



AAQEP Annual Report for 2022

Provider/Program Name:	Utah State University – Instructional Leadership
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	06/23/26

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

Utah State University (USU) is a land-grant institution with a main campus in Logan, UT. In 2021, USU was awarded the Carnegie classification of R1, very high research activity. In Fall 2021, USU enrolled 27,426 students, including 6,043 students on statewide campuses and 3,171 graduate students and 1,761 international students.

USU began as an agricultural college but began offering courses related to teaching in the 1920s. On March 8, 1927, Senate Bill No. 97 was signed, which authorized the College to provide teacher preparation courses as part of a new School of Education that was assigned to the College of Arts and Sciences. In 1932, the School of Education established its independence from the School of Arts and Sciences. In 1957, Utah’s Agricultural College became Utah State University and the School of Education became the College of Education. On April 23, 2008, USU announced it

was naming its prestigious college of education the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) in honor of a \$25 million gift from the Emma Eccles Jones Foundation.

Statewide Campuses

In keeping with its land-grant mission, USU's Statewide Campuses serve a significant portion of the university's total enrollment. Teacher preparation programs at USU are well represented in regional campus offerings. Distance education extends USU's and CEHS's reach to provide higher education to students throughout Utah and around the world. Through distance education, USU can deliver classes via interactive broadcast to every county in Utah. A complete map of USU's statewide campuses can be viewed here: <https://statewide.usu.edu/>.

Starting Summer 2023, USU is launching a more flexible teaching model that includes: in-person, online, virtual, hybrid, connect, and arranged delivery models to prioritize the best learning opportunities to students while extending access. Information on these deliver models is accessible here: <https://www.usu.edu/teach/>.

The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services (CEHS)

CEHS offers preparation programs for prospective teachers, school counselors, and administrators and supervisors in education. It also provides preparation for professionals in human services areas and corporate settings. Composed of seven departments, the College is also home to the: Emma Eccles Jones Center for Early Childhood Education; Center for Persons with Disabilities; Sorensen Legacy Foundation Center for Clinical Excellence; National Center for Hearing Assessment and Management; Dolores Dore Eccles Center for Early Care and Education; Center for the School of the Future; Edith Bowen Laboratory School; and the Sound Beginnings Program (for children with cochlear implants or digital hearing aids).

U.S. News and World Report has ranked the graduate programs annually. Recent ranking highlights for CEHS include:

- Ranked #1 college of education in Utah – a ranking it has held for 22 years
- Graduate programs are ranked #30 in the nation (of 274 graduate schools)
- Ranked #13 nationally in external research funding with over \$37 million in external research funding

CEHS also has placement rates at or above 94% for certified graduates seeking employment in special education, elementary education, speech-language pathology, audiology, and 18 secondary education fields.

Profile of the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (TEAL)

Within CEHS, TEAL offers programs for early childhood education, elementary education, the social studies composite secondary teaching major, and the professional education framework leading to secondary education licensure in other teaching majors. The department's website is <https://cehs.usu.edu/teal/>.

Instructional Leadership

For many years, the college has offered a program for the preparation of school leaders. In 1972, the Board of Regents discontinued the Ph.D. Program in Educational Administration and in 1974, the Department of Educational Administration at Utah State University was dissolved, leaving the University without programs of instruction in the field. In 1979, the Administrative/Supervisory Certificate (ASC) program was approved by the Utah State Office of Education, allowing USU to again offer programs to prepare school leaders. This program was a non-degree, licensure-only certification program. Because the Department of Educational Administration had been dissolved, the program was housed in the Dean's Office and was directed by the Associate Dean for Extension. In 2008, the program became part of TEAL.

In 2010, TEAL was authorized to offer a specialization in instructional leadership within the existing M.Ed. programs in elementary education and secondary education. Effective in 2011, the program received approval to become a Master of Education Degree in Instructional Leadership. Thus, the Instructional Leadership program currently has two strands: 1) the Administrative/Supervisory Concentration (ASC) program, which is a licensure-only program consisting of 30 credits of coursework for students who hold a master's degree prior to admission (required for Utah Administrative Licensure), and 2) the M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership (M.Ed.) program, consisting of 36 credits and including a set of courses addressing a curriculum and instruction core.

