November 1st, 2018

**Response to Feedback**

We thank you for the feedback provided on October 1st, 2018. Below we note the feedback that you provided and how we’ve responded to such feedback. We look forward to hosting AAQEP at our upcoming site visit.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| General Feedback  | Response |
| In terms of formatting, some exhibits are repeated in more than one place in the document. That’s probably not necessary (although one of the displays, the internship experiences list, is altered to include more information in the second use; the version with more info could be placed where it is, and referred to by page number (see 3 below) in its first instance.  | We removed any redundancy in tables, specifically the Internship Experiences List, as well as any redundancy in the INSPIRE survey data and the UEL Standards-based Curriculum Matrix. When these data are referred to in subsequent instances, the page numbers are now noted accordingly.  |
| Page numbers in the PDF document would facilitate references and discussion of specific points in the text in conversations among reviewers and between reviewers and representatives of AAQEP and USU. | Page numbers are now noted throughout the report. |
| Inconsequential note: Under ‘program rationale’ … “The Faculty regularly self-evaluates the curriculum”. Just ‘regularly evaluates the’ | This text was modified – see p. 8. |
| Standard 1: Please see comments in the section for Standard 1 below. In addition, while it is helpful to have three years of INSPIRE data available in its aggregate report form on the website, the report itself only discusses the most recent administration which includes responses from 16 individuals. Reviewers off- and on-site could dig into the other two years to see if there are trends in the data, but it might be helpful if that kind of display were included in the report itself. And reviewers are likely to ask the program faculty what trends they have seen and what they make of them. | Previously we included selected questions or domains from the INSIPRE 2018 results. In order to provide richer data, updated tables have been provided throughout the report, including:1. Tables that include 4 years of USU INSPIRE results.
2. Tables that provide USU and state normative data (2018 INSPIRE data).
3. Tables that provide USU and national normative data (only 2017 INSPIRE data are available).

New data interpretation headings (see, for example, p. 18) were added to the document to illustrate how Instructional Leadership faculty are making sense of the data for program improvement purposes. |
| Standard 2: There is a lot of repetition in presentation from Standard 1. The argument (if I’m reading it right) is basically that the foundation has been provided for the specific aspects of the standard (as shown in Std 1), and that the proof that completers are ready to go on learning is really in the focus group data. (And when exactly was the INSPIRE survey administered? Just at the point of completion, or are the respondents completers who are really looking back at what they’ve experience a year or more out? I can’t tell if it is ‘point of completion’ data, which supports the first part of the argument, or if it is a year out, which would support the second part of the argument).  | More information was added to the report to indicate when INSPIRE survey data are collected (see p. 12). The INSPIRE survey is intended to reflect the perceptions of those after they have left the program (and most have entered the field). Thus, INSPIRE data has been removed from Standard 1 and to illustrate the way these data are being used to provide evidence for the standards. |
| As it stands, there is a lot of repeated data, and not much commentary or analysis. How does the program faculty interpret these results? What about the comment regarding the lack of special education law course? Is that something to take seriously? And what about the various (some of them very practical – like facilities matters) aspects of internships that were not completed by many of the candidates? Did that matter? Does it match up with what they are reportedly a little less than ready to take on? The progress is clearly noteworthy, but the data still raises some questions. | For each area under each standard, additional data interpretation sections were added to clarify how faculty interpret the data. |
| Standard 3, admissions interview. Looks like great stuff; how are interviewers calibrated? | Additional information was added about interview calibration. See p. 39 |
| Standard 4 could benefit from a little more explication on the part of the faculty. Are candidates getting experience working on disparity reduction? Does the program partner in any particular ways with specific districts to address issues? | Please see p. 44 for extended discussion of Standard 4 results.  |
| Appendix A: Great on recruitment and admissions; is anything done to ensure inter-rater reliability in the admissions interviews? Nothing here about monitoring and persistence; is the admissions process effective? What is retention in program like, and if anyone is leaving, why? | We have added some additional information about the number of students who have withdrawn (see p. 48) |
| Appendix G hits some main points. Are you confident that the allocation of hours on the internship experience form is pretty accurate? How were the participants in the focus groups selected, and how were the questions developed? Was there one group or more than one? | Yes, are confident, in part because the final internship form completed by supervisors and mentors see p.11 for a description and p.23-24 for data.More information on the focus group is presented on p. 67. |
| There are separate notes on standards 1 and 2 below, but here is a question that bridges them. Are candidates evaluated in their field placements with any kind of rating form or rubric? The detail on what specific things they experience in their internships is very helpful, but the question remains how well they performed in it.  | Please see the final internship form completed by supervisors and mentors see p.11 for a description and p.23-24 for data. |

**Standard 1: Completer Performance**

*Completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.*

Candidates and completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive. Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target credential or degree.

