AAQEP Accreditation Self-Study

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
MED IN INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISORY CONCENTRATION
PROGRAMS

Prepared by Courtney Stewart, Assistant Professor, Instructional Leadership
Alyson Lavigne, Assistant Professor, Instructional Leadership
Greg Lewis, Clinical Assistant Professor, Instructional Leadership
Susan Turner, Clincial Assistant Professor, Instructional Leadership
Amanda Taggart, Assistant Professor, Instructional Leadership
Michael Freeman, Associate Professor, Instructional Leadership (retired)
Krista Terrell, Graduate Program Coordinator (Previous)
Lori Hyde, Graduate Program Coordinator (Current)

FINAL SUBMISSION November 1, 2018

Introduction and Overview

Utah State University is Utah's land-grant and space grant institution. Its Carnegie classification is RU/H, a research university with high research activity.

President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Act on July 2, 1862, opening the way for the establishment of a new college in each state and territory. The intent of the Morrill Act in creating these new schools was to provide opportunities for higher education and practical learning to the people in each state, especially those in more rural areas. Nearly twenty-six years later, on March 8, 1888, the Utah State Legislature passed the Lund Bill, and the Agricultural College of Utah (UAC) was created. In the spirit of the Land Grant Act, the Lund Bill stated: "The leading object of the Agricultural College of Utah shall be to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, and such other scientific and classified studies as shall promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits of the professions of life." Conspicuously absent from the legislative language was the authorization of a teacher preparation curriculum, which was to remain part of the mission of the University of Utah in Salt Lake City.

As Utah grew in population and the need for school teachers increased, the Utah State Legislature authorized the Agricultural College of Utah in 1921 to offer rural related teacher education programs under its own name. A new Department of Education was established at the Agricultural College of Utah and became part of the School of General Science. In 1923, the National Summer School was founded at ACU, bringing in Knute Rockne, Frederick Jackson Turner, and other distinguished faculty from Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, and elsewhere. For the next three consecutive summers, farmers, educators, and their families flocked to Logan to learn from the visiting scholars. Many of them lived in a tent city located in the grove of trees east of the quad. The sessions of this educational experiment were remarkably successful. Over thirteen hundred students were enrolled in the first session, coming from twenty-four states and five foreign countries. The 1925 Summer School was even more impressive and brought distinguished scholars like Columbia University's William H. Kilpatrick, John Dewey's associate and interpreter of his philosophy, to instruct the attendees. Finally, on March 8, 1927, Utah's Governor George H. Dern signed Utah's Course of Study Bill (Senate Bill No. 97), which authorized the College to "give courses for the preparation of teachers . . . such as to meet the certification requirements of the State Board of Education." The new School of Education was assigned to the College of Arts and Sciences. The following year, the newly launched School of Education established a teacher training school, which is now known as the Edith Bowen Laboratory School. The new School of Education was made independent of the School of Arts and Sciences in 1932 with the naming of Dr. E.A. Jacobsen as its first full time Dean. In 1957, Utah's Agricultural College became Utah State University and the School of Education became the College of Education.

On April 23, 2008, Utah State University announced it was naming its prestigious college of education the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services in honor of a $25 million gift from the Emma Eccles Jones Foundation. The gift made possible the design and construction of a new building, the Emma Eccles Jones Center for Early Childhood Education, and five endowed chairs in early childhood education.

Regional Campuses

In keeping with the original land-grant mission of providing educational opportunities for people living in rural and remote areas of the state, and consistent with the early efforts of the National Summer School of the 1920's, Utah State University's Regional Campuses currently 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 the Emma Eccles Jones College of

Education and Human Services's reach to provide higher education to students throughout Utah and around the world. Through distance education, Utah State University has the ability to deliver classes via interactive broadcast to every county in Utah. Great effort is taken to ensure that the quality of the regional campus courses is equivalent to the courses offered on the main campus. We are one university, geographically dispersed. Students can enroll in programs at all of the regional campuses, which are located in Brigham City, Uintah Basin, and Tooele. There are additional smaller sites where students can take classes in selected programs. A complete map of USU's regional campuses can be viewed here: regionalcampuses.usu.edu. Not every program is available at every campus due to Board of Regents policy (R315) that regulates service areas for all of the public institutions of higher education in Utah: higheredutah.org

Profile of the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services

The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services 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.

The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services is the largest college at Utah State University with 5,773 students (2017-18). The College is comprised of seven departments: Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education, Human Development and Family Studies, Kinesiology and Health Science, Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences, Psychology, the School of Teacher Education and Leadership, and Special Education and Rehabilitation.

The College is also home to the following: the Emma Eccles Jones Center for Early Childhood Education; the Center for Persons with Disabilities; the Sorensen Legacy Foundation Center for Clinical Excellence; the National Center for Hearing Assessment and Management; the Dolores Dore Eccles Center for Early Care and Education; the Edith Bowen Laboratory School; and the Sound Beginnings Program (for children with cochlear implants or digital hearing aids).

Honors for the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services

U.S. News and World Report magazine has ranked the graduate programs in the university's Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services among the top tier of colleges of education in the nation—the only such program in the Intermountain West and Desert Southwest to achieve and maintain this distinction. In 2017, the magazine ranked the college 26th in the nation overall against all graduate colleges of education, and the college ranked 6th in the nation in total research dollars. The College's dean, Beth Foley, has said: "The amount and scope of the research we do only aids in our ongoing commitment to be pioneers in education. Potential educators and students looking to learn from and work with some of the nation's best now know the Emma Eccles Jones College is a leader when it comes to producing quality teachers and offering innovative research opportunities." The *U.S. News and World Report* bases its rankings on a weighted average of 11 quality measures, including peer assessments, faculty resources, faculty awards and GRE scores for doctoral students.

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

The School of Teacher Education and Leadership (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. Students access these programs on-campus or through distance delivery via online and interactive video conferencing technology. The department's website is teal.usu.edu.

The mission statement for the School of Teacher Education and Leadership details the program faculty's commitment to research, teaching, leadership, and service:

- As a unit within the land grant institution of Utah State University, we are part of one university, geographically dispersed. 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.
- The mission of the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (TEAL) is to inspire and prepare reflective and effective educators, scholars, and leaders through student-focused learning experiences; diverse knowledge and thought; school, community, and global engagement; and research and innovation that inform practice.

Program Overview

For many years the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services has offered a program for the preparation of school leaders. In 1972 the Board of Regents discontinued the PhD 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 Deans Office and was directed by the Associate Dean for Extension. In 2004, that title was changed to Associate Dean for Continuing Education, and in 2007 to Associate Dean for Education Outreach. With the creation of the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (TEAL) in 2008, the program found a logical academic home, and became part of TEAL. July 1, 2011 the Associate Dean for Education Outreach (Extension) position was eliminated and the program director, coordinator and staff assistant were moved from the Dean's Office to the School of Teacher Education and Leadership. The program is now part of the School of TEAL, a School within the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services.

In Fall Semester 2010 The School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University was authorized to offer a specialization in instructional leadership within the existing M.Ed. programs in elementary education and secondary education. Effective Fall Semester 2011, the program received approval to become a Master of Education Degree in Instructional Leadership, standing separate from the existing M.Ed. programs in Curriculum and Instruction. The program also continues to offer the ASC (licensure only) option for students who already hold a Master's degree from an accredited university.

Distinguishing Features of the Instructional Leadership Program

1. The program has been known for increasing access to administrative licensure throughout Utah by the use of distance education technologies. Over its history, courses have been delivered using a variety of delivery systems and formats, including both audio and video components, carried over phone lines, satellite, and the Internet. Currently, courses are delivered during Fall and Spring Semesters using the Canvas course management system, and WebEx, an interactive internet-based videoconferencing system, allowing students to participate in course meetings wherever they have access to a high-speed internet connection. The system provides full audio and video interaction and access to instructional materials and presentation software.

2. 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. Because of the intensity of the compressed time frame, students are limited to four courses during the Summer Session.
3. The internship element of the program consists 450 hours of applied internship as outlined in the rules of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE). This link, http://www.teal.usu.edu/graduate/instructional-leadership/internships provides the USBE Internship rules and the tools used to document the internship experiences. The internship experience culminates with a 2 credit hour internship seminar (TEAL 6930) during which students meet to share experiences and insights from the internships, and complete reflective assignments to bring the experience to a logical conclusion.
4. Students are able to complete the program at their own pace with limited sequencing of coursework, and flexibility in selecting the location and timing of the internship experience.
5. 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. Minutes and agendas of selected meetings can be viewed at this link: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

The program has two strands. 1) The Administrative/Supervisory Concentration program. This is a licensure only program consisting of 30 credits of coursework. It assumes that the student holds a Master's Degree prior to admission (Required for Utah Administrative Licensure), and 2) The MEd in Instructional Leadership consisting of 42 credits and including set of courses addressing a curriculum and instruction core. The Planning Guides are provided below:

Utah State University
Instructional Leadership: Administrative License for School Leaders
Program Outline

Course	Course Title	Credit	Grade	Completion Date
TEAL 6080[1]	Leadership and the School Principal	3		
EDUC 6540	Data-Based Decision Making for School Leaders	3		
TEAL 6945[1]	Supervision and Administrative Internship	3		
TEAL 6050[2]	Theories of Instructional Supervision	3		
TEAL 6500	School Finance and Resource Management	3		
TEAL 6090	Theories of Organizational Leadership in Education	3		
TEAL 6280	Instructional Practices for Diverse Learners	3		
TEAL 6060[2]	Assessment for Curricular Accountability	3		
TEAL 6740	School Law	3		
TEAL 6940	Supervision and Administrative Internship	1		
TEAL 6930[3]	Supervision and Administrative Internship with Seminar	2		
Total Credit		30		

First Semester Courses	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Final Semester Courses

Notes:
1. TEAL 6080 and 6945 must be taken during the student's <u>first</u> semester.
2. TEAL 6930 and TEAL 6940 must be taken during the student's <u>final</u> semester in the program.
3. Students may take <u>UP TO four courses per semester</u>; 6930, 6940, and 6945 do NOT count as one of the four.

Leadership Core	Course Title	Credit	Grade	Completion Date
TEAL 6080[1]	Leadership and the School Principal	3		
TEAL 6540	Data-Based Decision Making for School Leaders	3		
TEAL 6945[1,3]	Supervision and Administrative Internship	3		
TEAL 6050	Theories of Instructional Supervision	3		
TEAL 6500	School Finance and Resource Management	3		
TEAL 6090	Theories of Organizational Leadership in Education	3		
TEAL 6280	Instructional Practices for Diverse Learners	3		
TEAL 6060	Assessment for Curricular Accountability	3		
TEAL 6740	School Law	3		
TEAL 6940[2,3]	Supervision and Administrative Internship	1		
TEAL 6930[2,3]	Supervision and Administrative Internship with Seminar	2		
Curriculum and Instruction Core[4] (Only for students getting the master's degree with the license.)				
TEAL 6410	Educational Foundations	3		
TEAL 6150	Foundations of Curriculum	3		
TEAL 6190	Theories of Learning and Models of Teaching	3		
TEAL 6710	Diversity in Education	3		
	Total Credit	42		

Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Suggested: Courses taken same semester	Final Semester Courses

Notes:

1. TEAL 6080 and 6945 must be taken during the student's first semester.
2. TEAL 6930 and TEAL 6940 must be taken during the student's final semester in the program.
3. Students may take UP TO four courses per semester; 6930, 6940, and 6945 do NOT count as one of the four.
4. Master's Degree students are encouraged to complete the courses in the Curriculum and Instruction Core before the majority of the other program courses, with the exception of TEAL 6080 (see note 1).

Program Logic, Rationale and Standards Alignment

Alignment of Curriculum with the Utah Education Leadership Standards (UEL). The coursework is designed to address the standards. The Faculty regularly evaluates the curriculum to determine alignment of the curriculum to the standards. The Praxis test for Administration and Leadership (5411) provides a subscale score that aligns with each standard. (A description of the subscale score alignments is included below – see p.9).

Utah State University, The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services, and The School of Teacher Education and Leadership each follow strict program and course approval systems to ensure quality and appropriate oversight of academic programs and courses. This system requires review by:

1. The Council on Teacher Education. Based on that review, the Utah State Board of Education accepts the recommendation of USU in granting the administrative/supervisory licensure concentration.

2. The admission process follows the requirements of the School of Graduate Studies and includes a rigorous telephone interview to ensure quality students.

The USBE has recently approved (May 2018) an updated set of standards for leadership programs (updated standards are available at the following link: https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/29459c6e-a0b5-4367-b767-a32a04bb8a2d), and a formal approval process for institutions offering the Administrative/Supervisory licensure Concentration. Dr. Lavigne, Dr. Stewart, and Dr. Lewis are representing USU on committees responsible for developing state standards for instructional leadership programs.

Summary

In order to ensure that our students meet these requirements, we have established:

1. A strong admissions process that assesses candidates potential as school leaders,
2. Coursework that is tied to the UEL standards,
3. Assessment in course grades and with a passing score on the Praxis exam,
4. Internship documentation that ensures that students experience application of the principles covered in coursework,
5. A post-completion survey that provides an opportunity for student feedback,
6. Focus groups with selected superintendents and curriculum directors from school districts that employ our graduates.

Self-study Overview

A team of four members of the Instructional Leadership Graduate program faculty and authored the written self-study report. The USU Instructional Leadership program is committed to ongoing data collection as part of its internal quality assurance process. The program utilizes a multi-method, multi-source approach to collect data for program monitoring and improvement. The data are primarily drawn from the following six sources.