Distinguishing Features

- **Course Delivery.** The program has been known for increasing access to administrative licensure throughout Utah using distance education. Over its history, courses have been delivered using a variety of systems and formats, including interactive broadcast (where courses are delivered through a video-conference modality to statewide campuses). Summer courses have traditionally been offered in a Hybrid model over seven weeks,

including one week at the USU Brigham City Campus, with the remaining six weeks online. In the past three years, courses have been delivered online (synchronously and asynchronously) using Zoom and Canvas. Currently our ASC program is considered a blended online program with a combination of asynchronous and synchronous course offerings. Currently, those enrolled in the M.Ed. program can take their additional two required curriculum and instruction core courses in an online, face-to-face, or interactive broadcast format.

Because all courses are offered 2/3 semesters, students, to a great extent, can complete their program at their own pace and because there is flexibility in selecting the locations and timing of the internship experiences.

- **Internship.** Historically, and for students included in the data points for this annual report, the internship element of the program has consisted of 450 hours of applied internship as outlined in the rules of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE). However, the USBE changed the internship requirements in 2018 and students now focus on completing a number of required internship experiences organized by the seven Utah Educational Leadership standards and no longer are required to complete a certain number of internship hours. While students are engaged in completing internship experiences throughout their program, the internship is flanked by an opening internship course (TEAL 6945) that provides structure and guidance in setting up their internship sites and determining their mentor principals and then a closing internship course (TEAL 6930) where student submit their entire internship experience log, including their reflections and self-ratings, and ratings by their mentor principals. Students are also assigned an Internship Supervisor who helps students maintain progress on their internship experiences throughout the program.
- **Faculty.** In the 2021-2022 academic year, the core Instructional Leadership faculty group consisted of two full-time faculty supplemented with semester hires with credentials specific to the courses they teach (e.g., School Law). The core faculty meet monthly during the academic year and periodically during the summer to consider candidates for admission, address potential program changes, and collaborate on research and program development projects.

Longitudinal Data Collection (from 2015 – Summer 2021 graduates)

- Data collected in Fall 2021 from graduates from the ASC and M.Ed. programs since 2015 who have received their licensure, acquired a school-building leadership role, and responded to our survey ($n = 51$) rated their preparation an overall average of 3.97/5.

Fall 2021- Summer 2022 (2021-2022) Annual Review Highlights

- 86% of 2021-2022 graduates complete their programs in the expected time to completion (3-4 semesters for ASC, 5 semesters for M.Ed.); 97% within 1.5 times the expected time to completion.
- At program exit, 100% of our 2021-2022 graduates passed the Praxis Exam 5411 exam.
- 93% of 2021-2022 graduates agreed or strongly agreed that the program prepared them for the duties and responsibilities of an education leader.
- 2.5% of 2021-2022 graduates had acquired a school leadership position (assistant principal or principal) at the conclusion of their program; 47% of those not already employed as a school leader intended to go into school leadership as soon as possible.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

<https://cehs.usu.edu/about/annual-report-instructional-leadership>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2021-2022

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
		N/A	N/A
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		N/A	N/A

<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
Administrative/Supervisory Concentration (only)	Administrative/Supervisory Licensure	68*	29
M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership	Administrative/Supervisory Licensure	15*	6
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		83*	35
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
		N/A	N/A
Total for additional programs		N/A	N/A
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers			35

*** We admit students every semester, and the number listed reflects the total number of students that were enrolled at some point in the previous 12 months (the Fall 2021, Spring 2022, and/or Summer 2022 semesters). Note: this value is distinctively higher than what was reported last year because last year we reported enrollment as designated by a single chosen semester (Fall 2021) to represent current enrollment.**

