td>State, school district, and preparation program provider usage and performance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 3</strong></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate program-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain</td>
<td>Program-wide artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stronger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 2</strong></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that SOME indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate individual course implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain</td>
<td>Individual course artifacts include usage and performance data for selected faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 1</strong></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that FEW/NO indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td>Artifacts do not yet demonstrate implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QM Rubrics
While candidate recruitment is a vital component leading to the success of a school, research shows that less than half of all higher education institutions have a clear strategy that guides the development of their recruitment efforts.\(^1\) While institutions are relying more on social media and digital presence to define their brand and attract students, most popular are the traditional forms of outreach that are event-driven and involve direct interaction with prospective students.\(^2\) A more selective, probing process for selecting candidates for training is thought to be an essential first step in creating a more capable and diverse corps of future principals.\(^3\) Effective programs probe to determine if applicants have the needed experience, leadership skills, aptitudes and dispositions to achieve district goals and improve instruction under trying conditions.\(^4\) Meta-analyses of psychology research studies suggest that the best way to forecast leadership is to use a combination of cognitive ability, personality, simulation, role-play, and multi-rater assessment instruments and techniques.\(^5\) Bray (1982) reported that these assessment data were reasonably valid predictors of a person’s promotion record.\(^6,7\)

**QM Indicators of Effective Candidate Admissions:**

1. Marketing Strategy
2. Recruitment Practices
3. Admissions Standards
4. Applicant Screening
5. Predictor Assessments
6. Candidate Selection

---


\(^4\) Ibid., 5


Domain 1: Candidate Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marketing Strategy</td>
<td>A comprehensive marketing strategy is based on the following data: 1) an in-depth analysis of the current and future market for school principals in the region; 2) an assessment of program strengths and weaknesses; 3) the identification of market opportunities and threats that will positively or negatively impact efforts to attract the best, brightest, and most diverse talent to apply for admission to your program.</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Recruitment Practices</td>
<td>Recruitment practices are part of a strategic plan that builds on program strengths and opportunities identified in the market analyses. Practices are designed to attract applicants who have the maximum potential for becoming effective school leaders in chronically low-performing schools. Practices include: social media, a digital presence (website with analytics), and event-based outreach that involves direct interaction with prospective students. There is evidence that intentional strategies are being implemented to expand the ethnic and gender diversity of candidate pools.</td>
<td>3 - Meets MOST criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admission Standards</td>
<td>Admission standards for the program include a requirement that applicants provide documented evidence of prior experience in leading change, fostering collaboration, and contributing to the professional growth and development of others.</td>
<td>2 - Meets SOME criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Applicant Screening</td>
<td>Applications are screened to ensure that applicants meet admission standards including evidence of prior experience leading change, fostering collaboration, and supporting the growth and development of professional staff.</td>
<td>1 - Meets FEW/NO criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Predictor Assessments</td>
<td>Screened applicants participate in a combination of cognitive ability, personality, simulation, role-play, and multi-rater assessment instruments and techniques as the final step in the applicant screening process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Candidate final selection processes include a formal interview of finalists by a committee comprised of program faculty and school district staff to confirm that applicants are: 1) genuinely motivated to lead a chronically low performing school, 2) likely to successfully complete program requirements, and 3) are viewed as potential hires by the school district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence of DESIGN might include:
- Correspondence between program faculty and school district personnel
- Informational/marketing materials
- Application checklists, forms
- Handbooks
- Interview rubrics

Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:
- School leader vacancy projection data
- Candidate assessments and admissions scoring data
- Program impact data
- Program applicant scoring data

Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.
The most important development in university teaching over the past few years has been the shift from teaching seen as an individual responsibility to one that the institution should assume in matters of assessment practice and overall teaching design. McMahon and Thakore (2006), in a comprehensive review of higher order thinking and critical thinking in constructively aligned courses, found that constructive alignment (the process for linking teaching and learning activities with assessment tasks, to directly address the intended learning outcomes) led to:

- Increased standardization — leading to fairer and more reliable assessment;
- Greater transparency — leading to (a) easier and more accurate inter-university and international comparisons, (b) students being able to focus more effectively on the key learning goals;
- More effective evaluation of both modules and courses;
- Increased ability of evaluator to determine how well teaching and learning strategies, content, materials, other resources and assessment procedures actually support students in achieving learning goals;
- Greater coherence in programs of learning; and
- An increase in the criticality and depth of student work.