1. Praxis Test Scores
   a. Subscale scores for each UEL Standard

The Praxis exam is a nationally accepted measure of content knowledge in the area of administration and leadership. The exam provides subscale scores that in six areas that align with the ISSLC Standards. In this case, the Utah Education Leadership Standards are derived directly from the ISSLC Standards, allowing the subscale scores to support the students understanding of each UEL Standard. The subscale scores effectively connect this content knowledge to each of the UEL Standards. While ETS does not provide norming data for these scores (see an example here: https://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/uyps_1415.pdf), we observe encouraging consistency across the scoring for the standard subscales. Information about the exam can be located at this link: https://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/5411.pdf

2. Standards Based Curriculum Matrix

We have periodically examined our curriculum through the lens of the UEL Standards to determine how our courses align with the standards. The table outlining the alignment of our courses with the UEL Standards is here:

Educational Leaders...	TEAL 6090 Theories of Organizational Leadership	TEAL 6080 Leadership and the School Principal	TEAL 6500 School Finance and Resource Management	TEAL 6280 Instructional Practices for Diverse Learners	TEAL 6740 School Law	TEAL 6060 Assessment for Curricular Accountability	TEAL 6050 Theories of Instructional Supervision	TEAL 6540 Data-based Decision Making
1A. establish high and measurable expectations for all students and educators.	Minor	Major	Not Included	Minor	Minor	Not Included	Minor	Major
1B. facilitate a process of creating a shared vision, mission, and goals.	Minor	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Not Included	Minor	Major
1C. sustain strong organizational commitment to vision, mission and goals aimed at continuous improvement.	Major	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Not Included	Minor	Major
2A. ensure strong professional cultures that support teaching and learning.	Not Included	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Major	Major	Minor
2B. require all educators to know and use Utah Core Curriculum, and current Utah Effective Teaching Standards.	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Minor	Major	Major	Major
2C. implement appropriate systems of assessment and accountability	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Minor	Minor	Major	Minor	Major
3A. distribute responsibilities and supervise ongoing management structures and practices to enhance teaching and learning.	Major	Minor	Minor	Minor	Major	Major	Major	Minor
3B. strategically allocate and align human, fiscal, technological, and physical resources.	Major	Minor	Major	Not Included	Major	Not Included	Minor	Minor
3C. protect the well-being and safety of students and staff.	Major	Not Included	Not Included	Minor	Major	Not Included	Major	Major

Standard								
4A. collaborate with families and diverse community stakeholders to extend programs, services, and outreach.	Not Included	Not Included	Minor	Major	Minor	Not Included	Minor	Minor
4B. respond and contribute to community interests and needs	Not Included	Major	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor
4C. maximize shared school and community resources to provide essential services for students and families.	Not Included	Not Included	Major	Minor	Major	Not Included	Minor	Minor
5A. demonstrate appropriate, ethical, and legal behavior expected by the profession.	Major	Minor	Major	Not Included	Major	Not Included	Minor	Minor
5B. examine personal assumptions, values, beliefs, cultural competencies, and practices in service of a shared vision, mission, and goals for student learning.	Major	Major	Minor	Major	Major	Minor	Major	Minor
5C. perform the work required for high levels of personal effective leadership performance, including acquiring new capacities needed to fulfill responsibilities.	Major	Major	Minor	Minor	Major	Minor	Major	Major
6A. demonstrate active participation in the school's local community.	Not Included	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Not Included	Minor	Minor
6B. contribute to the larger arena of educational policy making.	Minor	Minor	Minor	Not Included	Major	Not Included	Minor	Minor
6C. increase the effectiveness of the school community's efforts to improve education.	Not Included	Not Included	Minor	Minor	Major	Not Included	Minor	Major

3. Internship Experiences List

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. USBE has used this

document as a model in the development of the new internship requirements adopted over the past two years (see pp. 18-25 for the Internship Experiences List and relevant data).

4. Final Internship Evaluation
   a. Section for each UEL Standard

The Final Internship Evaluation was developed by combining the reflective elements of the leadership portfolio used in past years and the Utah Education Leadership Standards. In addition to reflective comments from students for each standard, it provides assessments of the internship experience by the mentor principals and Internship supervisor, as well as a self-assessment. End of Internship Report

5. INSPIRE Survey

The INSPIRE Survey was developed by the University Council for Educational Administration. They have conducted reliability and validity testing, and the survey is quickly gaining acceptance nationally. Summaries of INSPIRE Surveys, and validity and reliability documentation are found here: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership. For USU, this survey is administred to all graduates who have or will be graduating in the previous calendar year. Students would have completed their program 6-12 months prior to taking the survey. The survey is administered in May.

6. Focus Groups with Superintendents and Curriculum Directors

The Program has conducted focus group meetings with a sample of Superintendents and Curriculum Directors from school districts with whom we work closely, and who have a history of employing our graduates. Notes and summaries from these meetings are available at the following link: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

Standard 1: Completer Performance

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.

Completer performance

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.	Content knowledge relevant to credential
	Pedagogical knowledge relevant to credential
	Professional knowledge relevant to credential
	Learners, learning theory (social, emotional, and academic)
	Application of learning theory in practice
	Culturally responsive practice (race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual identity)
	Impact of language acquisition/literacy on learning
	Assessment of and for learning, assessment and data literacy
	Use of data to inform practice and formatively in instruction

	Creation and development of positive learning and work Environments
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.	Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice

The evidence that the MEd in Instructional Leadership and Administrative/Supervisory Concentration programs meet the expectations of Standard 1 comes from several data sources and perspectives, including Scores on the Praxis Exam and Subscales, coursework alignment with standards, documentation of internship experiences, and focus group meetings with a sample of superintendents and curriculum directors from school districts who employ our graduates.

The basis of the data to support Standard 1 is organized around three primary categories drawn from the AAQEP Data Audit Framework. Since the program is focused on instructional leadership rather than teacher education, the organization of the data differs from other programs is significant ways.

The categories from the AAQEP Data matrix for Standard 1 are organized around the three categories as follows:

1) Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision,
    a. Praxis Scores
    b. Standards Based Curriculum Alignment Table

    AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
    Content knowledge relevant to credential
    Professional knowledge relevant to credential
    Learners, learning theory (social, emotional, and academic)
    Creation and development of positive learning and work environments

2) Application of content knowledge in practice,
    a. Internship Experiences List
    b. Final Internship Evaluation

    AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
    Application of learning theory in practice
    Assessment of and for learning, assessment and data literacy

3) Understand and engage with school culture and community,
    a. Focus Groups

    AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
    Culturally responsive practice (race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual identity)
    Use of data to inform practice and formatively in instruction

Not needed for Instructional Leadership:

> AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
> Pedagogical knowledge relevant to credential
> Impact of language acquisition/literacy on learning

Content Knowledge relative to administration and supervision

The program offers three sources of evidence to support the claim that our completers are prepared with appropriate knowledge in the area of content knowledge relative to administration and supervision.

1. Praxis scores (pp.14-15)
2. Standards-based curriculum matrix (p.10)

The first is their scores on the Praxis test 5411. The Praxis test has been adopted by USBE as a required exam for Utah administrative licensure. While ETS does not provide national norming data, the test is used nationally, and is widely accepted as a valid and useful measure of preparation for leadership in school settings. It is based on the UEL Standards, which are derived directly the ISLLC standards. ISLLC standards are also widely accepted as the national standard for education leadership preparation programs. Information on the test and our completers performance follows. While a new version of the standards is underdevelopment, the data we have collected is based on the version in sue during the past several years. The program will adopt the updated standards for future analysis.

Praxis Scores

Licensure Exam: In order to earn licensure in the state of Utah, completers seeking their Administrative/Supervisory K-12 licensure must pass the Praxis test version for hip: Administration and Supervision (5411). Completers must achieve a passing score of 151 to qualify for licensure.

This computer-delivered assessment is composed of 110 questions. According to ETS, the 110 selected-response questions are aligned with the *Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. The questions organize into six areas with the approximate number of questions and percentage/weight in final score is provided in Table 1 below pages 14 and 15 (ETS, 2017).

Table 1. Praxis 5411 content categories, number of questions, and percentage of examination

Content Area	Approx. Number of Questions	Approx. Percentage of Examination
Vision and Goals (I)	21	19%
Teaching and Learning (II)	28	25%
Managing Organizational Systems and Safety (III)	15	14%
Collaborating with Key Stakeholders (IV)	14	13%
Ethics and Integrity (V)	18	16%
The Education System (VI)	14	13%

USU Praxis 5411 Data

Utah State University has access to completers' sub-scores for each of the categories, however, passing the Praxis 5411 is determined by the total score (candidates are not required to meet a passing score for each category). Table 2 includes averages, ranges, and standard deviations for candidates (*N* = 174) who took the Praxis 5411 between Spring of 2015 and Spring of 2018. Data are missing for three completers.

Table 2. Praxis 5411 scores from Spring 2015 – Spring 2018

Category	Mean	SD	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
Vision and Goals (I)	13.91	1.92	9	18
Teaching and Learning (II)	18.59	2.21	13	24
Managing Organizational Systems and Safety (III)	9.18	1.54	5	13
Collaborating with Key Stakeholders (IV)	8.26	1.74	4	12
Ethics and Integrity (V)	11.95	2.09	7	17
The Education System (VI)	8.93	1.51	3	12
TOTAL Score	170.16	10.41	149	198
Passing Rate	99%			

References

Educational Testing Service (2017). The Praxis Study Companion. Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/5411.pdf

Standards-based Curriculum Alignment

The second source is our own standard alignment document produced by our faculty. See the table provided on p. 10–11. This document has been created on a recurring basis over several years to ensure alignment of coursework with the standards. Curricular changes have been made periodically in response to the data provided by this document.

The table is created by the faculty member with primary responsibility for each content course analyzing their own syllabus in relation to each standard and substandard. This provides evidence that:

1. The faculty are attentive to the standards and makes an effort to ensure that each standard and substandard is represented in our courses.
2. The courses are designed around the standards.

Dark Green indicates that the standard is addressed as a major element of the course. Light Green indicates that the standard is addressed as a minor element of the course. White indicates that the standard is not addressed in the course.

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge: Data interpretation

Data from Table 2 (p. 15) indicates that on average, our candidates' performance on the Praxis 5411 far exceeds the adequate or satisfactory standards set by the state of Utah as evidenced by an average performance of 170.16 relative to the passing score of 151. Out of all completers who took the exam between Spring 2015 to Spring 2018, only one completer failed and performed just under the passing score of 151 with a score of 149. All other completers passed the exam on their initial attempt. Collectively the passing rates for this time period was 99% and nearly half (46%, n = 52) of our completers exceeded the passing score of 151 by 20 or more points suggesting that completers possess a strong, if not exceptional, command of the content area knowledge required to be successful school leaders.

Our analysis of the data presented in the curriculum alignment matrix (p. 10-11) suggests that all standards except one are adequately represented throughout the program curriculum. Standard 6A is not represented as a major element of any of the courses. This will lead to a discussion in future faculty meetings as a program improvement effort.

Application of content knowledge in practice

Evidence of completer ability to apply content knowledge in practice is found in the internship element of the program. The program offers a comprehensive internship program meeting the standards set by the USBE under Board Rule: R-277-505. This provides an opportunity for students to demonstrate their ability to apply content knowledge from the program in school-based situations.

The following link outlines the program internship requirements and provides forms for documenting internship experiences. http://www.teal.usu.edu/graduate/instructional-leadership/internships

The following documents are offered as evidence of application of content knowledge in practice:

1. Internship Experiences List p.17-24
2. Final Internship Evaluation p.26

The **Internship Experiences List (**Internship Experiences**)** was developed to provide consistency in internship experiences with less dependence on the mentor principal for the quality of the experience. Prior to the use of this document (Fall, 2016), interns were at the mercy of the assignments given by the mentor principal with little consistency. Since mentor principals are not paid by the program for their work, and are selected by the student or the student's employer, the interns sometimes found themselves assigned to tasks the mentor principal needed done without regard for the quality of the internship experience. Utilizing this form encourages consistency by providing a list of forty potential internship experiences in three categories.