*All six aspects of this standard, included in the table below, must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.*

Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P12 partners, program completers, graduates’ employers), direct measures of performance in program- appropriate field/clinical setting.

**Does the evidence address each aspect of the standard?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects of Standard 1**  | Evidence of quality or capacity  | Negative evidence/gap/? |
| Content knowledge relevant to credentialPedagogical knowledge relevant to credentialProfessional knowledge relevant to credential | PraxisQuality of experiencesAlignment of curriculum |  |
| Learners, learning theory (including social, emotional, academic); application of learning theory in practice | Internship |  |
| Culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning | INSPIRE, course mapping, content of experiences |  |
| Assessment of /for learning, assessment; data literacy; use of data to inform practice; formative assessment | Courses? | Are any course or assignment grades or ratings relevant here? |
| Creation and development of positive learning and work environments | INSPIRE and inferred from experiences |  |
| Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice | Screened in the interview | Are they also part of the evaluation in internship? |

**Comments specific to text or tables**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Standard 1 Inspire scores | There isn’t much commentary, and in general “less is more” in these things. But it looks like, one, sometimes two, out of 16 respondents gave pretty low ratings. These don’t detract from the main story of strength, but do the occasional low ratings give the faculty pause? Do you have a theory, or do the scores indicate either an area for strengthening the program or possibly inconsistencies in field placement experiences? I guess I’m wondering why the writer wasn’t wondering why the few low scores were there (again, not to make that the main part of the story. But it is a SMALL part of the story.Also, from looking at the USU data from INSPIRE and the national aggregate, I can see that some comparisons could be made. A table looking at USU’s data over the three available years against the aggregate for the year for which aggregate is available would be useful. The comparisons may contain useful information in trends and on relative standing. In addition, such a longitudinal look at the data, along with comparison to a national benchmark, would address Standards 3 and 4. |
| Rating of internship EXPERIENCES | From this: “Mentors and the University Supervisor rate the candidates’ field experience for each of the UEL Standards (3 individual ratings) based on whether the candidate’s experience was 1) Unacceptable, 2) Weak, 3) Competent, 4) Good, or 5) Strong. A rating of three or higher indicates the candidate had an acceptable experience applying what they have learned for each of the UEL Standards. “ So the experience is rated—what about the actual performance? Is candidate performance in the internship rated? |
| Focus Group comments | “The missing special ed law class for administrators is noticeable. “(from focus group). Thoughts about addressing this? |
| Not needed for Instructional Leadership: AAQEP Data Matrix Categories Pedagogical knowledge relevant to credential (Agree)Impact of language acquisition/literacy on learning (Question – see below under clarification questions) | To the extent that literacy is a priority in schools, and to the extent that second language learners (EL s) are a part of the Utah student population, it would seem that knowledge of and ability to support teachers in instructing ELs and in supporting literacy development would be important. The INSPIRE give you some related (you have to extrapolate) evidence on this. What do you think? |

**Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth**

*Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.*

Program completers engage in professional practice in educational settings and show that they have the skills and abilities to do so in a variety of *additional* settings and community/cultural contexts. For example, candidates must have broad and general knowledge of the impact of culture and language on learning, yet they cannot, within the context of any given program, experience working with the entire diversity of student identities, or in all types of school environments. Candidate preparation includes first-hand professional experience accompanied by reflection that prepares candidates to engage effectively in different contexts they may encounter throughout their careers. Evidence shows that completers:

*All six aspects of this standard, included in the table below, must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.*

Evidence for this standard will show both that program completers have engaged successfully in relevant professional practice and that they are equipped with strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of school placements & educational settings appropriate to the credential or degree sought.