**QM Indicators of Effective Course Content:**

1. Standards
2. Learning Goals
3. Course Design
4. Course Evaluation
5. Course Coherence

---

8 Note: The term constructive alignment was first coined by Professor John Biggs and represents a marriage between a constructivist understanding of the nature of learning, and an aligned design for outcomes-based teaching education.

# Domain 2: Course Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Standards</strong></td>
<td>Courses are based on leader performance standards and designed to develop leader competencies including: 1) agency for change; 2) parent-community-school partnerships; 3) professional capacity building; 4) student centered learning; 5) instructional guidance and support; 6) culturally responsive teaching and learning.</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Learning Goals</strong></td>
<td>Courses articulate clear learning goals for candidates that identify both the leader behavior to be developed and the context within which the behavior will be performed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Course Design</strong></td>
<td>Course designs explicitly connect course content, learning activities, resources and materials, and course assessment measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Course Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Course evaluations are audited on a regular schedule to ensure that assessment tasks and criteria clearly and directly relate to intended learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Course Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Courses are organized and logically sequenced to ensure that: concepts, knowledge, and skills build upon each other in a structured progression of learning, and learning in one course mirrors learning in the same course taught by a different instructor including methods used to evaluate learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of DESIGN might include:**
- Syllabus, course description
- Standards, rubrics, crosswalk documents
- Student work samples
- Program of study
- Course evaluation survey
- Handbooks

**Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:**
- Program completer survey data
- Program assessment data
- Cohort performance data
- Leadership practices inventory data

*Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.*
Domain 3: Pedagogy-Andragogy

Key indicators of effective pedagogy-andragogy emerge from reviews of empirical studies on transformative learning and are rooted in deeply held assumptions about the nature of adult learning and purposes of teaching for change. When taken together, they seek to establish a reciprocal relationship between the practices and the theoretical orientation of transformative learning that can provide a lens for making meaning and guiding transformative leader practice.

**QM Indicators of Effective Pedagogy-Andragogy:**

1. Active Learning Strategies
2. Experiential Learning Activities
3. Reflective Practices
4. Formative Feedback
5. Performance Benchmarking
6. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy
### Domain 3: Pedagogy-Andragogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Active Learning Strategies</td>
<td>Courses consistently use active learning strategies including project-based and case-based instruction to engage candidates in the content being studied.</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experiential Learning Activities</td>
<td>Courses include structured experiential learning activities in which learners apply new learning and become familiar with various real-world contexts and associated skill requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reflective Practices</td>
<td>Courses incorporate reflective practices as a standard of practice in developing the essential habit of self-examination and continuous improvement of one’s practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formative Feedback</td>
<td>Courses use formative feedback as an essential tool in guiding learning toward stated goals, objectives and performance benchmarks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance Benchmarking</td>
<td>Courses provide candidates with performance benchmarks of best practices for use in reflecting upon and refining specific competencies being developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy</td>
<td>Courses use culturally responsive methods to develop leader competencies at the personal, instructional, and institutional level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of DESIGN might include:**
- Syllabus, course assignments
- Standards, rubrics, crosswalk documents
- Student work samples

**Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:**
- Reflection logs
- Handbooks
- Coaches’ report on candidate performance
- Formative assessment data

*Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.*
Domain 4: Clinical Practice

Clinical practice is defined as a form of experiential learning that integrates knowledge and theory learned in courses with practical application and skill development in a real-world, professional setting. These experiences are intended to give students the opportunity to gain valuable applied knowledge and make connections to the professional field being considered as a possible career path. Additionally, it gives prospective employers the opportunity to guide and evaluate talent.10