1. Experiences required by USBE Rule (highlighted in yellow)
2. Experiences embedded in program coursework (green highlight)
3. Experiences that would be useful, but are not required (not highlighted)

Internship Experiences USU – Instructional Leadership Experiences	Average Number of Hours Per Completer	% of Completers Participating in Activity

1. Data assessment (school level)
   a. Best: make a presentation to a group outside of the school (school board, PTA/PTO, civic club, etc.) about the data, the implications derived from the data, and the school's plan based upon the data
   b. Better: make a presentation to the faculty or subgroup of the faculty about the data and implications for school personnel actions
   c. Good: help analyze assessment data from common formative assessments, summative assessments, standardized assessments, and interim or benchmark assessments.
	8.19	100%

2. Data assessment (classroom level) a. With a teacher, examine student learning data from formative, summative, and standardized assessments, and analyze the data for median performance and demographic characteristics of students.	7.47	100%
3. Data management systems a. Study and/or evaluate a school-wide or district-wide data management system	6.75	88%
4. Action research project a. Best: participate in the administrative discussions utilizing the data and report on the decision(s) made because of the action research project information	11.13	75%

b. Better: complete the action research project as designed c. Good: design an action research project to collect data for the specific purpose of informing an administrative decision confronting the school		

5. Teacher evaluation (filled by assignment TEAL 6050)
    a. Best: conduct two teacher evaluations or accompany the principal as he or she conducts at least two teacher evaluations
    b. Good: review the instrument with the administrator; sit with at least two teachers and review the teacher's process for self-assessment; sit with the administrator and review the administrator's process for determining a teacher's evaluation report and score, and completing the requirements to evaluate teachers
	10.9	100%

6. Classified evaluation (filled by assignment TEAL 6050)
    a. Best: conduct an evaluation of a classified employee or accompany the principal as he or she conducts the evaluation of a classified employee
    b. Good: review the instrument with the administrator; sit with a classified employee and review the employee's self-assessment; sit with the administrator and review the administrator's assessment of the employee and how he or she completes the requirement to evaluate the employee
	3.5	88%

7. Administrator evaluation
    a. Best: complete the administrator evaluation process with a supervisor from the district office
    b. Better: review the self-assessment with the mentor principal as if the mentor was the administrator evaluator from the district
    c. Good: complete the administrator evaluation self assessment
	0	0%

8. Professional development (filled by assignment TEAL 6050) a. Plan or participate in the planning, organizing, conducting, and evaluating the effectiveness of a professional development activity for the staff	12.31	100%
9. Learning community (PLC) (filled by assignment TEAL 6050) a. Participate in multiple meetings of more than one school-based learning team in the school	13.56	100%
10. School improvement plan (SIP) a. Best: participate in the annual development and evaluation of the SIP	5.94	100%

b. Better: compare the SIP with the LAND Trust plans, and the similarities and differences in focus, requirements, and involvement. c. Good: review the process undertaken to develop the SIP and its annual evaluation		
11. School LAND Trust plan a. Best: participate in the annual development and evaluation of the LAND Trust plan b. Better: compare the LAND Trust Plan with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) c. Good: review the process undertaken to develop the LAND Trust plan and its annual evaluation	4.19	100%
12. Classroom observation for a minimum of 3 separate teachers (filled by assignment TEAL 6050) a. Better: accompany the principal during classroom observations and walk-throughs b. Good: review the process used by the principal to conduct a classroom observation or walk through for each of 3 teachers, including scheduling, recording observations, communicating with the teacher, and using any technological assistance during the walk through	15.38	100%
13. IEP meeting a. Best: participate in an IEP as the LEA representative b. Better: attend multiple IEP meetings and observe the administrator's role and responsibility as LEA representative	7.56	100%
14. 504 meeting a. Better: participate in a 504 plan meeting as the LEA to determine accessibility needs for a student b. Good: attend a 504 plan meeting and observe the administrator's role and responsibility as LEA representative	2.75	88%
15. Access to learning a. Best: meet with parents and teachers to address issues related to student attendance b. Better: follow up with students having excessive absences or tardiness c. Good: review carefully with the school administrator and any appropriate support personnel (attendance secretary, counselor, school resource officer, etc.) the process and procedures for identifying truants, communicating with the student and his or her parents, involvement of non-school personnel and agencies, documenting efforts, and consequences incurred	2.63	88%

16. School culture (filled by assignment in TEAL 6080) a. Complete an analysis of the culture of a school	15	100%

17. Substitute teachers
    a.   Best: develop a substitute teacher packet
    b.   Good: solicit (or thoroughly understand how substitutes are obtained), meet, greet, help, and supervise substitute teachers
	.81	38%

18. Curriculum
    a.   Best: include examination and review of student learning objectives in tested and non-tested subjects
    b.   Better: with a school-wide learning team, review the core curricula, common formative assessments, and summative assessments aligned with math, literacy, and science for all grade level(s) within the school
    c.   Good: with a learning team within the school, review the core curricula, common formative assessments, and summative assessments aligned with math, literacy, and science for the grade level(s) with which the learning team is concerned
	3.13	75%

19. Class scheduling
    a.   Participate in the building of the master schedule (secondary) or the assignment of students to teachers (elementary)
    b.   Participate in the handling of student and parent requests for specific teachers
	5.06	63%

20. Mentoring
    a.   Interview and observe a principal or assistant principal perform the role of mentor in at least two of the following areas:
        i.   mentoring a beginning teacher
       ii.   mentoring a mid-career or veteran teacher
      iii.   mentoring an instructional team (grade level or department)
      iv.   mentoring a school leadership team such as a community council or faculty/staff leadership committee
	4.06	83%

USU – Management Experiences		
21. Building usage scheduling a. Pick a community activity and follow the process to schedule, supervise, and account for the use of the building	.75	25%
22. SCC meeting a. Best: participate in the SCC meeting where the School LAND Trust money and the School Improvement Plan are addressed	4.00	100%

b. **Better:** attend the SCC meetings where the School LAND Trust and School Improvement Plans are reviewed, approved, amended, and/or developed c. **Good:** attend an SCC meeting and review the principal's involvement with developing the SCC agenda, soliciting members or candidates to run for election to the SCC, distribution of announcements for SCC meetings and minutes of meetings held, and scheduling SCC meetings		

23. School board meeting
  a. Best: attend a meeting where an item of specific importance to the school is discussed, and address the school board on that topic
  b. Better: attend multiple meetings of the local school board
  c. Good: attend one meeting of the local school board
	16.25	63%

24. Student discipline
  a. **Best:** personally handle multiple cases of student discipline referred to the office for more than one type of misconduct
  b. **Better:** observe the principal handle at least one case of student discipline necessitating the involvement of parents in a meeting with the student and one or more teachers
  c. **Good:** observe the principal handle several cases of student discipline for more than one type of misconduct confined to individuals within the school, i.e. parents were not required to attend a meeting with school personnel
	16.56	100%

25. Extracurricular activities
  a. **Best:** arrange for transportation of students (bussing) to an activity and chaperone students during the travel to and from, and during the activity
  b. **Good:** Supervise a variety of after school activities: games, dances, concerts, plays, fundraising activities, fieldtrips, etc.; and monitor or trace the process for collecting fees and gate receipts, and the appropriate expenditure of those funds once collected
	48.00	100%

26. Hiring a. Participate in the school's screening process, including interviews and the notification of successful and unsuccessful applicants	13.19	100%

27. Budget management
  a. Review the school budget
  b. Understand the procurement process: requisition, purchase order, invoice, payment, and accounting
	6.65	88%

c. Review the requirements for bidding		

28. Building management
    a.   Participate in building inspections: halls, classrooms, parking lots, gyms, restrooms, cafeterias, media centers, playing fields
    b.   Participate in administrator meetings with the head custodian
    c.   Participate in the process for opening and securing the building
	61.25	100%

29. Student management a. Supervise students before and after school, in a variety of places around the school: hallways, other common areas of the school, during lunch, during recess, during assemblies, etc.	52.66	100%

30. Paraprofessionals/aides
    a.   Best: participate in the selection and supervision of paraprofessionals or aides
    b.   Good: participate in, or review carefully, the process to determine the number and types of paraprofessionals or aides to be employed in the school
	1.13	38%

31. Emergency response
    a.   Best: conduct one of the emergency drills (fire, earthquake, or intruder) including the evaluation of its success and need for improvement
    b.   Good: review the annual calendar of emergency response drills and how it was developed and scheduled
	2.41	88%

32. Communication with community
    a.   Best: represent the school and make one or more presentation(s) to a community group outside of the school, e.g. civic club, business partner, church group, etc.
    b.   Good: help prepare newsletters or other documents to be sent from the school
	3.69	50%

33. Community awareness
    a.   Best: participate in the work of amending or revising the child access routing plan
    b.   Better: review the child access routing plan (elementary, middle, and junior high schools), noting designated routes students should travel to the school
    c.   Good: tour the school attendance area and note the demographics of neighborhoods, businesses that might partner with the school, and any unique challenges or benefits to the school because of the neighborhood and location of the school
	1.50	38%

34. Student meetings a. Attend various student meetings: clubs, student council, teams	3.44	50%
35. Parent and community meetings a. Attend various parent meetings: PTA/PTO, Booster Club, Back-to-School, open house, orientation	5.56	75%

36. School resource officer (SRO)
    a. Best: shadow the SRO
    b. Good: review the duties of the SRO with the officer
	1.38	38%

37. Strategic planning
    a. Work directly with a practicing administrator to develop strategic objectives and strategies that relate directly to the mission and vision statements and are measurable.
    b. Meet with parents, teachers and other stakeholder groups to identify and clarify current issues influencing enrollment patterns and staffing needs.
    c. Examine data on achievement, behavior and other school indicators to identify current issues.
    d. Include a five year staffing plan that recognizes hiring and professional development needs to support the strategic plan.
	10.00	50%

38. Funding Proposal
    a. Best: identify a grant opportunity, create and direct a grant writing team and follow through with the submission of a proposal. Grants may be available through the district, the local district foundation, local businesses, regional, or national competitions.
    b. Better: serve as a team member on a grant writing group that identifies and submits a grant proposal
    c. Good: identify a grant sought by the school and review the process undertaken to identify, write, revise, and submit the proposal with the grant writer.
	.88	13%

39. School Safety Plan
    a. Best: lead meetings of faculty, staff, and parents to disseminate the school
    b. Better: participate in the revision or development of a school safety plan with the building administrator and school community council, and include passing time coordination, bussing and parent pick up flow, student walking or driving routes to and from school, crossing guard placement, coordination with local police, and student-to-student interaction
    c. Good: conduct an evaluation of the school safety plan and review your evaluation with to the building administrator.
	8.97	75%

40. Shadow principals (filled by assignment in TEAL 6080)
    a. Shadow a principal (may be the principal of your school) for 9 hours during the regular school day, must be done in blocks of time minimally 3 hours long.
    b. Shadow a principal at a school opposite (elementary or secondary) the principal you shadowed for part a, for a minimum of 6 hours during the regular school day.
	15.00	100%

41. Other a. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Interns, mentor principals, and university supervisors are encouraged to propose other experiences deemed beneficial to the training of the future administrator. Each such experience should be described and documented the same as other experiences on this list.	41.53	63%

The **Final Internship Evaluation (LINK** End of Internship Report) provides a final evaluation of the internship experience organized around the UEL Standards. It includes reflection on each standard and the experiences they have had to support their understanding of each standard. In addition, it provides evaluation from mentor principals at both the elementary and secondary levels, as well as the University Supervisor.

Process:
1. Candidates list the experiences that they had for each of the UEL Standards; their related course assignments completed; and a short narrative on why they feel prepared to lead within the standard.
2. 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.

Standard 1: Visionary Leadership

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015			3%	20%	74%	3%				24%	70%	6%				32%	65%	3%
2016		3%		26%	71%					33%	67%				3%	41%	56%	
2017		5%		5%	90%					17%	83%					25%	75%	

Standard 2: Teaching and Learning

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015				29%	70%	3%			4%	32%	62%	2%			2%	26%	68%	4%
2016			8%	16%	73%	3%				46%	54%				6%	22%	72%	
2017				5%	90%	5%				6%	94%					18%	75%	7%

Standard 3: Management for Learning

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015			3%	24%	73%				3%	27%	68%	2%		3%		24%	70%	3%
2016			8%	16%	73%	3%			4%	16%	80%				5%	19%	76%	
2017			4%	10%	86%				6%	22%	72%					32%	61%	7%

Standard 4: Community Collaboration

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015			6%	24%	70%				4%	35%	50%	11%			5%	35%	55%	5%
2016			6%	22%	72%				4%	24%	68%	4%				32%	68%	
2017			10%	14%	76%				5%	17%	78%				25%	71%	4%	

Standard 5: Ethical Leadership

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015			3%	15%	82%				2%	15%	76%	7%				22%	75%	3%
2016				13%	87%					29%	71%					20%	80%	
2017			10%	10%	80%				6%	11%	83%					36%	57%	7%

Standard 6: System Leadership

	Elementary Mentor						Secondary Mentor						USU Supervisor					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2015			11%	24%	59%	6%			2%	32%	53%	13%			8%	32%	46%	14%
2016		4%	9%	31%	56%				8%	25%	67%				11%	27%	62%	
2017			10%	10%	80%				6%	11%	83%				36%	57%	7%	

Application of content knowledge in practice: Data interpretation

Our analysis of the results from the Internship Experiences List (pp. 17-24) indicates that the use of the Internship Experiences List has provided candidates with coherent and authentic experiences that allow them to synthesize and apply content knowledge from coursework; develop professional skills; and demonstrate their capabilities. The list has provided a framework for the candidate and mentors to ensure that the internship experiences authentically cover a significant portion of an administrator's duties within a building setting.

We note that some did not experience internship in schools with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds. Typically, internship experiences take place largely in the school or district of current employment. While this is not totally within our control, we recognize a need to attempt to include this type of experience in each students' training.

Data from the Final Evaluation of the Internship (p. 25), indicates that of the 88 completers surveyed over the last three years, only four students had an elementary experience with limited application of all areas of the UEL Standards. All completers' secondary experiences covered all of the Standards.

Together, this evidence supports that, by the time of program completion, candidates have received field experiences that incorporate the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected in the UEL Standards.

Understand and engage with school culture and community

The program offers one source of data to support the claim that our completers have the ability to understand and engage with the school culture and community.

1. Focus Groups with selected Superintendents and Curriculum Directors p.26-27

Program faculty take pride in the strong relationships we have developed with leaders in the schools and districts that employ our completers. We have conducted focus group meetings with selected leaders in order to understand the issues they are facing and ensure that our completers are prepared with the needed foundational background. Summaries of the focus group meetings are found here: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

Focus Groups with Superintendents and Curriculum Directors

A few highlights of the focus group meetings are included here:

Question: Are USU graduates who are principals/administrators in your district…

1. Able to support teachers to differentiate instruction for different students?

Response: Very aware of who graduated from USU. <u>DISTRICT</u> is really diverse, so there's a lot of differentiation. Nobody graduates from a leadership program really ready for a principal job. Shortage in leadership as well as teachers. So, we have a 3-year induction program for leaders. <u>USU graduates come prepared to take it on, have the foundation that they need.</u> Most come from BYU, U. of Utah, and USU. Some come from out of state, but

usually with experience. A smattering of U. of Phoenix folks. USU provides practical preparation and those grads compete better than U. of Utah and BYU. <u>Very pleased with USU principals.</u> The missing special ed law class for administrators is noticeable.