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

N/A

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

<p>A. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>
83
<p>B. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>
35
<p>C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>
35
<p>D. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.</p> <p>We indicate on our website: https://teal.usu.edu/graduate/med-il that the average time to completion is 3-4 semesters for the Administrative/Supervisory Concentration and 5 semesters for the M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership, or 4.5 - 6 years and 7.5, respectively for 1.5 times the expected time frame. The completion data are as follows for 2021-2022 completers:</p> <p>Aggregated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 or 86% of all students across the two programs completed the program within the expected time frame • 34 or 97% of all students across the two programs completed the program within 1.5 times the expected timeframe <p>Disaggregated by Program:</p> <p>Administrative/Supervisory Concentration-only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average time to completion: 3.97 semesters (range: 3 – 8 semesters; mode: 4 semesters) • Percent of students who completed within expected time frame (3-4 semesters): 86% • Percent of students who completed within 1.5 times the expected time frame (4.5 - 6 semesters): 97% <p>M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average time to completion: 4.67 semesters (range: 4 - 6 semesters; mode: 4 semesters)

- Percent of students who completed within expected time frame (5 semesters): 83%
- Percent of students who completed within 1.5 times the expected time frame (7.5 semesters): 100%

E. Summary of state license examination results, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

The Praxis 5412: Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision (<https://www.ets.org/praxis/prepare/materials/5412>), administered by ETS, is required for licensure in the state of Utah, with a passing score of 146 or ETS' School Leaders Licensure Assessment (Test Code: 6990) with a passing score of 151 (<https://origin-www.ets.org/sls/prepare/materials/6990>) . For 2021-2022 completers, final passing licensure assessment scores ranged from 146 - 186, with a mean score of 172.57, and a mode of 172. The initial pass rate (passing on the first try) was 100%.

F. Narrative explanation of evidence available from program completers, with a characterization of findings.

Program completers complete the INSPIRE, an annual survey conducted by the Utah Education Policy Center at the University of Utah (<https://uepc.utah.edu/our-work/inspire-leadership/>) and completed by all principal preparation programs within the state of Utah. Our survey completion rate for 2021-2022 program completers was 95.2% ($n = 40$ responders) and a summary of our survey findings (aggregated, as raw data on the specific program strand of the student-ASC only or M.Ed. are not available). Items are rated on a "1" to "5" scale (with a mid-point of 2.5 = average, 3.75-5 = highly above average).

Program Relevance and Rigor. Completers rated the relevance and rigor of their program and coursework. **All items were rated, on average, from 4.3 – 4.6**, indicating that program completers rated the **program's relevance and rigor (e.g., coherence, challenge, reflection, integrated theory and practice, varied and engaging instruction, strong orientation towards profession) as highly above average.**

Faculty Quality. Completers rated the program faculty on their: knowledge, instructional competence, responsiveness to students, respectfulness of diversity, and value and support of students. **All items under this category were rated, on average, 4.4 – 4.6**, indicating that completers rated the **program's quality of faculty as highly above average.**

Peer Relationships. Completers rated to what extent peer relationships developed through the program are close in nature and influenced their professional and personal growth. **Survey items within this component were rated, on average, 3.3 – 4.2**, indicating that completers rated the **program's effectiveness in fostering peer relationships as above average to highly above average.**

Program Accessibility. Under program accessibility, completers rated the: convenience of timing and location of course offerings, effectiveness of online options, costs, and admission requirements. **These items were rated, on average, 3.7 – 4.7**, indicating

that completers rated the **program's accessibility as average to highly above average**. Note: costs incurred by students (e.g., tuition, fees, books), was rated the lowest ($M = 3.7$) under this topic.

Curriculum. In the area of curriculum, completers rated their preparation in core leadership concepts: organizational culture, instructional leadership, school improvement, management, family and community relations, and technology. **These areas were rated, on average, 3.7 – 4.5**, indicating that completers rated the **program's curriculum as above average to highly above average**. Note: technologies to relevant future administrative work were rated the lowest ($M = 3.7$) under this topic.

Candidate Assessment. This area was a newly added area of the survey to assess to what extent the program makes decisions about students' knowledge and skill development throughout the program (e.g., formative assessments, mid-program review, final summative assessment). **These areas were rated, on average, 4.0 – 4.3**, indicating that completers rated the **program's curriculum as above average to highly above average**.