Practicums and internships are two forms of school-based experiential learning often used by preparation programs and school districts to provide aspiring principals with experiential learning experiences in real school settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Internship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A component of some educational programs where students are placed in a</td>
<td>A short-term opportunity for students to work (paid or unpaid) for an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real-world setting (i.e., classroom or school) to observe the work of</td>
<td>employer where, ideally, their academic learning can be applied to real-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals while also spending some time performing assigned tasks</td>
<td>world tasks. A structured academic program where students “learn and earn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves. Typically, students are also enrolled in a course connected</td>
<td>by working at a job site while taking a limited number of academic courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the practicum for deeper understanding and meaningful facilitation of</td>
<td>Apprenticeships can take between 3-4 years, often require on-the-job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what is being learned during the experience.</td>
<td>training, and can lead to professional certification and often full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment at the job site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QM Indicators of Effective Clinical Practice:**

1. Clinical Design
2. Clinical Quality
3. Clinical Coaching
4. Clinical Supervision
5. Clinical Placements
6. Clinical Evaluation

---

### Domain 4: Clinical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clinical Design</td>
<td>Clinical designs are co-developed by academic faculty, prospective employers, and candidates. They are anchored to academic coursework and articulate clear and specific learning <em>and</em> career development goals/targets for each candidate.</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clinical Quality</td>
<td>Clinical experiences are guided by criterion standards and data systems that produce actionable information on the quality and efficacy of clinical experiences. Standards include expectations for the duration of the clinical experience, relevant high-level leadership tasks, high-quality onsite guidance and modeling, coordination between academic program and school sites to ensure high-quality learning experiences for candidates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clinical Coaching</td>
<td>Candidates receive detailed, high-quality feedback and coaching support, from both academic staff <em>and</em> senior level professionals, on a variety of authentic, professional-level tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Clinical Supervision</td>
<td>Candidates are supervised throughout the duration of their clinical experience, by both academic staff <em>and</em> a school-site supervisor(s). Performance expectations and evaluation criteria are clearly defined, prior to beginning the clinical experience, by academic staff and school site supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clinical Placements</td>
<td>Clinical placements are identified by academic program staff and ensure that school sites are adequately resourced to provide candidates with a high-quality clinical experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Clinical Evaluation</td>
<td>Candidate clinical evaluations are based on systematically developed program assessment criteria and used to guide field supervision and evaluation appropriate for a specific clinical context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of DESIGN might include:**
- Syllabus, handbooks
- Student work samples
- Activity logs, observation forms
- Standards, rubrics
- Clinical evaluation survey
- Discussion boards for peer/coaching feedback

**Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:**
- Cohort performance reports
- Candidate performance reports
- Clinical evaluation data
- Pre/post internship survey results

*Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.*
Domain 5: Performance Assessment

Criterion-referenced assessments are designed to measure candidate performance against a fixed set of predetermined criteria or learning standards—i.e., concise, written descriptions of what candidates are expected to know and be able to do at a specific stage of their education. They are used to evaluate whether candidates have learned a specific body of knowledge or acquired a specific skill set. If candidates perform at or above the established expectations, they are deemed to be proficient. In a fully criterion-referenced system, objectives (learning outcomes) define what students need to know and be able to do (content), how they will be taught (pedagogy), and how learning will be assessed.\(^\text{11}\) In a criterion-referenced system of assessment, instructor responsibilities include linking/scaffolding learning and teaching activities to the intended outcomes and structuring assessments appropriate to the level of learning expected.

**QM Indicators of Effective Performance Assessment:**

1. Assessment Purpose
2. Candidate Performance Targets
3. Assessment Quality
4. Assessment Methods
5. Communication of Assessment Results
6. Assessment Impact