3. Able to support teachers create positive learning environments?

Response: That's one of the standards that is taught to <u>create that culture of positive learning. We really know how important that is now.</u> It's important for motivation.

Response: We talked to the effective teachers in Price, with high test scores, <u>but they had a more positive learning environment. Principals have to create that culture.</u> The challenge for a young principal is when the heat is on. We work with developing principals in this area, but when the job pressures are intense it gets much harder. You can't just talk about it in class. You have to experience the parents, the personnel issues, the challenging kids. They can understand it intellectually, but not be able to provide leadership in this area. <u>Certain situations will trigger the concepts that were learned in classes.</u>

4. Able to collaborate with other principals/administrators in the district?

Response: <u>Very positive in this area.</u>

Response: Principals don't spend a lot of time talking to each other; <u>the ones who are struggling don't make an effort to find out what their successful peers are doing.</u> They need to understand that it's efficient and effective to learn from their peers. Agriculture is out in the open, but education is behind closed doors. We're not good at collaborating and being willing to share.

6. Able to support teachers to making a positive impact on student learning?

Response: The data class is important here. This is a different time even than it was 10 years ago. Data is not to catch people but to see what it tells us, what it doesn't tell us, and what instructional decisions it can drive. <u>USU grads come with the foundation to take the next step in this area.</u> Nobody comes out from a program with the total package, but what's important is that they come out ready to learn.

Response: <u>They're ready to think outside of the box. The USU grads have an edge in this area.</u>

Understand and engage with school culture and community: Data interpretation.

Selected results from the focus groups (pp. 26-27) indicates that upon completion, USU graduates effectively engage with the school culture and community.

Standard 2: Completer Practice and Growth

Program completers **engage** in professional practice and show that they have the skill and ability to do so in a variety of **additional settings** and community/cultural contexts.

2. Completers engage, adapt, & grow

Program completers **engage** in professional practice and show that they have the skill and ability to do so in a variety of **additional settings** and community/cultural contexts. Evidence shows that 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 settings.	Understand and engage local school and cultural communities
	Foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers
	Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners
	Engage in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community Contexts
	Create productive learning environments
	Can develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts
	Support students' growth in international and global Perspectives
	Establish goals for their own professional growth
	Engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their Practice
	Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning

Evidence shows that 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 settings.

The basis of the data to support Standard 2 is organized around the same three primary categories drawn from the AAQEP Data Audit Framework used in Standard 1.

The categories from the AAQEP Data matrix for Standard 2 are organized around the three categories as follows:

1. Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision,
   a. Focus groups with superintendents and curriculum directors
   b. Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey

   AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
   Create productive learning environments
   Can develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts

2. Application of content knowledge in practice,
   a. Focus groups with superintendents and curriculum directors
   b. Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey

   AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
   Establish goals for their own professional growth

Engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their practice
Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning
Can develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts

3. Understand and engage with school culture and community,
    a. Focus groups with superintendents and curriculum directors
    b. Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey

    AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
    Understand and engage local school and cultural communities
    Foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers
    Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners
    Engage in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts

Content Knowledge relative to administration and supervision

The program offers two sources of data to support the claim that our completers are prepared with appropriate knowledge in the area of content knowledge relative to administration and supervision.

1. Focus groups with superintendents and curriculum directors (pp.29-30)
2. Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey (pp. 30-34)

Selected Focus Group Comments

A few highlights from focus group interviews are included here:

Question: Are USU graduates who are principals/administrators in your district…

2. Able to support teachers to differentiate instruction for different students?

Response: Very aware of who graduated from USU. <u>DISTRICT</u> is really diverse, so there's a lot of differentiation. Nobody graduates from a leadership program really ready for a principal job. Shortage in leadership as well as teachers. So, we have a 3-year induction program for leaders. <u>USU graduates come prepared to take it on, have the foundation that they need.</u> Most come from BYU, U. of Utah, and USU. Some come from out of state, but usually with experience. A smattering of U. of Phoenix folks. USU provides practical preparation and those grads compete better than U. of Utah and BYU. <u>Very pleased with USU principals.</u> The missing special ed law class for administrators is noticeable.

6. Able to support teachers to making a positive impact on student learning?

Response: The data class is important here. This is a different time even than it was 10 years ago. Data is not to catch people but to see what it tells us, what it doesn't tell us, and what instructional decisions it can drive. <u>USU grads come with the foundation to take the next step in this area.</u> Nobody comes out from a program with the total package, but what's important is that they come out ready to learn. <u>They're ready to think outside of the box. The USU grads have an edge in this area.</u>

Selected INSPIRE Survey Questions

Table 3 provides data on overall perceptions of rigor and relevance.

Table 3. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Program Rigor & Relevance

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. The program content emphasized instructional leadership.	16	4.44	1.03	17	4.88	0.33	32	4.84	0.37	33	4.55	0.79
b. The program content emphasized leadership for school and organizational improvement.	16	4.38	1.02	17	4.94	0.24	32	4.72	0.52	33	4.45	0.79
c. The program provided a coherent learning experience.	16	4.47	1.06	17	4.65	0.49	32	4.63	0.61	33	4.30	0.88
d. The progam was challenging and intellectually stimulating.	16	4.25	1.18	17	4.59	0.51	32	4.56	0.72	32	4.22	0.94
e. I was asked to reflect on practice and analyze how to improve it.	16	4.06	1.18	17	4.71	0.47	32	4.56	0.56	33	4.48	0.83
f. The program integrated theory and practice.	16	4.19	0.98	17	4.65	0.49	32	4.66	0.55	33	4.36	0.82
g. The program gave me a strong orientation to educational leadership as a career.	16	4.25	1.00	16	4.56	0.51	32	4.59	0.67	33	4.30	0.95

The following INSPIRE Questions relate to specific content knowledge: ethics and professional norms, strategic leadership, operations and management, instructional leadership, professional organization and culture, supportive and equitable learning environment, and family and community engagement.

Table 4. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Ethics & Professional Norms

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Act in an open and transparent manner.	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.53	0.62	31	4.61	0.56	33	4.45	0.75
b. Engage in self-reflection and opportunities to learn.	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.76	0.56	31	4.77	0.43	33	4.64	0.60
c. Maintain visibility and approachability to stakehholders.	16	4.50	0.63	17	4.35	0.86	31	4.55	0.57	33	4.48	0.62
d. Act as a moral compass for the school or district.	16	4.56	0.63	17	4.34	0.83	31	4.68	0.54	33	4.48	0.71
e. Place children at the center of education with a focus on each child's success and well-being.	16	4.75	0.45	17	4.53	0.87	*	*	*	*	*	*
f. Promote the values of democracy, individual freedom and responsibility, equity, and diversity	16	4.44	0.51	17	4.35	0.86	*	*	*	*	*	*
g. Lead with interpersonal communication skill, social-emotional insight, and sensitivity to students' and staff members' backgrounds and cultures.	16	4.56	0.63	17	4.53	0.87	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Question was not provided.

Table 5. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Strategic Leadership

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Lead change efforts to promote school improvement.	16	4.50	0.52	17	4.53	0.80	31	4.56	0.57	33	4.64	0.55
b. Design the school's organization to enhhance teaching and learning.	16	4.56	0.51	17	4.53	0.80	31	4.61	0.56	33	4.58	0.61
c. Establish high expectations for student learning.	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.41	0.87	31	4.68	0.48	33	4.61	0.56
d. Use school or district data to promote school improvement.	16	4.69	0.60	17	4.41	0.87	31	4.74	0.44	33	4.67	0.48
e. Modify actions to reflect vision and mission of school.	16	4.69	0.48	17	4.41	0.87	31	4.65	0.49	33	4.58	0.50

* Question was not provided.

Table 6. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Operations & Management

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Manage school resources effectively and efficiently to support school vision (e.g., technology, personnel, instructional time, public funds, and supplies/equipment).	16	4.19	0.91	17	4.29	0.77	31	4.35	0.80	33	4.18	0.85
b. Manage discipline effectively by ensuring that each student is treated failry, respectfully, and with an understanding of each student's culture and context.	16	4.13	0.89	17	4.18	0.73	31	4.00	0.93	33	3.94	1.17
c. Manage facilities and their maintenance to promote a safe and orderly learning environment.	16	4.35	0.77	17	4.24	0.75	31	4.06	0.89	33	4.00	1.00
d. Recruit, hire, and retain high quality personnel.	16	4.31	0.60	17	4.18	0.95	31	4.19	0.70	33	4.00	1.09
e. Manage and use data to provide actionable information.	16	4.38	0.62	17	4.35	0.79	31	4.55	0.62	33	4.55	0.56
f. Develop and manage productive relationshhip with a district office.	16	4.44	0.63	17	4.24	0.75	31	4.23	0.76	*	*	*

* Question was not provided.

Table 7. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Instructional Leadership

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Develop the individual and collective instructional capacity of faculty	16	4.56	0.51	17	4.29	0.77	30	4.50	0.51	33	4.33	0.78
b. Provide constructive feedback for teachers to improve instruction.	16	4.50	0.82	17	4.41	0.80	30	4.47	0.51	33	4.42	0.75
c. Support differentiated instruction to enhance student learning.	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.41	0.80	30	4.47	0.51	33	4.24	0.87
d. Support professional development activities for teachers based on identified instructional needs of students.	16	4.73	0.46	17	4.59	0.80	30	4.50	0.68	33	4.39	0.75
e. Promote rigorous and relevant curricula, instruction, and assessments	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.53	0.80	30	4.47	0.57	33	4.30	0.81
f. Ensure culturally relevant teaching and learning.	16	4.31	0.79	17	4.35	0.79	30	4.47	0.63	33	4.18	0.85
g. Promotes a curriculum that supports college and career readiness.	16	4.38	0.81	17	4.41	0.80	30	4.23	0.82	33	4.15	1.00
h. Evaluate curriculum for its use and effectiveness.	16	4.50	0.63	17	4.41	0.80	30	4.33	0.80	33	4.09	1.01
i. Support the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning	16	4.38	0.62	17	4.41	0.87	30	4.50	0.57	33	4.18	0.92

Table 8. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Professional & Organizational Culture

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Promote effectiveness in serving all students well.	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.53	0.51	30	4.53	0.63	33	4.48	0.62
b. Build a collaborative environment.	16	4.63	0.62	17	4.53	0.80	30	4.63	0.56	33	4.70	0.47
c. Foster staff sensitivity to student diversity.	16	4.44	0.73	17	4.35	0.51	30	4.50	0.51	33	4.33	0.82
d. Work with staff to solve school or department problems.	16	4.69	0.48	17	4.53	0.86	30	4.47	0.68	33	4.48	0.80
e. Build and sustain lerning-centered vision for the shool.	16	4.75	0.45	17	4.53	0.80	*	*	*	*	*	*
f. Build and sustain an educational vision for a school.	*	*	*	*	*	*	30	4.77	0.43	33	4.67	0.48
g. Use clear ethical principles to guide decision making and problem solving.	*	*	*	*	*	*	30	4.67	0.48	33	4.61	0.66
h. Use clear ethical principles to safeguard the values of democracy, equity, justice, community, and diversity	15	4.67	0.49	17	4.53	0.80	*	*	*	*	*	*
i. Encourage staff members' inititative and innovative efforts (to enhance instructional capacity).	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.41	0.80	30	4.47	0.51	33	4.36	0.74
j. Engage staff in comprehensive planning for (continuous) school improvement.	16	4.63	0.62	17	4.59	0.80	30	4.53	0.51	33	4.48	0.67
k. Facilitate (a culture of) shared leadership.	16	4.81	0.40	17	4.59	0.80	30	4.67	0.48	33	4.64	0.49

* Question was not provided.

Table 9. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Supportive & Equitable Learning Environment

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Create an equitable and inclusive environment.	16	4.56	0.63	17	4.47	0.80	30	4.53	0.51	33	4.45	0.67
b. Promote trusting relationships.	16	4.56	0.63	17	4.65	0.49	30	4.57	0.57	33	4.58	0.50
c. Create an environment to promote the academic, social, emotional support for students.	16	4.69	0.48	17	4.65	0.49	30	4.53	0.51	33	4.48	0.62
d. Promote a sense of belonging among staff and students.	16	4.56	0.63	17	4.65	0.49	30	4.57	0.50	33	4.39	0.70

* Question was not provided.

Table 10. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Family & Community Engagement

Item	2018			2017			2016			2015		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers.	16	4.44	0.63	17	4.41	0.62	30	4.33	0.55	33	4.30	0.68
b. Effectively communicate and engage with families and caregivers.	16	4.44	0.63	17	4.41	0.51	30	4.37	0.61	33	4.36	0.65
c. Build and sustain positive relationships with community partners.	16	4.44	0.73	17	4.35	0.86	30	4.47	0.57	33	4.15	0.87
d. Communicate with and effectively engage with community partners.	16	4.56	0.73	17	4.29	0.77	30	4.37	0.49	33	4.09	0.88
e. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse resources.	16	4.50	0.73	17	4.24	0.83	30	4.40	0.50	33	4.15	0.91
f. Advocate for children, families and caregivers.	16	4.69	0.48	17	4.65	0.49	30	4.30	0.75	33	4.33	0.74

* Question was not provided.