Internship Residency/Quality. Completers rated the effectiveness of their internship, including experiences, developing important perspectives, engagement with colleagues, experience with relevant responsibilities, regular evaluation, adequate opportunities for application, and access and engagement with students from a variety of backgrounds. **These items were rated, on average, 4.1 – 4.5**, indicating that completers rated the **program's internship as above average to highly above average**.

Learning Outcomes. Completers rated the program's effectiveness on achieving various learning outcomes on 45 items across the following dimensions:

- Ethics and Professional Norms (item means: 4.3 – 4.6)
- Strategic Leadership (item means: 4.2 – 4.5)
- Operations and Management (item means: 4.1 – 4.4)
- Instructional Leadership (item means: 4.2 – 4.3)
- Professional and Organizational Culture (item means: 4.1 – 4.4)
- Supportive and Equitable Learning Environment (item means: 4.3 – 4.4)
- Family and Community Engagement (item means: 4.0 – 4.2)

Across all 46 learning outcomes, 46 or 100% were rated as highly above average.

Overall Quality of Preparation. Completers rated, on average, the preparation program a 4.4 for preparing candidates for the duties and responsibilities of an education leader (93% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement). Completers rated, on average, the preparation program a 4.6 for having a good reputation in the state or region (95% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement).

Program Completers (2021-2022): Longitudinal Evidence

Only 11 of our 2021-2022 completers have secured a school leadership role. Given our typical survey response rate of 41%, we did not believe we would have enough data to report statistics on our most recent graduates and their perceptions of our program now that they have resumed a leadership position. Likewise, these individuals have only been in their roles less than 6 months. For these reasons, we will be collecting data on graduates who have secured a position and the employers of those graduates following a full year of employment. This new annual data collection period will be integrated into our data collection plan articulated under Standard 2 in our plans for growth and improvement. However, we did launch a significant longitudinal data collection last year on a large pool of graduates (from 2015-2021). These data, in the next subheading, reflect our most up-to-date information on completers.

Program Completers (~ 2015- 2021): Longitudinal Evidence

In response to the need to gather better evidence *on our completers after they complete our program and their perceptions of their preparation as they acquire leadership positions*, in fall 2021 the Instructional Leadership program worked in collaboration with Dr. Sylvia Read (Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Services) and Jairo Hernandez Velasquez (Database Administrator, College of Education and Human Services), and two student workers (Kamryn James and Kelsey Lamb) in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership to administer a post-graduate survey to all students who graduated from our ASC and M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership programs and that have earned their administrative license since 2015 ($n = 252$; 4 were unreachable yielding a survey pool of $n = 248$). A total of 101 graduates responded to the survey (41% response rate).

Reasons for Acquiring Administrative License. Those who responded to the survey indicated that they sought their administrative license for the following reasons (respondents could indicate multiple reasons):

- To immediately apply for or secure a school leadership position (36.4%)
- To eventually apply for/secure a school leadership position (55.5%)
- To acquire more pay (43.6%)
- To move into a different position within the school or district immediately or eventually (44.5%)
- To enhance and expand current skills and expertise (76.4%)
- Other (8.2%)

Employment Patterns. Of those who responded to the survey, 77.3% had searched for building-level administrative job openings, 75.5% had applied for building-level administrative positions, 48.2% had secured a building-level job offer, and 51.8% had been employed as a building level administrator. 50% of respondents indicated that they were currently employed in a building-level administrative position (18.2% at the elementary level, 20% at the secondary level, 11.8% “other”).

Perceptions of Preparation. Those who responded to the survey indicating they held a building-level leadership position ($n = 51$) were asked to rate how well their principal preparation program prepared them to be a successful school leader as rated on the

[Utah Educational Leadership Standards](#) (UELS; 2018), using a Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well). The UELS (2018) represent 40 indicators that organize into 7 leadership strands. **Survey respondents employed as building-level leaders reported their principal preparation program as preparing them, on average (across all 39 items), a 3.97 out of 5 (adequately).** Item means organized by strand are presented below:

- Strand 1: Visionary Leadership (item means: 3.88 – 4.08)
- Strand 2: Teaching and Learning (items means: 3.64 – 4.16)
- Strand 3: Management for Learning (items means: 3.59 – 4.18)
- Strand 4: Community Engagement (item means: 3.86 – 4.14)
- Strand 5: Ethical Leadership (item means: 4.22 – 4.31)
- Strand 6: School Improvement (item means: 3.78 – 4.02)
- Strand 7: Equity Cultural Responsiveness (item means: 3.80 – 4.16)

Based on feedback from AAQEP, we also asked these respondents to rate an additional indicator of preparation that is not captured in the UELS:

- Promote the preparation of students to live and participate in the global economy by developing international awareness and global perspectives (AAQEP, 2d)

This indicator was rated, on average, a 3.63 – that our graduates felt they were adequately prepared in this facet.

G. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Supervisors of Program Completers (2021-2022): Longitudinal Evidence

Only 11 of our 2021-2022 completers have secured a school leadership role. Given our typical survey response rate of about 45% from employers of our graduates, we did not believe we would have enough data to report statistics on employers' perceptions of our most recent graduates and their effectiveness in their roles as school leaders. Likewise, our graduates have only been in their roles less than 6 months. For these reasons, we will be collecting data on employers' perceptions of graduates who have secured a leadership position following a full year of employment. This new annual data collection period will be integrated into our data collection plan articulated under Standard 2 in our plans for growth and improvement. However, we did launch a significant longitudinal data collection last year on a large pool of graduates (from 2015-2021) and their employers. These data, in the next subheading, reflect our most up-to-date information on employers' perceptions of our graduates.

Supervisors of Program Completers (~ 2015- 2021): Longitudinal Evidence

In response to the need to gather better evidence *on our completers after they complete our program and their effectiveness once they adapt to the profession*, in fall 2021 the Instructional Leadership program worked in collaboration with Dr. Sylvia Read (Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Services), Jairo Hernandez Velasquez (Database Administrator, College of Education and Human Services), and two student workers (Kamryn James and Kelsey Lamb) in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership to administer a survey to the employers (direct supervisors) of the individuals from the pool of 252 students who: 1) graduated from our ASC and M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership programs and that have earned their administrative license since 2015, 2) were currently employed as a building-level leader, yielding a pool of 76 graduates. Note: we intentionally chose a longitudinal model because based on INSPIRE survey data, we were aware that approximately less than 30% of our graduates are employed as building level leaders which would have yielded too small of a sample size.

Thus, surveys were administered to the direct supervisors of those 76 graduates. A total of 34 surveys were completed (a response rate of 45%). In the survey, supervisors were asked to consider how effective these graduates are in their current roles as measured by the Utah Educational Leadership Standards (2018), and rate their preparation on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not at all, 5 = very well). While we recognize that it is challenging to conclude that our graduates' effectiveness as school leaders is a direct or predominant result of their preparation, the data acquired from this survey, albeit not perfect, provides a moderator indicator especially when combined from graduates' own perceptions. We recognize that these data are likely more accurate for recent graduates and for those who hold a principal position as opposed to an assistant principal or vice principal position. Item mean results organized by UELS (2018) strands are provided below:

- Strand 1: Visionary Leadership (item means: 4.47 – 4.75)
- Strand 2: Teaching and Learning (items means: 4.22 – 4.67)
- Strand 3: Management for Learning (items means: 4.28– 4.75)
- Strand 4: Community Engagement (item means: 4.56 – 4.86)
- Strand 5: Ethical Leadership (item means: 4.72 – 4.89)
- Strand 6: School Improvement (item means: 4.43 – 4.58)
- Strand 7: Equity Cultural Responsiveness (item means: 4.44 – 4.69)

Based on feedback from AAQEP, we also asked supervisors to rate an additional indicator of school leader effectiveness that is not captured in the UELS:

- Promote the preparation of students to live and participate in the global economy by developing international awareness and global perspectives (AAQEP, 2d)

This indicator was rated, on average, a 4.31 – that our graduates were rated by their supervisors as well prepared.

H. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

The INSPIRE survey for 2021-2022 completers is administered at the conclusion of the semester in which students complete their program. At the time of survey administration responders ($n = 40$; 92.5% of our graduates), 2.5% of 2021-2022 completers were employed as an assistant principal or principal. A data pull from our Coordinator of Graduation, Educator Licensing, and Accreditation of those graduating from our programs that earned an administrative license between Fall 2021 and Summer of 2022 revealed that as of September 2021, a total of 11 graduates were currently employed as a school administrator.

An additional 47.5% were employed as a teacher leader or district leader, 32.5% were currently employed as a teacher, and 17.5% listed "other" or "other educational leader position" as employment. Of those not employed as a school leader, 47% indicated the intent to go into school leadership as soon as possible and 50% indicated plans to go into school leadership "some day". One responder was undecided, and no one indicated they did not plan to go into school leadership.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Praxis	<p>To earn licensure in the state of Utah, completers seeking their Administrative/Supervisory K-12 licensure must pass the Praxis test version for Instructional Leadership: Administration and Supervision (5412). Completers must achieve a passing score of 146 to qualify for licensure. Alternatively, those seeking licensure may take the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (Test Code: 6990) with a passing score of 151 to qualify for licensure.</p> <p>For successful performance, we expect an initial pass rate of 95% and an all-attempt pass rate of 100%.</p>	<p>Final passing licensure assessment scores for 2021-2022 ranged from 146 - 186, with a mean score of 172.57, and a mode of 172.</p> <p>The initial pass rate (passing on the first try) was 100%.</p> <p>Our expectations for successful performance were met.</p>
Internship Experiences List	<p>Students in our program are asked to complete a list of Internship Experiences. While 41 experiences are listed, not all are required.</p> <p>For successful performance, we expect that all students complete the required experiences (15).</p>	<p>For completers in which data were readily accessible ($n = 29$), completers completed on average, 25 experiences with a range of 17 – 37. 100% of completers completed the required 15 experiences.</p> <p>Our expectations for successful performance were met.</p>

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Survey of completers	We expect that completers will rate the program average to above average on all components of the INSPIRE survey.	On all Likert-rated components, completers rated all items on program effectiveness in the INSPIRE survey as above average or highly above average. Our expectations for successful performance were met.
Survey of graduates (longitudinal) – selected sub-set (those employed as building level school leaders)	We expect graduates to rate their program preparation as adequate or better (well, very well) on all UELS.	Based on our most up-to-date and available data, on all Likert-rated components, graduates (~2015 – 2021, employed as a building-level school leader) rated their preparation on all UELS as adequate or better. Our expectations for successful performance were met.
Survey of supervisors of graduates (longitudinal)	We expect supervisors of our graduates to rate their program preparation as adequate or better (well, very well) on all UELS (considering their effectiveness as current school leaders).	Based on our most up-to-date and available data, on all Likert-rated components, supervisors of our graduates (~2015 – 2021) who are currently employed as building-level school leaders rated the preparation of those graduates on all UELS as adequate or better, exceeding. Our expectations for successful performance were met.

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

Self-Assessment & Continuous Improvement Plans from 2021 AAQEP Report

Here we briefly note the plans we articulated in our 2021 AAQEP annual report and our progress on those initiatives.

Standard 1 & 3: Monitor Status of Re-design Efforts

While the state of Utah has promoted a more competency-based model, due to employee shifts at the state in the last year the state support on this effort has stalled and state meetings focused on whether the 2018 Educational Leadership Standards needed to be revised. During the fall of 2022, it was determined that these standards **will not** be revised, and the state has been exploring the feasibility of adopting a performance-based outcomes assessment to take the place of the current Praxis exam. With these considerations in mind, we were pausing re-design efforts and have not resumed our plans and will be coordinating with our department chair on needs to enhance this work, including a portfolio approach to summarizing our student's internship experiences.