---

## Domain 5: Performance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment Purpose</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments are designed to collect evidence of candidate progress toward proficiency that is then used to inform instructional decisions.</td>
<td>3 - Meets MOST criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Candidate Performance Targets</td>
<td>2 - Meets SOME criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate performance targets are clearly articulated and align with high-priority leader performance standards that form the foundation for candidate assessments.</td>
<td>1 - Meets FEW/NO criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessment Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments facilitate valid evaluation of complex competencies, promote learning, and are complemented with exemplars and/or models of performance. Assessments make expectations and criteria explicit which enables feedback and promotes self-assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment methods are tightly linked to learning targets and collect both formative and summative data that provide a sufficient sample of candidate performance data to reliably infer levels of proficiency for a particular performance target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication of Assessment Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods for communicating candidate assessment data produce accurate, timely, and immediately usable information about the level of candidate mastery of performance target(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assessment Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates use assessment data and continuous improvement processes to take charge of their own progress toward performance mastery and growth over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence of DESIGN might include:
- Syllabus
- Activity logs
- Forms
- Standards, crosswalk documents
- Assessment rubrics

### Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:
- Cohort performance reports
- Candidate performance reports
- Program assessment data
- Annual data review and evaluation data report

*Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.*
Domain 6: Graduate Performance Outcomes

Outcomes are clear learning results that we want students to demonstrate at the end of significant learning experiences. They are not values, beliefs, attitudes, or psychological states of mind. Instead, outcomes are what learners can actually do with what they know and have learned. They are the tangible application of what has been learned. This means that outcomes are actions and performances that embody and reflect learner competence in using content, information, ideas, and tools successfully. Having learners do important things with what they know is a major step beyond knowing itself. Because outcomes involve actual doing, rather than just knowing or a variety of other purely mental processes, they must be defined according to the actions or demonstration processes being sought.12

**QM Indicators of Effective Principal Preparation:**

1. Exit Competencies
2. State Certification
3. School District Eligibility
4. School District Hiring
5. Job Placement and Retention13,14
6. Job Performance

---


## Domain 6: Graduate Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QM INDICATORS</th>
<th>QM CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit Competencies</td>
<td>Candidates demonstrate program exit competencies required to become education leaders, based on program exit exams, professional standards for educational leaders, and local school district performance expectations for principal and assistant principal.</td>
<td>4 - Meets ALL criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Certification</td>
<td>Program graduates are certified and licensed by the state upon program completion or advanced to the next level of the state certification process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Eligibility</td>
<td>Eligible program graduates are admitted into one or more school district applicant pools and are eligible to be interviewed for principal and/or assistant principal positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Hiring</td>
<td>Eligible program graduates are hired as principals and/or assistant principal leadership positions within one year of program completion or progress to the next level of the hiring process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement and Retention</td>
<td>Program graduates hired by a school district are placed in vacancies in chronically low performing schools and remain in the same position for at least three years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Program graduates placed in leadership positions either meet or exceed expectations on district performance evaluations during their induction period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence of DESIGN might include:
- State certification requirements/checklist
- State-approved program verification form
- Program exit survey

### Evidence of IMPLEMENTATION might include:
- List of principal graduates
- University/school district MOU
- Survey to employers of 1st year leaders
- Cohort performance reports
- Candidate performance reports
- Exit competencies assessment data
- State certification exam data
- Map of graduate placements

*Examples of evidence artifacts from QM program users can be found in the Appendix.*
Glossary of Terms

This glossary of terms is included here as a quick reference tool for self-study teams engaged in the process of examining their principal preparation program practices using Quality Measures™ rubrics. The glossary is intended to offer general definitions of terms to assist teams in developing a shared understanding of indicators associated with each program domain.

Domain 1: Candidate Admissions

**Marketing Strategy:** A comprehensive plan for recruiting a diverse pool of highly qualified applicants to enroll in the institution’s principal preparation program.

**Recruitment Practices:** Specific actions taken by programs to attract applicants who demonstrate strong potential for becoming effective school leaders. Practices may include: strategic social media, digital campaigns (website with analytics), event-based outreach that involves direct interaction with prospective students, and other practices that target ethnic and gender specific applicants.

**Admissions Standards:** Admission standards define the specific requirements for screening program applications and selecting candidates for admission.

**Applicant Screening:** Refers to specific processes designed and implemented to screen applications in order to identify highly qualified applicants who meet program admission requirements.

**Predictor Assessments:** A battery of assessments used as part of the applicant screening process to predict different leadership behaviors (e.g., task-oriented behaviors, relational-oriented behaviors, and change-oriented behaviors).