INSPIRE Survey results presented by year and domain (means)

Table 11. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Means By Year and Survey Domain

Domain	2018	2017	2016	2015
Program Rigor and Relevance	4.29	4.71	4.65	4.38
Faculty Quality	4.58	4.67	4.81	4.57
Peer Relationships	4.19	4.06	4.29	4.08
Program Accessibility	4.44	4.26	4.44	4.67
Internship Residency & Quality	4.36	4.61	4.34	4.36
Ethics & Professional Norms	4.58	4.48	4.65	4.51
Strategic Leadership	4.61	4.46	4.65	4.62
Operations & Management	4.30	4.25	4.23	4.13
Instructional Leadership	4.51	4.42	4.44	4.25
Professional & Organizational Culture	4.69	4.53	4.56	4.49
Supportive & Equitable Learning	4.59	4.61	4.55	4.48
Family & Community Engagement	4.51	4.39	4.37	4.23
Overall Quality	4.66	4.55	*	*

* Domain not measured.

Content Knowledge relative to administration and supervision: Data interpretation

Results from selected questions from the focus groups indicates that once program completers have entered the profession, they **engage** in professional practice and show that they have the skill and ability to do so in a variety of **additional settings** and community/cultural contexts.

Seleted results from 98 graduates who responded to the INSPIRE survey indicates that across four years of completers, once engaged in the profession, they indicate strong perceptions that USU prepared them well to leverage their content knowledge in their new settings and contexts as evidenced by means of 4.00 or higher on all items (except one in operations and management in 2015) across all four years in seven content areas/domains (see pp. 30-34).

Application of content knowledge in practice

The program offers two sources of data to support the claim that our completers are prepared with appropriate knowledge in the area of content knowledge relative to administration and supervision.

1. Internship experiences list (pp. 17-24)
2. Focus groups with superintendents and curriculum directors (pp.35-36)

Internship Experiences List Table

The **Internship Experiences List (Link** Internship Experiences) was developed to provide consistency in internship experiences with less dependence on the mentor principal for the quality of the experience. Prior to the use of this document interns were at the mercy of the assignments given by the mentor principal with little consistency. Since mentor principals are not paid by the program for their work, and are selected by the student or the student's employer, the interns sometimes found themselves assigned to tasks the mentor principal needed done without regard for the quality of the internship experience. Based on the identified need, the Internship Experiences List was created. Utilizing this form encourages consistency by providing a list of forty potential internship experiences in three categories.

1. Experiences required by USBE Rule (yellow highlight)
2. Experiences embedded in program coursework (green highlight)
3. Experiences that would be useful, but are not required (no highlight—most student interns make a concerted effort to complete all forty items on the list at least at a minimal level)

The Internship Experience List was used for student who began the program in Fall, 2016. The average number of hours completers reported completing for each experience is listed along with the percentage of students who completed hours in the experience area (see pp. 17-24)

Selected Focus Group Comments

Question: Are USU graduates who are principals/administrators in your district…

3. Able to support teachers create positive learning environments?

Response: That's one of the standards that is taught to create that culture of positive learning. We really know how important that is now. It's important for motivation.

Response: We talked to the effective teachers in Price, with high test scores, but they had a more

positive learning environment. Principals have to create that culture.

Response: The challenge for a young principal is when the heat is on. We work with developing principals in this area, but when the job pressures are intense it gets much harder. You can't just talk about it in class. You have to experience the parents, the personnel issues, the challenging kids.

Response: They can understand it intellectually, but not be able to provide leadership in this area. Certain situations will trigger the concepts that were learned in classes.

4. Able to collaborate with other principals/administrators in the district?

Response: Very positive in this area.

Response: Principals don't spend a lot of time talking to each other; the ones who are struggling don't make an effort to find out what their successful peers are doing. They need to understand that it's efficient and effective to learn from their peers. Agriculture is out in the open, but education is behind closed doors. We're not good at collaborating and being willing to share.

Application of content knowledge in practice: Data interpretation

As shown from the Internship Experiences List data (pp. 17-25), completers engaged in authentic professional practice that allowed them experience using knowledge, skills, and ability at both the elementary and secondary setting. The internship experience is concentrated requiring 450 total hours as follows:
- 50 embedded as clinical experience in course work with direct supervision from the building mentor and faculty.
- 300 hours in school setting mentored by two, licensed building administrators who have been collaboratively selected by the intern and supervisors. The mentor is provided training from a USU supervisor. To provide authentic rigor and concentration, 151 hours must be completed in minimum 2-hour blocks of time when students are present and 32 of the hours must be completed during the regular school day in a school in which the intern is not employed and in 8-hour blocks of time.

Prior to the use of the Internship Experience list, completers reported a majority of their internship hours were completed supervising students before and after school and during lunchtime. As shown by the data, the list has provided a balanced result to the internship experience with only 12% of the internship time spent in student supervision. As a result of this balanced approach, completers have the experience to develop strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of settings.

Results from selected focus group questions indicates that once candidates have graduated, they are able to apply their rich content knowledge in new and different settings and contexts.

Understand and engage with school culture and community

Focus Groups with Superintendents and Curriculum Directors

A few highlights of the focus group meetings are included here:

Question: Are USU graduates who are principals/administrators in your district…

3. Able to support teachers to differentiate instruction for different students?

Response: Very aware of who graduated from USU. DISTRICT is really diverse, so there's a lot of differentiation. Nobody graduates from a leadership program really ready for a principal job. Shortage in leadership as well as teachers. So, we have a 3-year induction program for leaders. USU graduates come prepared to take it on, have the foundation that they need. Most come from BYU, U. of Utah, and USU. Some come from out of state, but usually with experience. A smattering of U. of Phoenix folks. USU provides practical preparation and those grads compete better than U. of Utah and BYU. Very pleased with USU principals. The missing special ed law class for administrators is noticeable.

3. Able to support teachers create positive learning environments?

Response: That's one of the standards that is taught to create that culture of positive learning. We really know how important that is now. It's important for motivation.

Response: We talked to the effective teachers in Price, with high test scores, but they had a more positive learning environment. Principals have to create that culture. The challenge for a young principal is when the heat is on. We work with developing principals in this area, but when the job pressures are intense it gets much harder. You can't just talk about it in class. You have to experience the parents, the personnel issues, the challenging kids. They can understand it intellectually, but not be able to provide leadership in this area. Certain situations will trigger the concepts that were learned in classes.

4. Able to collaborate with other principals/administrators in the district?

Response: Very positive in this area.

Response: Principals don't spend a lot of time talking to each other; the ones who are struggling don't make an effort to find out what their successful peers are doing. They need to understand that it's efficient and effective to learn from their peers. Agriculture is out in the open, but education is behind closed doors. We're not good at collaborating and being willing to share.

6. Able to support teachers to making a positive impact on student learning?

Response: The data class is important here. This is a different time even than it was 10 years ago. Data is not to catch people but to see what it tells us, what it doesn't tell us, and what instructional decisions it can drive. USU grads come with the foundation to take the next step in this area. Nobody comes out from a program with the total package, but what's important is that they come out ready to learn.

Response: <u>They're ready to think outside of the box. The USU grads have an edge in this</u>
<u>area.</u>

Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey

Understand and engage with school culture and community: Data interpretation

Results from focus groups indicates that completers can leverage their knowledge of how to engage school community and culture in new and different contexts and settings.

Seleted results from 98 graduates who responded to the INSPIRE survey indicates that across four years of completers, once engaged in the profession, they indicate strong perceptions that USU prepared them well to leverage their content knowledge in their new settings and contexts as evidenced by means of 4.00 or higher on all items relevant to the school culture and community, and building relationships with families and communities (see pp. 33-34, Tables 8-10).

Standard 3: Quality of Program Practices

The basis of the data to support Standard 3 is organized around the same three primary categories drawn from the AAQEP Data Audit Framework used in Standard 1 and 2.

The categories from the AAQEP Data matrix for Standard 3 are organized around the three categories as follows:

Quality program practices

Program consistently offers coherent curricula, provides high quality, diverse clinical experiences, engage in dynamic partnerships, and enacts comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Evidence documents practices and resources as well as the program's rationale	Coherent curriculum aligned with relevant standards
	Develops high quality clinical experiences in the context of partnerships
	Engages stakeholders in analysis, planning, improvement, Innovation
	Enacts admission processes that are shown to predict candidate success
	Monitors candidate progress to provide support and Guidance
	Engages in continuous improvement of program and program Components
	Investigates opportunities for improvement and innovation
	Maintains capacity for quality in staffing, resources, institutional commitment

1. Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision,
   a. Standards Based Curriculum Alignment Table

AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
Coherent curriculum aligned with relevant standards
Enacts admission processes that are shown to predict candidate success
Monitors candidate progress to provide support and guidance
Maintains capacity for quality in staffing, resources, institutional commitment

2. Application of content knowledge in practice,
    a. Internship Experiences List

       AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
       Develops high quality clinical experiences in the context of partnerships

3. Understand and engage with school culture and community,
    a. Focus Groups
    b. Select questions from INSPIRE Survey

       AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
       Engages stakeholders in analysis, planning, improvement, innovation
       Engages in continuous improvement of program and program components
       Investigates opportunities for improvement and innovation

Summary of Continuous Improvement Efforts & Alignment with Standards

The faculty use several practices to ensure quality in the management and ongoing evaluation of the program.

1. The faculty meet together on a regular basis, usually monthly during the academic year to talk about the program practices. Discussions include approval of assignments, and changes in the curriculum, changes in the admissions process, updates of faculty searches, teaching schedules, state program requirements and standards, and students who may be struggling in the program. A link to selected meeting minutes are here. https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

2. The faculty have developed a rigorous admissions process that follows the USBE Requirements for administrative licensure programs and includes items such as writing samples, letters of recommendation, and a standards based admissions interview to assess the candidates potential to be a successful school leader.

3. The faculty have developed a standards based curriculum alignment table (p.10) where we have periodically examined our curriculum through the lens of the UEL Standards to determine how our courses align with the standards.

4. The faculty participate in the Utah Consortium of Educational Leadership – a group that is composed of educational leadershihp preparation programs around the state as well as state leaders in the Utah State Board of Education. Here we have the opportunity to review our

program relative to others in the state doing the same work. This informs our continuous improvement efforts.

ASC Applicant Interview Process

The ASC Applicant Interview questions were developed by instructional leadership faculty members and based on the Utah Educational Leadership Standards as well as the program coursework. Interviewers/raters are typically selected from the pool of instructiona leadership faculty members, individuals in the community who hold a current or have held a role in K-12 administration, and others who have completed the program or have instructed in the program. Interviewers/raters are randomly assigned to interviewees with the intent to have 2-3 interviewers/raters per interviewee. Below we present data on our ratings:

	Average Score	Range	Average Deviation	Range
2016-2017	72.90	54.17-91.07	4.75	.01-15.01
2017-2018	59.99	33.93-100.00	3.84	.48-15.05

Our goal in inviting multiple raters is not necessarily to calibrate or gather consensus in scoring, but rather to acknowledge that those from the community may have a unique perspective than faculty members and that this perspective has value. Hence, the goal is to have multiple ratings for each prospective candidates interview. Multiple ratings are averaged to calculate a final score.

Admissions Interview questions:

ASC Applicant Interview Questions (Adopted 2013)

1. **Describe the characteristics of an effective school.** (Standard 1: Visionary Leadership)
    Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
    o   Every student learning
    o   Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
    o   High expectations for students, staff, and community
    o   Reflection on assumptions and beliefs
    o   Continuous, evidence-based improvement

2. **What have you and your school done to ensure student learning?** (Standard 2: Focus on Teaching and Learning)
    Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
    o   Learning as the fundamental purpose of school
    o   Affirming diversity
    o   Continuous professional learning and growth
    o   Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
    o   High expectations for students, staff, and community
    o   Every student learning

3. **Leaders manage as well as lead in schools; describe what good "management" by a school leader would look like.** (Standard 3: Management for Learning)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   o Creating a safe and supportive learning environment
   o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
   o Equitable distribution of resources
   o Operating efficiently and effectively
   o Service to student learning and others

4. **What elements of the community should be involved in the education of students, and how would you facilitate that involvement?** (Standard 4: Community Collaboration)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   o High expectations for students, educators, and community
   o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
   o Affirming diversity
   o Continuous professional learning and growth

5. **Everyone agrees ethics are important. Describe what it means to be an ethical school leader.** (Standard 5: Ethical Leadership)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   o Assuming personal responsibility for actions
   o Ethical principles (fairness, integrity, honesty, etc.) in all relationships and decisions
   o Modeling high expectations for students, staff, and community
   o Continuous professional learning and growth
   o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups

6. **What roles should a school leader fill in the larger political and policy arenas of the school district and the state?** (Standard 6: Systems Leadership)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   o Advocating for students and education
   o Influencing policies
   o Upholding and/or improving laws and regulations
   o Eliminating barriers to achievement
   o Affirming diversity

Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision

See the Standards Based Curriculum Alignment Table on p. 10.

Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision: Data interpretation

Results from the Standards Based Curriculum Alignment Table provides evidence of our continuous improvement efforts to maintain alignment between our courswork and standards – we achieve this at a high level with the exception of Standard 6A (as noted earlier).

Application of content knowledge in practice

The **Internship Experiences List (Link** [Internship Experiences](#)**)** was developed to provide consistency in internship experiences with less dependence on the mentor principal for the quality of the experience. Prior to the use of this document interns were at the mercy of the assignments given by the mentor principal with little consistency. Since mentor principals are not paid by the program for their work, and are selected by the student or the student's employer, the interns sometimes found themselves assigned to tasks the mentor principal needed done without regard for the quality of the internship experience. Utilizing this form encourages consistency by providing a list of forty potential internship experiences in three categories. See pp. 17–24 for the Internship Experiences list, average number of hours per completer/per experience, and the % of completers participating in each experience.

1. Experiences required by USBE Rule
2. Experiences embedded in program coursework
3. Experiences that would be useful, but are not required (most student interns make a concerted effort to complete all forty items on the list at least at a minimal level)

Application of content knowledge in practice: Data interpretation

Data from the Internship Experiences List indicates that continuous improvement efforts have yielded positive experiences for students. As noted earlier, we will continue to strive to provide experiences for students that enhance their expertise in working in different settings and with different student populations.