**Does the evidence address each aspect of the standard?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects of Standard 2** | Evidence of quality or capacity  | Negative evidence or gap |
| Understand and engage local school and cultural communities; communicate and foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers | Contacts with local districts, focus group discussions elicit local needs |  |
| Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and engage in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts | INSPIRE data; not as much detail in focus group summary? |  |
| Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts | INSPIRE and focus group summary |  |
| Support students' growth in international and global perspectives | Mission: We acknowledge and appreciate the complex contexts that shape our work, and we are committed to furthering the cause of equitable educational opportunity for all students. We aim to prepare students for informed and influential participation in local and global communities. |  |
| Establish goals for their own professional growth; engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their practice |  | Did I miss this in the INSPIRE? Is there an evidence source on this? |
| Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning | Response is “very positive” in the focus group report. No detail provided. Was more said? | Is collaboration required in courses? |

**Standard 3: Quality Program Practices**

*The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet standards 1 and 2.*

Preparation programs ensure that candidates, upon completion, are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. Effective program practices include: consistent offering of coherent curricula; high quality, diverse clinical experiences; dynamic, mutually-beneficial partnerships with stakeholders; and comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Each aspect of the program is appropriate to its context and to the credential or degree sought. Evidence shows the program:

*All six aspects of this standard, included in the table below, must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.*

Evidence related to this standard will include documentation of program practices and resources as well as the program’s rationale for its structure and operation.

**Does the evidence address each aspect of the standard?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects of Standard 3**  | Evidence of quality or capacity  | Negative evidence or gap |
| Offers coherent curricula with clear expectations that are aligned with state and national standards, as applicable | Clearly documented |  |
| Develops and implements quality clinical experiences, where appropriate, in the context of documented and effective partnerships with P12 schools and districts | Lots of detail on this |  |
| Engages multiple stakeholders, including completers, local educators, schools and districts, in data collection, analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation | In the past the program was concerned that the internships experienced by our students were not as consistent as they might be as they were dependent on the skill and commitment of the mentor principal. The Internship experiences list was developed with collaboration from a group of School Superintendents to ensure that the students were having a consistent experience.  |  |
| Enacts admission and monitoring processes linked to candidate success as part of a quality assurance system aligned to state requirements and professional standards | Clear about the admissions process, less about monitoring (my hunch is nobody drops out, and outcomes of completers are good. I may have missed retention numbers, but adding that would be helpful |  |
| Engages in continuous improvement of programs and program components, and investigates opportunities for innovation, through an effective quality assurance system | “The core Instructional Leadership faculty group consists of five full-time faculty supplemented with a small group of adjunct faculty with credentials specific to the courses they teach (School Law, School Finance and Resource Management). The core faculty meets together 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 In the past the program was concerned that the internships experienced by our students were not as consistent as they might be as they were dependent on the skill and commitment of the mentor principal. The Internship experiences list was developed with collaboration from a group of School Superintendents to ensure that the students were having a consistent experience. “ |  |
| Maintains capacity for quality reflected in staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment | Four highly qualified practitioners teach courses in the program as adjunct faculty in their areas of specialization. Nice touches on the evidence on faculty. | Is there information on fiscal resources and any comparison to other programs on campus? |

**Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement**

*Program practices strengthen the P20 education system in light of local needs, in keeping with the program’s mission.*

The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P20 education system. Each program’s context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field’s shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation support the field’s collective effort to address education’s most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation. The program provides evidencethat it:

*All six aspects of this standard, included in the table below, must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.*

Evidence for this standard addresses identified issues in light of local and institutional context.

**Does the evidence address each aspect of the standard?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects of Standard 4** | Evidence of quality or capacity  | Negative evidence or gap |
| Engages with local partners and stakeholders to support high-needs schools and participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes | Mission: We acknowledge and appreciate the complex contexts that shape our work, and we are committed to furthering the cause of equitable educational opportunity for all students. We aim to prepare students for informed and influential participation in local and global communities.  |  |
| Seeks to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support | The program has been known for increasing access to administrative licensure throughout Utah by the use of distance education technologies. Summer courses are offered in a Hybrid model over seven weeks, including one week at the USU Brigham City Campus meeting four hours each day. The remaining six weeks provide online interaction and WebEx course meetings. The summer program has remained popular because of the cohort feel that the students gain from meeting in a common location.  |  |
| Supports completer entry into and/or continuation in their professional role, as appropriate to the credential or degree being earned | Focus group data positive |  |
| Investigates available, trustworthy evidence regarding completer placement, effectiveness, & retention in the profession; uses that information to improve programs | Focus groups |  |
| Meets obligations and mandates established by the state, states, or jurisdiction within which it operates | State standards met! |  |
| Investigates its own effectiveness relative to its institutional and/or programmatic mission and commitments | Clearly mission focused. |  |