**Candidate Selection:** Processes used to select candidate for admission to the program. May include face-to-face interviews, job shadows, reference checks. May involve a selection committee comprised of program faculty and school district staff.
Domain 2: Course Content

Standards Based: Refers to Professional Standards for School Leaders (PSEL).

Learning Goals: Learning goals clearly define the purpose for the learning (i.e., what the learner should know and be able to do as a result of the instruction). When developed by the learner, in collaboration with the instructor, learning goals help to create a shared understanding and focus for the learning and also provide a guide for developing short- and long-term measures to assess results.

Constructive Alignment: Refers to the process for devising teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks, to directly address the intended learning outcomes. The term constructive alignment was first coined by Professor John Biggs and represents a marriage between a constructivist understanding of the nature of learning and an aligned design for outcomes-based teaching education.

Course Design: An approach to designing curriculum that integrates learning goals, course content, learning activities, resources and materials, and course assessment measures.

Course Evaluation: The process of gathering information about the impact of learning and of teaching practice on student learning, analyzing and interpreting that information, and responding to and acting on the results.

Course Coherence: Refers to a set of interrelated courses and learning experiences that are logically sequenced (vertically aligned) and guided by a common framework/design for curriculum, instruction, assessment, and learning climate, and pursued over a sustained period of time.

Domain 3: Pedagogy-Andragogy

Pedagogy-Andragogy: Pedagogy, as used here, refers to the field of study that deals mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools; while andragogy refers to the art or science of teaching adults (Malcolm Knowles first coined this term in 1970). Andragogy is based on a humanistic conception of self-directed and autonomous learners and teachers as facilitators of learning. Important Note: Malcolm Knowles himself changed his position on whether andragogy really applied only to adults and came to believe that “pedagogy-andragogy represents a continuum ranging from teacher-directed to student-directed learning and that both approaches are appropriate with children and adults, depending on the situation.” Hanson (1996) argues that the difference in learning is NOT related to the age and stage of one’s life, but instead related to individual characteristics and the differences in “context, culture and power” within different educational settings.

Active Learning: A method of learning that engages students in two aspects of the learning process – doing things and thinking about the things they are doing.
**Experiential Learning:** The process of learning through experience. More specifically defined as "learning through reflection on doing." Experiential learning is distinct from rote or didactic learning, the latter in which the learner plays a comparatively passive role.

**Reflective Practice:** Involves the practice of reflecting on one's actions as a way to engage in a process of continuous learning. According to one definition, reflective practices involve "paying critical attention to the practical values and theories which inform everyday actions."

**Formative Feedback:** Ongoing feedback throughout the learning process that can be used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning.

**Performance Benchmarking:** A way of discovering what is the best performance being achieved – whether in a particular course, in a competitor program, or in an entirely different industry. This information can then be used to identify gaps in program content and processes in order to improve outcomes and achieve a competitive advantage.

**Culturally Responsive Pedagogy:** An instructional method that is grounded in teachers’ displaying skill at teaching in a cross-cultural or multicultural setting. Enables students to relate course content to their own cultural experiences.

**Domain 4: Clinical Practice**

**Clinical Design:** Refers to the essential elements of an effective experiential learning experience that integrates knowledge and theory learned in the classroom with practical application and skills development in a professional school setting. Essential elements include learning goals that are structured into the learning experience and supervised by a professional with relevant and related background in the field. The overall clinical design balances the intern’s learning goals with the organization’s (school) needs. May be part-time or full-time.

**Clinical Quality:** Refers to the degree to which clinical designs incorporate the design elements that result in desired learner performance outcomes.

**Clinical Coaching:** Refers to the dedicated time supervisors and/or coaches spend observing and providing feedback to interns on both accomplishments and areas for improvement. Includes intentional support in the intern’s transition from the classroom to the workplace.