Understand and engage with school culture and community,

Focus Groups with Superintendents and Curriculum Directors

A few highlights of the focus group meetings are included here:

Question: Are USU graduates who are principals/administrators in your district…

4. Able to support teachers to differentiate instruction for different students?

Response: Very aware of who graduated from USU. DISTRICT is really diverse, so there's a lot of differentiation. Nobody graduates from a leadership program really ready for a principal job. Shortage in leadership as well as teachers. So, we have a 3-year induction program for leaders. USU graduates come prepared to take it on, have the foundation that they need. Most come from BYU, U. of Utah, and USU. Some come from out of state, but usually with experience. A smattering of U. of Phoenix folks. USU provides practical preparation and those grads compete better than U. of Utah and BYU. Very pleased with USU principals. The missing special ed law class for administrators is noticeable.

3. Able to support teachers create positive learning environments?

Response: That's one of the standards that is taught to create that culture of positive learning. We really

know how important that is now. It's important for motivation.

Response: We talked to the effective teachers in Price, with high test scores, but they had a more positive learning environment. Principals have to create that culture. The challenge for a young principal is when the heat is on. We work with developing principals in this area, but when the job pressures are intense it gets much harder. You can't just talk about it in class. You have to experience the parents, the personnel issues, the challenging kids. They can understand it intellectually, but not be able to provide leadership in this area. Certain situations will trigger the concepts that were learned in classes.

4. Able to collaborate with other principals/administrators in the district?

Response: Very positive in this area.

Response: Principals don't spend a lot of time talking to each other; the ones who are struggling don't make an effort to find out what their successful peers are doing. They need to understand that it's efficient and effective to learn from their peers. Agriculture is out in the open, but education is behind closed doors. We're not good at collaborating and being willing to share.

6. Able to support teachers to making a positive impact on student learning?

Response: The data class is important here. This is a different time even than it was 10 years ago. Data is not to catch people but to see what it tells us, what it doesn't tell us, and what instructional decisions it can drive. USU grads come with the foundation to take the next step in this area. Nobody comes out from a program with the total package, but what's important is that they come out ready to learn.

Response: They're ready to think outside of the box. The USU grads have an edge in this area.

Selected questions from the INSPIRE Survey

Understand and engage with school culture and community: Data interpretation

Results from focus groups indicates that continuous improvement efforts have yielded high quality experiences for completers as it relates to engaging the school community and culture.

Seleted results from 98 graduates who responded to the INSPIRE survey indicates that continuous improvement efforts across four years of completers, has yielded positive perceptions of their experiences in engaging the school community and culture as evidenced by means of 4.00 or higher on all items (see pp. 33-34, Tables 8-10).

Standard 4: Engagement, Improvement, Innovation, Impact

The evidence that the elementary education and secondary programs meet the expectations of Standard 4 comes from several data sources and perspectives.

Engagement with P20 system

The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P20 education system.	Engages with partners to support high needs schools
	Participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational Outcomes
	Seeks to meet local and state educator workforce needs
	Seeks to diversify the educator workforce through recruitment and support
	Supports completer entry into their professional role
	Uses data on completer placement, retention, effectiveness to improve
	Meets obligations to all jurisdictions in which it operates
	Investigates effectiveness relative to its own mission and Commitments

The basis of the data to support Standard 4 is organized around the same three primary categories drawn from the AAQEP Data Audit Framework used in Standard 1, 2, and 3.

The categories from the AAQEP Data matrix for Standard 4 are organized around the three categories as follows:

1. Content knowledge relative to administration and supervision,
   a. Not used under standard 4

2. Application of content knowledge in practice,
   a. Not used under standard 4

3. Understand and engage with school culture and community,
   a. Select questions from INSPIRE Survey

   AAQEP Data Matrix Categories
   Engages with partners to support high needs schools
   Participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes
   Seeks to meet local and state educator workforce needs
   Seeks to diversify the educator workforce through recruitment and support
   Supports completer entry into their professional role
   Uses data on completer placement, retention, effectiveness to improve
   Meets obligations to all jurisdictions in which it operates
   Investigates effectiveness relative to its own mission and commitments

Understand and engage with school culture and community

Selected INSPIRE Survey Questions:

See pp. 30-34, specifically Table 10 – Family & Community relations and Table 9.

Understand and engage with school culture and community: Data interpretation

Selected INSPIRE survey questions indicates that our existing relationships with districts has yielded positive outcomes for students in relationship to their experiences. Table 9 points to the extent to whhic students feel prepared to reduce disparities in education settings. Although this was rated high (4.00 or higher, on average), it is unclear, in practice to what extent students can leverage and apply this knowledge. In alignment with other areas of improvement we raised, this will be addressed.

Although we do not have established partnerships with high needs schools to foster principal prepration, our faculty do partner with districts with high needs schools. These collaborative research efforts inform course curriculum in ways that prepare our graduates and it offers the possibility to foster future collaborations specifically relevant to principal preparation and experiences.

Conclusion: Findings and Recommendations

A review of our extensive narrative provides evidence that our program meets the expectations for Standards 1-4.

Standard 1

We align our coursework with the UEL standards to develop a comprehensive curriculum that develops the appropriate knowledge required of the profession. In internship, our candidates aquire experiences that allow them to apply that knowledge and further develop their skills, with 95% of candidates completing experiences that meet all UEL standards. At exit, our candidates complete the Praxis Exam 5411 with a pass rate of 99% and aligned with those outcomes. Once our candidates enter the field, superintendents and curriculum directors report that they are effective and have the "foundation they need" to take on the challenge of being a first-year principal. Together, this evidence indicates that when our candidates leave our MEd in Instructional Leadership and Administrative/Supervisory Concentration programs, they possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be successful educational leaders.

Standard 2

Candidates report on the INSPIRE survey that the program prepared them well in the needed knowledge, skills, and abilities (with means ranging from 4.44 – 4.81 on a 5-point Likert scale for select questions in 2018) to be reflective and adaptive practitioners. Over a period of four years, we have consistently acquired ratings of 4.00 or higher on all included INSPIRE survey questions.

Once our candidates enter the field, superintendents and curriculum directors report that they are able to adapt and that "they're ready to think outside of the box. The USU grads have an edge in this area. Together, this evidence indicates that when our candidates leave our MEd in Instructional Leadership and Administrative/Supervisory Concentration programs, they are able to use the skills, knowledge, strategies, and habits they acquired and successfully adopt and adapt those to new and different contexts.

Standard 3

Faculty meeting meetings are examples of how the program engages in continuous improvement efforts to maintain a high quality program. These expectations manifest themselves in our admission process which is rigorous, standards-based, and follows the USBE requirements for licensure. The extent to which we align our courses with UEL Standards speaks to the comprehensiveness of our program. Together, these artifacts provide evidence of a program that is of high quality and that engages in continuous quality assurance processes.

Standard 4

Select INSPIRE survey questions indicate that candidates perceive their experiences with the program has helped them develop strong relationships with the P20 education system as well as with each other (fellow educational leaders), providing evidence that our program is committed to and invests in the P20 education system through engagement, innovation, and improvement efforts.

Implications and Goals for Improvement

In our review we were able to identify a few select areas for improvement, the first area for improvement, being derived from specific areas in the newly revised UEL Standards (2018).

Self-Audit Driven Goals

As a result of self-audit, the program leadership and staff have identified a new system for collecting all documents into one data system—a one file per student data system. The audit provided a list for staff assistants of required documents. The self-audit has resulted in the staff developing a new data management system that collects all documentation in one data system and has increased accessibility of documents to the program leadership/advisors.

The number of courses taught by adjunct instructors will be reduced. Courses taught by adjuncts will be reviewed by a faculty member at least every three years to reduce any drift from course objectives or the program/state requirements. It is also recommended that each adjunct instructor be assigned a point-of-contact faculty member. This will allow a faculty member to mentor the adjunct instructor.

To meet the needs of the wide variety of program students, synchronous offerings during the summer will be increased while still maintaining some options for the blended/face-to-face options in a pilot program. Students will then be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of the pilot offerings.

Community, Equity, & Cultural Responsiveness: Aligning to the Revised UEL Standards

First, when reviewing the alignment between our coursework and UEL standards, it was apparent that no course focused heavily on UEL Standard 6A. This standard indicates that effective educational leaders demonstrate active participation in the school's local community. The USBE just adopted a new set of standards in May of 2018 which provides greater specification as it pertains to preparing our candidates to engage successfully with the school's local community. The related standard from these recently updated standards are reflected in Strand 4:

Strand 4: Community Engagement

Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in order to create an inclusive, caring, safe, and supportive school environment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.
- Standard 4.1: Demonstrate an approachable, accessible, and welcoming disposition to families and members of the community.
- Standard 4.2: Create and sustain positive, collaborative, and productive relationships with families and the community.
- Standard 4.3: Understand, value, and employ the community's resources to promote student learning and school improvement.
- Standard 4.4: Work to collaborate with families around items such as cultural perspectives and practices, transportation, work schedules, and language to ensure that all families can be fully engaged in the school community.

As we revise our coursework to meet the expectations of the revised UEL Standards, we intend to place special attention on the ways we can better prepare our candidates to engage in the school community.

It was also mentioned in the focus groups that there was a need for more special education law. This recommendation will also be taken into our coursework revisions as we revisit our educational law course curriculum. Adding additional special education law content will be included.

As student demographics continue to evolve in Utah and elsewhere yielding a student body that is more linguistically and culturally diverse than ever before, the revised UEL Standards (2018) have placed greater attention on creating equitable learning environments that support the success of all students. This is reflected in Strand 7 of the revised UEL Standards (2018):

Strand 7: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness

Effective educational leaders honor the heritage and background of each student, use culturally responsive practices, and strive for cultural competency and equity of educational opportunity to promote each student

- Standard 7.1: Create and sustain a school environment in which each student is known, accepted, valued, trusted, and respected.
- Standard 7.2: Ensure each student has equitable access to efective teachers, learning opportunities, academic and social support, and other resources necessary for success.
- Standard 7.3: Lead faculty and staf to equitably distribute and target resources at the right moment and in the right places to achieve student success. 's academic success and well-being.
- Standard 7.4: Implement school procedures to address student behavior in a positive, equitable, and unbiased manner.
- Standard 7.5: Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership.
- Standard 7.6: Promote the preparation of students to live productively in, and positively contribute to society including participation in representative governments and other civic processes.

Internship experience data indicates that a limited number of respondents work in schools with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds. Typically, internship experiences take place largely in the school or district of current employment. While this is not totally within our control, we recognize a need to attempt to include this type of experience in each students' training.

Finally, we will be updating our interview questions to better reflect these new UEL standards, overall, and particularly as it pertains to Strand 7, as well as our internship experiences document and final exit evaluation. These modifications will also strengthen our performance on AAQEP Standar 1 as it pertains to supporting instruction and assessment that are culturally responsive.

Improving Internship Supervision

A second area of improvement is the supervision provided to our candidates while completing their internship. Results from the self-study indicated that some respondents indicated a lack of supervision and evaluation of the internship experience. In order to improve in this particular area of our program, we intend to do the following:

Combine the Internship Experiences List and the End-of-internship Report and tie it directly to the Log of Internship Hours so that students and supervisors become focused on quality experiences rather than just hours logged.

Train University Supervisors using new forms and roll play interactions with candidates and school advisors yearly. Faculty will shadow an interaction to provide coaching and feedback for each supervisor twice per year.

Collecting additional data after these changes will help document if these two data-driven responses have improved the quality of our program in measurable ways.

Appendices

Appendix A: Candidate recruitment, selection, monitoring, described and documented

Recruitment: In past years, program faculty have accomplished recruitment by visiting school districts and recruitment fairs (often a combined effort of multiple districts) where potential candidates are invited by their employers. Program leaders make a presentation and invite candidates to apply. The Regional Campus system is also instrumental in recruitment activities in the local communities and on their campuses.

With the hiring of a new coordinator, additional recruitment efforts include contact with curriculum directors who are invited to nominate potential administrators. Nominated individuals are contacted by phone, provided information and invited to apply. While this is a new approach, it has shown promise as an effective recruitment strategy.

The program has a strong reputation in Utah. It is common for potential candidates to seek information from the website and from past program completers. This is the strongest source of new applicants. Below is information about the recruitment and enrollment trends over the last three years:

Year	Applied	Accepted	Enrolled	Withdrawn
2015-2016	88	69	62	22*
2016-2017	57	47	41	14**
2017-2018	74	68	65	7***

* 9 inactive (students who have not registered for a course in the past year)
** 7 inactive (students who have not registered for a course in the past year)
*** 5 inactive (students who have not registered for a course in the past year)

Admissions and Selection

The program has two distinct tracks with differing application processes and requirements: Administrative Supervisory Concentration (ASC) licensure only and M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership.

Each required element of the application process is scored and considered as part of the overall admissions decision. The most important element is the admissions interview conducted by members of the faculty. The questions are standardized and drawn from the UEL Standards.

ASC Licensure Only

Admission to the ASC licensure only program requires students be a licensed level II teacher and hold a Master's degree in an education or closely related field.

