

Initial Review
First Rejoinder
X Second Rejoinder

NCATE
Approval with Specialized Professional Association (SPA)
2002 Standards

SPA Professional Organization: **Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)**

Institution Submitting Programs: Eastern Michigan University

Date of Review: December 14, 2003

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Program Type	Award or Degree Level
Educational Leadership (M)	Advanced: EdAdm	Masters
Educational Leadership (S)	Advanced: EdAdm	Specialist

SPA DECISION ON PROGRAM(S) (*Specifics of decisions are noted beginning on page three of this report*)

Program(s) Recognized: Educational Leadership (Masters and Specialist)

SUMMARY OF STRENGTHS: The information included with the rejoinder report clarified many areas of concern noted in the previous report. It is evident that the department has made great strides toward revising its programs to meet the expectations for the guideline indicators. With the changes described in the rejoinder report, the following guideline indicators are now in compliance: 3.5 (M & S), 4.6 (S), 5.4 (M & S), 7.4 (S), 8.1 (S), 8.2 (S), 8.3 (S), 8.4 (S), 9.1 (S), 9.2 (S), and 9.3 (S).

GUIDELINE INDICATORS STILL NOT MET: None noted.

SUMMARY OF AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT: None noted.

RECOMMENDATIONS OR COMMENTS: It is evident that many of the indicators have been addressed in multiple activities throughout the course-work. Candidates now have ample opportunities to build the knowledge, skills, and dispositions contained in these guidelines. The effort the department took to make these exemplary changes is definitely in evidence and the department is commended on their hard work and effort. The programs are now in substantial compliance with each of the ELCC guidelines.

DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF REJOINDER: A rejoinder may be filed with NCATE to be reviewed by the ELCC for re-evaluation of the decision given in this review. Please include a narrative explanation and additional supporting performance and/or assessment documentation for each of the standard elements needing improvement that are cited in this report. The narrative should include an explanation on how these elements have been corrected and include a timeline for implementation and gathering of assessment data. Do not resubmit evidence from previous program reports. Only include new or revised documentation in the rejoinder report. Supporting documentation should be cross-referenced back to the narrative comments by writing in the standard indicator (e.g., 1.2, 2.3) at the specific place in the documentation where the standard element is in evidence. Three bound copies of the rejoinder report should be sent to the ELCC, via NCATE.