**Clinical Supervision:** Refers to the level of guidance and oversight provided to interns. Generally includes: familiarizing them with the school assignment, providing assignments, and serving as a “contact” person for questions. Internship supervision should be conducted by an expert in the type of work the intern(s) will be performing to provide the appropriate guidance for the intern’s assignments. An intern supervisor’s responsibilities typically include: taking part in an intern’s placement, screening, and interview process; conducting the intern orientation; developing intern learning goals; meeting with and observing an intern regularly to evaluate performance and determine if needs/goals are being met; and assessing the internship program’s success.
Clinical Placements: Refers to the professional schools identified for interns to complete the experiential segment of their preparation and training.

Clinical Evaluation: Refers to the evaluation of the intern’s initial learning objectives identified at the start of the internship. Typically, supervisors are asked to evaluate interns at the midpoint and end of the internship. Employers are encouraged to review the internship with the intern before he or she leaves. Evaluations are helpful in determining the intern’s success within the assigned school and also serve as predictors of success for future internships or employment upon graduation.

Domain 5: Performance Assessment

Formative Assessment: Provides feedback to teachers and learners throughout the teaching and learning process about what is working, what is not working, and what the student and the teacher should do next to improve.

Summative Assessment: Measures the extent to which the learner has accomplished the intended learning outcomes and contributes to the final grade. It is most often used at the end of a course of study to quantify learning achievement and provide data for determining the next level of study.

Candidate Performance Targets: Defines the specific learner performance to be accomplished by the end of the course of study as well as interim indicators of progress along the way.

Assessment Quality: As used here, assessment quality is defined as the extent to which an assessment accurately measures the performance it is intended to measure.

Assessment Methods: Refers to the strategies, techniques, tools and instruments used to collect information to determine the extent to which learners demonstrate desired learning outcomes. Several different methods should be used to assess learner outcomes.

Communication of Assessment Results: Refers to the methods and timelines used to communicate progress toward performance targets and learning goals to learners.

Assessment Impact: Refers to the methods used to determine the effects of teaching and learning on changes in learner behaviors, either intended or unintended.
Domain 6: Graduate Performance Outcomes

**Exit Competencies:** A general statement that describes the desired knowledge, skills, and behaviors of a student graduating from a program (or completing a course). Competencies commonly define the applied skills and knowledge that enable people to successfully perform in professional, educational, and other life contexts.

**State Certification:** The certification process is different for each state, but most states require an in-depth analysis of a potential principal's background, as well as exams that test his or her knowledge of running a school.

**School District Eligibility:** Refers to the number of graduates from certified principal preparation programs who meet school district requirements and, as a result, are eligible to be interviewed by the school district for the position of school principal. Requirements for hiring eligibility vary by school district.

**School District Hiring:** Refers to the number of graduates from certified principal preparation programs who are hired by school districts as school principals.

**Job Placement and Retention:** Refers to the number of graduates from certified principal preparation programs who are placed as first-year principals or assistant principals in chronically low performing schools, and their tenure in the position.

**Job Performance:** Refers to the number of graduates from certified principal preparation programs who meet or exceed school district performance expectations as reflected in performance evaluations conducted during the first three years of induction.
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Appendix:
Exemplars from the Field of Level 3 and Level 4 Artifacts

In response to requests from users for concrete examples of supporting evidence of design and implementation, this appendix draws from an extensive catalogue of artifacts submitted by QM users as examples of the types of products and practices that programs identify when selecting supporting evidence for level 3 and level 4 ratings. Featured artifacts were submitted by QM users as part of their self-study process and are intended for use as reference only.

In an effort to continue advancing the field of principal preparation’s understanding of what one might expect to observe as evidence of effective training and preparation products and practices, we gratefully acknowledge the following contributors for their willingness to share their work: Augusta University, Florida Atlantic University, Gardner-Webb University, Kennesaw State University, Lehman College CUNY, North Carolina State University, San Diego State University, Southern Connecticut State University, University of Connecticut, University of Georgia, and Virginia State University. Additionally, we extend sincere thanks to all QM users for their willingness to share their program’s evidence-based products and practices with their colleagues in order to advance the collective learning of the field.