Please submit: [ASC Application form](#) (online submission)

1. Three Letters of Recommendation are required and should address your effectiveness as a teacher and potential as an education leader. One of the letters must come from your principal or immediate administrative supervisor, one from the Superintendent or someone from the district office, and one from a person of your choice. Please send the individuals you select the link to the [form](#) and they can submit the form directly to us by saving the form and attaching it to an email to [krista.terrell@usu.edu.](mailto:krista.terrell@usu.edu)
2. $50 non-refundable application fee mailed to the following: ASC Program 2805 Old Main Hill Logan UT 84322
3. Official Graduate Transcripts which list your awarded Master's degree (We do not need these if your Master's degree is from USU)
4. Copy of current teaching license (if anticipating a Utah license you must have a level 2 teaching license)
5. Evidence of clearing a USOE fingerprint background check.
6. Evidence of being deemed effective or higher by your districts system.
7. Interview: After completing the admissions checklist, you will be invited to participate in a telephone interview with the admissions committee. The interview should take approximately 15 minutes. [Rating Sheet](#)

M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership

In addition to the application for license only applicants for the master's degree must complete the following:

1. [Application](#) completed with the School of Graduate Studies at Utah State University

Please Note:

- The Graduate School requires either the GRE or Miller's Analogy test with a score above the 40th percentile.
- Application fee: The School of Graduate Studies requires an additional application fee.
- Letters of recommendation: We suggest you have those who wrote letters for the program application upload that same letter when they receive the request from the School of Graduate Studies.

Interview questions:

ASC Applicant Interview Questions (2013)

7. **Describe the characteristics of an effective school.** (Standard 1: Visionary Leadership)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   o   Every student learning
   o   Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
   o   High expectations for students, staff, and community
   o   Reflection on assumptions and beliefs

- o Continuous, evidence-based improvement

8. **What have you and your school done to ensure student learning?** (Standard 2: Focus on Teaching and Learning)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   - o Learning as the fundamental purpose of school
   - o Affirming diversity
   - o Continuous professional learning and growth
   - o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
   - o High expectations for students, staff, and community
   - o Every student learning

9. **Leaders manage as well as lead in schools; describe what good "management" by a school leader would look like.** (Standard 3: Management for Learning)
   Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
   - o Creating a safe and supportive learning environment
   - o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
   - o Equitable distribution of resources
   - o Operating efficiently and effectively
   - o Service to student learning and others

10. **What elements of the community should be involved in the education of students, and how would you facilitate that involvement?** (Standard 4: Community Collaboration)
    Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
    - o High expectations for students, educators, and community
    - o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups
    - o Affirming diversity
    - o Continuous professional learning and growth

11. **Everyone agrees ethics are important. Describe what it means to be an ethical school leader.** (Standard 5: Ethical Leadership)
    Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
    - o Assuming personal responsibility for actions
    - o Ethical principles (fairness, integrity, honesty, etc.) in all relationships and decisions
    - o Modeling high expectations for students, staff, and community
    - o Continuous professional learning and growth
    - o Collaboration with all stakeholder groups

12. **What roles should a school leader fill in the larger political and policy arenas of the school district and the state?** (Standard 6: Systems Leadership)
    Dispositions: Listen to see if the applicant believes in, values, and is committed to:
    - o Advocating for students and education
    - o Influencing policies
    - o Upholding and/or improving laws and regulations
    - o Eliminating barriers to achievement
    - o Affirming diversity

Admissions Rating Sheet

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Administrative/Supervisory Certificate
Admissions Interview Rating Sheet
(semester)
(date)</td></tr>
</table>

Candidate Name: John Doe	Pct. of Poss.	89.88 %

Anytown School District

Interview Rating Scale:

0-Unacceptable	3-Good
2-Could be better	4-Very good

Interview Criteria	1	2	3	4	22.33
Articulates Ideas Clearly & Persuasively (observation)	4	4	2		
Understanding of the purposes of schooling (question 1)	3	4	2		
Understanding of teaching and learning (question 2)	3	4	4		
Understanding of the role of management (question 3)	2	4	2		
Understanding of relationship with community (question 4)	4	4	2		
Understanding of importance of ethics (question 5)	4	4	2		
Understanding of political context of schools (question 6)	3	4	2		
	23	28	16	0	

Level of License	5
Level I = 1pt, Level II = 3pts, Level III = 5pts	

Graduate GPA	3
<3.0 = 1 pt; 3.0-3.5 = 2 pts; >3.5 = 3 pts	

Letter of Recommendation	10
1 pt. if all 3 letters are from correct people 2 pts per letter if ranking is Top 5 or better; 1 pt. if Top 10; 0 below Top 10 1 pt per letter on subjective assessment of quantitative value of letter	

Writing	10
4 points--grammar and usage 4 points--coherence and construction 2 points--quality of answer	

Appendix B: Completer support and follow-up described and documented

Completer follow-up is accomplished through the INSPIRE Survey and focus groups with selected superintendents and curriculum directors. https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

Each year the program participates in the INSPIRE Survey administered through the University Council for hip. The survey has undergone rigorous validity and reliability testing and has been adopted by many programs nationally. The following https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership provides documentation of the survey provided by the creators.

Appendix C: Capacity described and document (faculty, resources, etc.)

During the past two years the School of TEAL has added new faculty to the previous core, replacing several long-term faculty who have retired from the university. Dr. Michael Freeman, Dr. Steve Laing, and Dr. L. Joseph Matthews have retired during the past two years and been replaced by Dr. Alyson Lavigne, Dr. Greg Lewis, and Dr. Amanda Taggart. They join Dr. Courtney Stewart and Dr. Susan Turner to complete the five-person core faculty. Four highly qualified practitioners teach courses in the program as adjunct faculty in their areas of specialization.

The core faculty meets together on a regular basis (usually 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. Selected meeting minutes are found here. https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

All of the core faculty hold terminal degrees. All have held administrative assignments in public education with two having been a principal and/or district leader. The core faculty consists of three assistant professors, and two clinical faculty.

The adjunct faculty members are carefully selected from respected and academically and professionally qualified professionals in the education community. All four hold terminal degrees (Ph.D., Ed.D., or J.D.) from accredited universities. All hold or have held leadership positions in Utah school districts.

The program also has a relationship with five current or former school administrators who, on a student by student basis conduct site visits to our students in their internship placements, follow up with documentation, and verify the experiences. Each holds a Utah teaching license with the Administrative Supervisory Concentration. The program faculty conducts annual training including updates on current USBE rules relating to internships and best practice.

All core faculty and adjunct faculty who teach in the program are evaluated using the approved USU course evaluation system. The USU Course Evaluation system is based on student feedback of faculty performance across a number of categories. The course evaluation system utilizes a system known as IDEA based on course objectives as determined by the instructor of each course. In addition, as part of the promotion and tenure process, pre-tenure faculty in their probationary years, tenured faculty seeking promotion and clinical faculty are encouraged to provide additional documentation of teaching effectiveness. Typical forms of documentation include a teaching portfolio, and faculty peer review.

Faculty vitae are available http://www.teal.usu.edu/directory/index. Vitae for Adjunct faculty and Intern Supervisors are on file.

Core Faculty

Name/Title	Degree Information	Publications	Years at USU/in Position	Courses Taught	% Time Teaching
Lavigne, Alyson Assistant Professor	Ph.D., University of Arizona Educational Psychology 2010	Articles: 13 Books: 4 Presentations: 35 Grants/Contracts: 4	1/1	TEAL 6060	40 %
Lewis, Greg Clinical Assistant Professor	Ed.D., Utah State University Curriculum and Instruction 2012	Articles: 0 Books: 0 Presentations: 13 Grants: 2	1/1	TEAL 6080 TEAL 6930 TEAL 6945	80 %
Stewart, Courtney Assistant Professor	Ph.D. Brigham Young University Educational Leadership and Foundations 2009	Articles: 12 Books: 0 Presentations: 34 Grants: 3 Book Chapters: 1	5/5	TEAL 6540 TEAL 6280 TEAL 7060 TEAL 7325 TEAL 7330 TEAL 7350	70 %
Taggart, Amanda Assistant Professor	Ed.D., The University of Texas at San Antonio Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 2011	Articles: 9 Book Chapter: 1 Presentations: 11 Grants: 0	0/0	TEAL 6090	40 %
Turner, Susan Clinical Assistant Professor,	Ph.D., Brigham Young University Leadership and Organizational Behavior, 1998	Articles: 7 Books: 0 Presentations: 18 Grants: 8	12/12	EDUC 6550 TEAL 6050 EDUC 7050 EDUC 6540	85 %
Freeman, Michael, Associate Professor,	Ph.D., University of Wyoming Adult & Postsecondary Education 1994	Articles: 20 Books: 1 Presentations: 24 Grants/Contracts: 2	24/18	TEAL 6090 TEAL 6410 TEAL 7090 TEAL 7350 TEAL 7080 TEAL 6930	80 %

Adjunct Faulty

Name	Degree	Years	Courses Taught	Title
Bates, Martin	PhD, JD, Brigham Young University	17	TEAL 6740	Superintendent, Granite School District
Stephens, Jeff	PhD, Utah State University	1	TEAL 6500	Superintendent, Weber School District
Alder, Heidi	JD, Brigham Young University	2	TEAL 6740	Legal Counsel, Weber School District
Nye, Rich	PhD, Utah State University	1	TEAL 6060	Superintendent, Ogden School District

Internship Supervisors

Name	Title	Degree	Years	Employer
Leichty, Mike	Deputy Superintendent	EdD, Lasalle University	20	Cache County School District
Downs, Chad	Retired	MEd, Utah State University	22	USU Retired, Cache County
Ramsey, Diane	Principal		2	Jordan School District
Sandy Coroles	Retired			Ogden School District

Select INSPIRE Survey Qeuestion

Table 12. INSPIRE Graduate Survey Results: Faculty Quality

	2018			2017			2016			2015		
Item	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
a. The faculty/instructors were knowledgeable.	16	4.69	0.48	17	4.76	0.44	32	4.84	0.37	33	4.64	0.49
b. The faculty/instructors were competent.	16	4.63	0.62	16	4.81	0.40	32	4.81	0.40	33	4.61	0.56
c. The faculty/instructors were responsive to	16	4.63	0.50	17	4.53	0.62	32	4.75	0.51	33	4.52	0.71
d. The faculty/instructors were respectful of diversity.	16	4.38	0.96	17	4.59	0.62	32	4.84	0.37	33	4.52	0.62

Classroom descriptions

Utah State University has state of the art facilities in Logan and at every regional campus and center. We have an extensive support system for academic and instructional services, which can be explored here: https://ais.usu.edu/

Many of the classrooms that we use can be viewed here: http://classroomsupport.usu.edu/classroom_information/index

A typical broadcast origination classroom and receive classroom has a large flat panel display that instructors and students use to see each other in real time, a sophisticated audio/mic system that allows for teacher-student and student-student interaction, a PC that enables the use of lecture capture, a

document camera, and BluRay DVD. In addition, small group work is facilitated through the use of additional technology-based video systems (e.g., Zoom) that students access using phones or laptops.

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
PLAN FOR THE INTERNAL AUDIT

For the student file audit, we randomly selected 3 MEd graduates and 3 ASC Administrative/Supervisory Concentration only graduates per year for the last three available years totaling 18 files being audited.

The audit included a review the programs, courses, faculty, and infrastructure for the selected number of students. We will use stratified random sampling to choose the students' whose programs, courses, faculty, and infrastructure will be audited. The breakdown will be as follows:

- 9 MEd Instructional Leadership graduates
    - 1 each per semester from Fall 2015 through Summer 2018
- 9 ASC (Licensure Only) graduates
    - 1 each per semester from Fall 2015 through Summer 2018

.

Instructional Leadership Audit Form

Student Number (Random) _____

Semester Completed _____   **Year Completed _____**

Audit Questions

			Admissions	Comments
Yes	No	NA	1. Did MEd completers meet graduate school admissions requirements?	
			a. Undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher or received waiver.	
			b. GRE or Miller's Analogy test with a score above the 40th percentile.	
			c. Application to the School of Graduate Studies.	
			d. School of Graduate Studies Application Fee	
Yes	No	NA	2. Did all completers (MEd and ASC) meet the IL admissions requirements?	
			a. ASC application form	
			b. Three letters of recommendation (one from current principal or immediate supervisor and one from the Superintendent or someone from the district office, and one from a person of candidate's choice.	
			c. IL application fee.	
			d. Copy of Level II or higher teaching license.	
			e. Evidence of clearing USOE fingerprint background check.	
			f. Evidence of being deemed effective or higher by the candidate's district evaluation system.	

			g. 80% of possible points on the Admissions Interview Rating Sheet calculated from:
			    i. A 1-4 score on 7 item admissions interview.
			    ii. Level of license (Level I = 1 pt., Level II = 2 pts.,
			        Level III = 5 pts.)
			    iii. GPA: < 3.0 = 1 pt., 3.0-3.5 = 2 pts., >3.5 = 3 pts.
			    iv. Letters of Recommendation: 1 pt. if all 3 letters are
			        from correct people; 2 pts. per letter if ranking is
			        Top 5% or better, 1 pt. if top 10%, 0 pt. if below top
			        10%; 1 pt per letter on subjective assissment of
			        quantitative value of letter.
			    v. Writing sample rating: 4 pts.for grammer and usage,
			        4 pts for coherence and constructin, 3 pts for quality
			        of answer.	

Yes	No	NA	3. Did ASC-only completers met the following IL admissions requirements?	
			a. Official Graduate Transcript listing awarded Mater's degree.	

Completion				**Comments**
Yes	No	NA	1. Did MEd completers meet graduate school complesion requirements?	
			a. Completers met University credit restriction requirements.	
			b. Completion of Requirements form submitted to the School of Graduate Studies	
			c. Letter of Completion sent by advisor.	
Yes	No	NA	2. Did all completers (MEd and ASC) meet the IL admissions requirements?	
			a. Submit all completed internship documentation (Internship Experiences List, Log of Internship Hours, End of Internship Report).	
			b. Submit passing Praxis score documentation.	
			c. Submit completed USBE Application form.	