Standard 2: Develop a Principal Preparation Advisory Board

Due to changes in Instructional Leadership faculty, development of USU's Principal Preparation Program Advisory Board was delayed until Fall 2021. During the fall of 2021, USU's Principal Preparation Program Advisory Board was established with 8 participating districts. Our first kick-off meeting occurred on January 14th, 2021. The district representatives consisted of Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Principal Supervisors as part of the Advisory Group. In that meeting we received feedback on and invitations to engage in direct recruitment events. We resumed these in person efforts in Tooele School District in spring 2023, visited with another partner district, Cache County School District, in fall of 2023 we reached out to 2-3 districts and will continue to do so each semester going to hold more personalized recruitment events. We also took this feedback as an opportunity to plan virtual recruitment events to reach both prospective principals in our partner districts and across the state. The virtual recruitment event/info session is scheduled for February 8th, 2023. Flyers and information have been distributed to all districts in the state of Utah in November 2022.

We plan to hold another annual advisory board meeting in Spring 2023 with updates on our program as well as guided feedback opportunities to engage in continual planning to support our district partners' needs.

Standard 4: Develop a Course on Community Engagement

To address graduates' lower ratings in feeling prepared in community engagement (from our INSPIRE data collection), we established TEAL 6330: Leadership in the School Community, a course that will be offered for the first time Spring 2023 and will take the place of TEAL 6540: Data-based Decision Making (in which some of this course content will now be integrated into a related course, TEAL 6060: Assessment for Curriculum Accountability).

Other Initiatives

To stay better connected to current students and our graduates and respond to evidence that our graduates are not necessarily employed in a school leadership position immediately upon graduation, we have launched an Instructional Leadership email address (il@usu.edu) as well as a social media site (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100087614214786>) in November 2022. Current students and graduates have been encouraged to share the site, we currently follow all school districts in the state of Utah, and this information has also been shared with all school districts in the state. This site will provide information about recruitment events, job openings, and professional learning opportunities for aspiring and current school leaders.

We have also started to establish a working Instructional Leadership program handbook where we will establish and document our policies and procedures for admission, academic progress, and annual data collection plans.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard. Note that providers may focus their work on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

	Standard 1
Goals for the 2022-23 year	Plan steps of internship revision w/ coursework to occur during 2023-2024 year.
Actions	1: Communicate plans in collaboration with Department Head and seek support. 2: Plan reduction of ASC and M.Ed. by 3 credit hours by combining an introductory principalship course (TEAL 6080) with the first internship course (TEAL 6945). 3: Explore the feasibility of establishing a portfolio that would provide a comprehensive source of evidence that program completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and abilities appropriate for first year school leaders.
Expected outcomes	A credit-reduced ASC and M.Ed. program. An end-of-program portfolio that encapsulates a revised set of competency-based internship experiences that are reflected in current coursework and align with state standards. An implementation plan.
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 2
Goals for the 2022-23 year	Plan and implement protocol for ongoing longitudinal data collection of employers graduates who have secured employment within 3 years of completing program as well as employment patterns of all graduates, position, as well as information on context of employment.
Actions	1: Determine needed supports and existing structures. 2: Establish ongoing dates of data collection. 3: Launch first round of data collection in the spring or summer of 2023.

Expected outcomes	Annual data from graduates who have secured a leadership position within 3 years of graduation and employers' perceptions of those graduates.
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 3
Goals for the 2022-23 year	See Standard 1.
Actions	
Expected outcomes	
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 4
Goals for the 2022-23 year	Examine longitudinal data collection to determine if TEAL 6330 has had an impact on INSPIRE ratings of graduates' preparedness in community engagement.
Actions	Examine INSPIRE data.
Expected outcomes	INSPIRE data reports and our reflection on those data and any needed actions.
Reflections or comments	

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate "n/a" if no concerns or conditions were noted). Note that where a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

While our program now consists of 3 full-time, tenure-track faculty members, we still rely heavily on semester hires following the failed search for a clinical faculty line. The clinical faculty line has been hard to staff, initially, and to sustain individuals in this particular role so we are currently revisiting more innovative ways to envision this role to be more attractive to candidates while supporting the needs of the program and the students it serves. This does mean that we remain understaffed, to some extent.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

N/A

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Alyson Lavigne, Associate Professor, Faculty Coordinator of Instructional Leadership Program	Sylvia Read, Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Services

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/19/22
---------------------	----------