ABOUT THIS APPENDIX:
• Organized by program domain to include examples of both evidence of design and evidence of implementation
• Includes highlights and call-outs to emphasize key areas of focus
• Includes program provider names
• Aligns with the Evidence Strength Continuum

NOTE: Special thanks to Melissa Lin, QM Center Project Coordinator, for her tireless efforts to compile, organize, and display selected artifacts for inclusion in this appendix.
QM Evidence Strength Continuum

Please see page 9 for a detailed overview of the QM Evidence Strength Continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **LEVEL 4**  
*Strongest* | Artifacts demonstrate that *ALL* indicator criteria have been met *at the design level* for the domain | Artifacts demonstrate *system-wide implementation* of the indicator criteria for the domain | *State, school district, and preparation program provider* usage and performance data |
| **LEVEL 3**  
*Stronger* | Artifacts demonstrate that *MOST* indicator criteria have been met *at the design level* for the domain | Artifacts demonstrate *program-wide implementation* of the indicator criteria for the domain | *Program-wide* artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data |
| **LEVEL 2**  
*Strong* | Artifacts demonstrate that *SOME* indicator criteria have been met *at the design level* for the domain | Artifacts demonstrate *individual course implementation* of the indicator criteria for the domain | *Individual course* artifacts include usage and performance data for selected faculty and students |
| **LEVEL 1**  
*Weak* | Artifacts demonstrate that *FEW/NO* indicator criteria have been met *at the design level* for the domain | Artifacts *do not yet demonstrate implementation* of the indicator criteria for the domain at this time | |
User Exemplars for Domain 1: Candidate Admissions

**EVIDENCE STRENGTH**

| LEVEL 4 Strongest | Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain |
| LEVEL 3 Stronger | Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain |

**TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 6: Candidate Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts Description: MEd Leader Application Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Contributor: Augusta University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE**

Master of Education (MEd) - Educational Leadership
Tier I School Administrator
Application Checklist

- Name: [Name]
- Degree Received: [Degree]
- Accepted for: Fall
- Residency: In-State
- Out-of-State: Form Submitted
- Home Phone: [Phone]
- Official transcripts from ALA-approved colleges

**TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2: Recruitment Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts Description: Email to Nominating Principals and Program Nomination Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Contributor: Florida Atlantic University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE**

NELA: Principal 1 Outperforms both the State and Local District

- Q1.1 (School Vision) |
- Q1.2 (High teacher availability) |
- Q1.3 (Community support) |
- Q1.4 (Adolescent needs) |

**Indicator 5: Predictor Assessments**

**Artifacts Description:** Regional Cohort Applicants’ Rankings

**Program Contributor:** San Diego State University

**EVIDENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Applicants Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM-WIDE artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data**

- Non-resident
- Resident
- Non-Resident
- Resident

**SYSTEM-WIDE artifacts include state, school district, program provider usage and performance data**

**NOT YET demonstrate implementation**

- Design evidence does NOT YET demonstrate implementation
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EVIDENCE STRENGTH | TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN | EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE | TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION | EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**LEVEL 4 Strongest**
Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain

**Indicator 5: Course Coherence**
**Artifacts Description:** Program Curriculum Model
**Program Contributor:** Florida Atlantic University

Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain

**Indicator 1: Standards**
**Artifacts Description:** Alignment of CAPE/Program Framework/PSEL Standards
**Program Contributor:** San Diego State University

Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain

**Indicator 4: Course Evaluation**
**Artifacts Description:** Ed.D. Assessment Report Cycle
**Program Contributor:** University of Georgia

Please stay tuned as QM tools are continually being updated...