Program and Courses				**Comments**
Yes	No	NA	1. Did all completers (MEd and ASC) meet the IL course requirements?	
			a. Completed all courses listed in the program guide with B- or better grade.	
			b. Documentation of acceptance of any substituted courses.	

Faculty & Infrastructure			**Comments**
Percentage		1. Did all courses instructed by a highly-qualified instructor?	
		a. Percentage of courses instructed by staff with PhD or EdD.	

	b. Percentage of courses instructed by adjunct staff with MEd.	
Percentage	2. Percentage of courses by delivery method.	
	a. Percentage of courses instructed through asynchronus online format.	
	b. Percentage of courses instructed through blended asynchronus online and face-to-face format.	

Program Self-Audit

The purpose of the program self-audit was to review the program, courses, faculty, and infrastructure to identify concerns that can lead to program improvement.
For the student file audit, one MEd graduate and one ASC (Administrative/Supervisory concentration) licensure-only completer were chosen using a random number generator to provide a stratified random sample for each semester for the last three years. This resulted in eighteen student files being audited. The breakdown of files audited was as follows:
- 9 MEd Instruction Leadership graduates
  - 1 each per semester from Fall 2015 through Summer 2018
- 9 ASC (licensure only) graduates
  - 1 each per semester from Fall 2015 through Summer 2018

Faculty and staff were also interviewed as part of the self-audit process.
The audit focused on the admission process, program and course completion, and faculty/delivery infrastructure. An audit form was created to guide the data collection process.

Program Admissions

As part of the program self-audit, the admission process was reviewed. Interviews were held with program leadership and staff assistants that identified the current process and documentation. Admissions file documents were then collected for the identified sample students.

Utah State University's Instructional Leadership program developed eight steps to the application process. These steps were designed with a dual purpose: to collect documentation required by the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) for recommendation for administrative licensure; and, the process provided a screening procedure to ensure a minimal level of student preparation for graduate level courses and leadership experience.
The admission process was designed to include:
1. An application form that included two writing samples to identify minimum ability to write at the graduate level.

2. Three Letters of Recommendation that asked respondents to rate leadership potential. Recommendations were evaluated for ratings and also whether the recommendations included the candidate's current principal and a recommender from district office. These recommendations were intended to screen candidates for leadership ability by their current leaders.

3. An application fee was collected.

4. An official transcript showing the award of Master's degree as part of USBE requirements. (this document was not required for those seeking a MEd in Instructional Leadership.)

5. Candidates provided a copy of their current teaching license. (A level 2 teaching license is required by USBE for licensure recommendation.)

6. Evidence that candidate cleared the USBE fingerprint background check was submitted (USBE requirement).

7. Candidates provided a copy of their last evaluation to show evidence that their teaching was deemed effective or higher to screen their instructional ability.

8. A personal interview was held by telephone that asked questions to determine current understanding and biases relating to the current Utah Instructional Leadership Standards.

In addition to these requirements, those applying to the MEd in Instructional Leadership program were required to meet all requirements for admission to Utah State University's graduate school. This included an application, minimum 3.0 GPA in previous coursework, a GRE or Miller's Analogy test with a score above the 40th percentile, and additional letters of recommendation. Program leadership and staff stated that one graduate admission requirement could be waved for students.

Each of these admission requirements were audited for the sample students. Data is presented in the chart below.

Admission Requirements		MEd IL Student									ASC Licensure Only Student								
		201430	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830	201540	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830
1. MEd Completers met graduate school admission requirements	a. GPA >3.0	3.6	3.6	3.9	4	3.3	3.9	3.7	3	3.6									
	b. GRE or MAT > 40th Percentile	95		85		94	79	99	45										
2. All completers met ASC admission requirements	a. ASC application	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y			Y
	b. 3 appropriate LOR	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3			3
	c. ASC fee	Y			Y	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	d. Level II license	N		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				Y
	e. > Effective evaluation								Y										Y
	f. 70% of interview points	71	79	75	77			85	72	64	76	66	82	73	82		68	70	43
3. ASC only addmission	a. Transcript showing MEd											Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y

Findings

There were a number of admission documents missing as indicated by the blank cells in the chart. Through the leadership and staff interviews the probable cause was identified. Two years ago, the staff assistant who collected and organized the documents moved to a new position in a different department. The person who replaced her was reorganizing the files based on her preferences when she unexpectedly passed away. This unexpected change in staffing and systems was identified as the main cause of the missing documents. Only the current staff assistant historically has had access to all documents.

In the leadership interviews, the outgoing program advisor indicated that at the conclusion of each semester's interview all candidate applications were reviewed for completion. This indicated that at one point all student files were complete. Thus, it is concluded that the missing files are due to a change in staffing issue and not a non-compliance issue. Interviews indicated that candidates were not admitted if more than one graduate school criterion was missing. An example observed was of a recent student applicant for the MEd program had a previous GPA of 2.8 and a GRE score in the 39th percentile in quantitative reasoning. He was advised that he need to raise one or the other. He opted to take the Miller's Analogy Test and received a score in the 80th percentile. He was then admitted to the program. Of the data that was collected in the sample, there were no instances where program candidates did not meet the admission requirements.

Recommendations

As a result of self-audit, the program leadership and staff have identified a new system for collecting all documents into one data system—a one file per student data system. The audit

provided a list for staff assistants of required documents. The self-audit has resulted in the staff developing a new data management system that collects all documentation in one data system and has increased accessibility of documents to the program leadership/advisors.

Program and Courses

The self-audit reviewed three course criterion:
1. Was all coursework completed with a grade of B- or higher? This query measured completion of all courses with expected minimum learning within coursework.
2. If a substitute/transfer course was accepted, was documentation of course review and acceptance present? This question measured compliance of accepted coursework with outlined coursework.
3. How many semesters did it take completers to finish their program? This measure indicates timeliness of program completion.

Program and Courses		MEd IL Student									ASC Licensure Only Student								
		201540	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830	201540	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830
1. Completed required courses	a. All courses completed with B- or higher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	y	Y
	b. Documentation of substitue acceptance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	c. Number of semesters to complete	5	5	5	3	11	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3

Findings

All sample students completed all coursework above the minimum B- standard. In the review of sample student transcripts, only two of the selected students had any grades lower than an A-.

Of the randomly selected students, no students had transfer credit or substituted courses on their transcript. Advisor interviews indicated that transfer or substitute course credit has been evaluated and documented. The transfer/substitute evaluation was reported in the interviews as averaging one to two students per semester. As none of the sample students had transfer or substitute credit, the documentation was not present in any university files reviewed.
MEd program completion time averaged 4.8 semesters. There was one outlier in the student sample that took 11 semesters to complete the program. 77% of students completed the program in five semesters.

The ASC program completion time averaged 3.4 semesters. There were no outliers in this group with 55% of students completing the program in three semesters. 45% of students completed in four semesters.

Recommendations

As findings were reviewed, the review team found that course completion and performance were acceptable. The completion time was reasonable and acceptable. Documentation of any transfer/substitute course acceptance will become part of the one file per student data system recommended under admission recommendations.

<div align="center">Faculty and Infrastructure</div>

This section of the program self-audit evaluated the qualifications of course instructors and the delivery method of instruction. Student transcripts were evaluated to determine the percentage of courses taught by instructors with a PhD or EdD. The percentage of courses taught by an adjunct instructor was also measured.

Students had the option of attending a blended summer course where a week of instruction was delivered in a face-to-face format with the remaining weeks delivered in an online format. During fall and spring semesters courses are delivered in a synchronous online format. Results were as follows:

Faculty & Infrastructure		MEd IL Student									ASC Licensure Only Student								
		201540	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830	201540	201620	201630	201640	201720	201730	201740	201820	201830
1. Instructors highly qualified	a. % of courses instructor with PhD or EdD	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	b. % of courses taught by adjunct	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
2. % of courses by delivery method	a. # of synchronous courses	6	7	6	7	11	2	7	9	5	8	9	2	7	8	7	8	9	6
	b. # of blended courses	5	4	5	4	0	9	4	2	6	3	2	9	4	3	4	3	2	5

Findings

All instructors were found to be highly qualified. All program instructors, whether faculty or adjunct, held a PhD or EdD. Two courses of the eleven program courses were consistently taught by adjunct instructors: TEAL 6740 School Law and TEAL 6500 School Finance. Faculty interviews indicate that there has been loose supervision and support for adjunct instructors. Sample students averaged 6.9 courses in the synchronous course format. The group averaged 4.1 courses taken in the blended format. The variance for the number of synchronous courses was 5.16 for the 11 courses. The standard deviation was 2.27. The Variance for the synchronous courses was 4.87 with the standard deviation as 2.27.

Faculty interviews have indicated a wide range of student desires pertaining to delivery method. They report that some distance students do not like the blended courses as the only option for summer as it requires additional travel/housing costs.

Recommendations

As a result of the self-audit, the number of courses taught by adjunct instructors will be reduced. It is recommended that when an adjunct is used regularly to fill a need, the course will be taught and reviewed by a faculty member at least every three years. This recommendation is intended to reduce any drift from course objectives or the program/state requirements. It is also recommended that each adjunct instructor be assigned a point-of-contact faculty member. This will allow a faculty member to mentor the adjunct instructor. To meet the needs of the wide variety of program students, it is recommended to increase the number of courses taught in a synchronous format during the summer while still maintaining some options for the blended/face-to-face options in a pilot program. Students will then be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of the pilot offerings.

Appendix F: Missional commitments and distinct contributions

In keeping with the original land-grant mission of providing educational opportunities for people living in rural and remote areas of the state, and consistent with the early efforts of the National Summer School of the 1920's, Utah State University's Regional Campuses currently 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 the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services's reach to provide higher education to students throughout Utah and around the world. Through distance education, Utah State University has the ability to deliver classes via interactive broadcast to every county in Utah. Great effort is taken to ensure that the quality of the regional campus courses is equivalent to the courses offered on the main campus. We are one university, geographically dispersed. Students can enroll in programs at all of the regional campuses, which are located in Brigham City, Uintah Basin, and Tooele. There are additional smaller sites where students can take classes in selected programs. A complete map of USU's regional campuses can be viewed here: regionalcampuses.usu.edu. Not every program is available at every campus due to Board of Regents policy (R315) that regulates service areas for all of the public institutions of higher education in Utah: higheredutah.org

Distinguishing Features of the Instructional Leadership Program:

1. The program has been known for increasing access to administrative licensure throughout Utah by the use of distance education technologies. Over its history, courses have been delivered using a variety of delivery systems and formats, including both audio and video components, carried over phone lines, satellite, and the Internet. Currently, courses are delivered during Fall and Spring Semesters using the Canvas course management system, and WebEx, an interactive internet-based videoconferencing system, allowing students to participate in course meetings wherever they have access to a high-speed internet connection. The system provides full audio and video interaction and access to instructional materials and presentation software.
2. 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. Because of the intensity of the compressed time frame, students are limited to four courses during the Summer Session.
3. The internship element of the program consists 450 hours of applied internship as outlined in the rules of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE). This link, http://www.teal.usu.edu/graduate/instructional-leadership/internships provides the USBE Internship rules and the tools used to document the internship experiences. The internship experience culminates with a 2 credit hour internship seminar (TEAL 6930) during which students meet to share experiences and insights from the internships, and complete reflective assignments to bring the experience to a logical conclusion.
4. Students are able to complete the program at their own pace with limited sequencing of coursework, and flexibility in selecting the location and timing of the internship experience.
5. 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. Minutes and agendas of selected meetings can be viewed at this link: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

Appendix G: Data quality appendix: reliability, validity, fairness, trustworthiness

The program utilizes a multi-method, multi-source approach to collect data for program monitoring and improvement. The data is primarily drawn from the following six sources.

1. Praxis Test Scores with Subscale scores for each UEL Standard

The Praxis exam is a nationally accepted measure of content knowledge in the area of administration and leadership. The exam provides subscale scores that in six areas that align with the ISSLC Standards. In this case, the Utah Education Leadership Standards are derived directly from the ISSLC Standards, allowing the subscale scores to support the students understanding of each UEL Standard. The subscale scores effectively connect this content knowledge to each of the UEL Standards. While ETS does not provide norming data for these scores, we observe encouraging consistency across the scoring for the standard subscales.

2. Standards Based Curriculum Matrix

We have periodically examined our curriculum through the lens of the UEL Standards to determine how our courses align with the standards. The table outlining the alignment of our courses with the UELS Standards is here:

3. Internship Experiences List

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. USBE has used this document as a model in the development of the new internship requirements adopted over the past two years. Students must complete internship logs documenting their experiences bi-monthly. Internship Experiences

4. Final Internship Evaluation, section for each UEL Standard

The Final Internship Evaluation was developed by combining the reflective elements of the leadership portfolio used in past years and the Utah Education Leadership Standards. In addition to reflective comments from students for each standard, it provides assessments of the internship experience by the mentor principals and Internship supervisor, as well as a self-assessment. Students internship logs are verified by mentor principals and Internship supervisors. End of Internship Report

5. INSPIRE Survey

The INSPIRE Survey was developed by the University Council for Educational Administration. They have conducted reliability and validity testing, and the survey is quickly gaining acceptance nationally. Summaries of INSPIRE Surveys and validity and reliability documentation are found here: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership

6. Focus Groups with Superintendents and Curriculum Directors

The Program has conducted focus group meetings with a sample of Superintendents and Curriculum Directors from school districts with whom we work closely, and who have a history of employing our graduates. Focus group questions were developed by the Associate Dean with support and feedback from instructional leaderhship faculty. Purposeful sampling was utilized to identify Superintendents who had hired a significant number of our graduates. One focus group was conducted with three to four Superintendents present. Notes and summaries from these meetings are available at the following link: https://cehs.usu.edu/evidence-room/instructional-leadership