**SYSTEM-WIDE artifacts include state, school district, program provider usage and performance data**

**PROGRAM-WIDE artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data**

---

**QM Self-Study Toolkit**

**User Exemplars for Domain 2: Course Content**
### User Exemplars for Domain 3: Pedagogy-Andragogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongest</strong></td>
<td>Indicator 2: Experiential Learning Activities</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artifacts Description:</strong> Leadership Experience Course Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Contributor:</strong> Lehman College CUNY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership Experience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formative Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplars</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate at the design level for the domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artifacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Provider Usage and Performance Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Provider Usage and Performance Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stronger</strong></td>
<td>Indicator 6: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy</td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate program-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artifacts Description:</strong> Residency Log and Reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Contributor:</strong> Kennesaw State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership Experience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formative Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate at the design level for the domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Provider Usage and Performance Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Provider Usage and Performance Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please stay tuned as QM tools are continually being updated...
## User Exemplars for Domain 4: Clinical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **LEVEL 4 Strongest** | ![Design evidence does NOT YET demonstrate implementation](image1.png) | **Indicator 4: Clinical Supervision**  
**Artifacts Description:** Discussion Boards for Receiving Clinical Coach or Peer Review Feedback  
**Program Contributor:** Gardner-Webb University | ![System-wide artifacts include state, school district, program provider usage and performance data](image2.png) | ![Please stay tuned as QM tools are continually being updated...](image3.png) |
| ![Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain](image4.png) | ![Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain](image5.png) | ![Artifacts demonstrate program-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain](image6.png) | ![Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain](image7.png) |
| **LEVEL 3 Stronger** | ![Program-Wide artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data](image8.png) | **Indicator 1: Clinical Design**  
**Artifacts Description:** Course Syllabus  
**Program Contributor:** University of Connecticut | **Indicator 6: Clinical Evaluation**  
**Artifacts Description:** Internship Pre-Post Survey Sample Results  
**Program Contributor:** Southern Connecticut State University | ![Program-Wide artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data](image9.png) |
| ![Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain](image10.png) | ![Design evidence does NOT YET demonstrate implementation](image11.png) | ![System-wide artifacts include state, school district, program provider usage and performance data](image12.png) | ![Please stay tuned as QM tools are continually being updated...](image13.png) |

### Indicator 1: Clinical Design

**Artifacts Description:** Course Syllabus  
**Program Contributor:** University of Connecticut

### Indicator 4: Clinical Supervision

**Artifacts Description:** Discussion Boards for Receiving Clinical Coach or Peer Review Feedback  
**Program Contributor:** Gardner-Webb University

### Indicator 6: Clinical Evaluation

**Artifacts Description:** Internship Pre-Post Survey Sample Results  
**Program Contributor:** Southern Connecticut State University

---

© 2018 Education Development Center, Inc.
### User Exemplars for Domain 5: Performance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LEVEL 4 | Strongest | Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met **at the design level** for the domain | Indicator 4: Assessment Methods  
**Artifacts Description:** Assessment Rubrics and Sample Exam  
**Program Contributor:** Virginia State University | Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain |
| LEVEL 3 | Stronger | Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met **at the design level** for the domain | Indicator 2: Candidate Performance Targets  
**Artifacts Description:** Professional Growth Targets Form  
**Program Contributor:** University of Georgia | Artifacts demonstrate program-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain |
| | | | Indicator 2: Candidate Performance Targets  
**Artifacts Description:** Cohort Performance by Standards Report  
**Program Contributor:** San Diego State University | |
User Exemplars for Domain 6: Graduate Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE STRENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE 1: EVIDENCE OF DESIGN</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF DESIGN EVIDENCE</th>
<th>TYPE 2: EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LEVEL 4 Strongest  | Artifacts demonstrate that ALL indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain | Indicator 3: School District Eligibility  
**Artifacts Description:** State-Approved Program Verification Form  
**Program Contributor:** Virginia State University | Artifacts demonstrate system-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain | Indicator 3: School District Eligibility  
**Artifacts Description:** State/District Map and Program Graduate Placement Data  
**Program Contributor:** North Carolina State University |
| LEVEL 3 Stronger   | Artifacts demonstrate that MOST indicator criteria have been met at the design level for the domain | Indicator 1: Exit Competencies  
**Artifacts Description:** Survey to Employers of 1st Year Leaders  
**Program Contributor:** Augusta University | Artifacts demonstrate program-wide implementation of the indicator criteria for the domain | Indicator 1: Exit Competencies  
**Artifacts Description:** Example of Exit Competencies Assessment Data  
**Program Contributor:** University of Georgia |
|                    |                             |                             | Program-wide artifacts include faculty- and student-wide performance data |                     |

**Implementation Level:** System-wide artifacts include state, school district, program provider usage and performance data