



AAQEP Annual Report for 2021

Provider/Program Name: Utah State University – Instructional Leadership

End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited): 06/23/26

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

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

Utah State University (USU) is a land-grant institution with a main campus in Logan, UT. Its Carnegie classification is RU/H, a research university with high research activity. As of Fall 2020, USU enrolled 27,691 students, including 6,352 students on statewide campuses and 1,770 international students.

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

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

Statewide Campuses

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

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

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

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

- No. 1 College of Education in Utah for the 21st Year in a Row
- No. 32 on the National List of Best Graduate Schools of Education (top 11.5% of all U.S. schools)
- No. 35 Nationally in Best Online Master's in Education Programs
- No. 12 Nationally in Funded Research with \$40 million

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

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

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

Instructional Leadership

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

In 2010, TEAL was authorized to offer a specialization in instructional leadership within the existing M.Ed. programs in elementary education and secondary education. Effective in 2011, the program received approval to become a Master of Education Degree in Instructional Leadership. 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

- **Course Delivery.** The program has been known for increasing access to administrative licensure throughout Utah by the use of distance education. Over its history, courses have been delivered using a variety of systems and formats. In the past two years, courses have been delivered online (synchronously and asynchronously) using Zoom and Canvas. Summer courses have traditionally been offered in a Hybrid model over seven weeks, including one week at the USU Brigham City Campus, with the remaining six weeks online. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, summer courses have been offered only online since the Summer 2020 semester.

Students, especially those enrolled in the licensure-only program are able to complete the program at their own pace because all licensure courses are offered every year and because there is flexibility in selecting the location and timing of the internship experience.

- **Internship.** Historically, and for students included in the data points for this annual report, the internship element of the program has consisted of 450 hours of applied internship as outlined in the rules of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE). However, the USBE changed the internship requirements in 2018 and students now focus on completing a number of required internship experiences across the Utah Educational Leadership standards and no longer are required to complete a certain number of internship hours. Internship experience culminates with an internship seminar during which students complete assignments to bring the experience to a logical conclusion.
- **Faculty.** In the 2020-2021 academic year, the core Instructional Leadership faculty group consisted of three full-time faculty supplemented with a group of adjunct faculty with credentials specific to the courses they teach (e.g., School Law). 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.

The program has two strands: 1) the Administrative/Supervisory Concentration (ASC) program, which is a licensure-only program consisting of 30 credits of coursework for students who hold a master's degree prior to admission (required for Utah Administrative Licensure), and 2) the M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership (M.Ed.) program, consisting of 36 credits and including a set of courses addressing a curriculum and instruction core.

New Longitudinal Data

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

2020-2021 Annual Review Highlights

- 56% of 2020-2021 graduates complete their programs in the expected time to completion; 92% within 1.5 times the expected time to completion.
- At program exit, 96% of our 2020-2021 graduates passed the Praxis Exam 5411 exam (100% after two attempts).
- 87% of 2020-2021 graduates agreed or strongly agreed that the program prepared them for the duties and responsibilities of an education leader.
- 18.7% of 2020-2021 graduates had acquired a school leadership position at the conclusion of their program.

Public Posting URL

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

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

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows enrollment and completion data from the most recently completed academic year for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2020-2021

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution/organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates currently enrolled	Number of Completers in 2020-21
Administrative/Supervisory Concentration (only)	Administrative/Supervisory Licensure	49*	25

M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership	Administrative/Supervisory Licensure	10*	11
	TOTALS:	59*	36

* We admit students every semester, however, we chose one time point to provide data on 2020-2021. These numbers are based on Fall 2021 enrollment.

Added or Discontinued Programs

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

n/a

3. Program Performance Indicators

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

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

1. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
59
2. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
36
3. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
35

4. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

We indicate on our website: <https://teal.usu.edu/graduate/med-il> and specifically in the Informational Video for the IL/ASC that the average time to completion is 3-4 semesters for the Administrative/Supervisory Concentration and 5 semesters for the M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership, or 4.5 - 6 years and 7.5, respectively for 1.5 times the expected time frame. Disaggregated by program, the data are as follows for 2020-2021 completers.

Administrative/Supervisory Concentration-only:

- Average time to completion: 4 semesters (range: 2 – 9 semesters; mode: 3 semesters)
- Percent of students who complete within expected time frame (3-4 semesters): 52%
- Percent of students who complete within 1.5 times the expected time frame (4.5 - 6 semesters): 96%

M.Ed. in Instructional Leadership:

- Average time to completion: 5 semesters (range: 4 - 10 semesters; mode: 5 semesters)
- Percent of students who complete within expected time frame (5 semesters): 64%
- Percent of students who complete within 1.5 times the expected time frame (7.5 semesters): 82%

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

The Praxis 5412: Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision (<https://www.ets.org/praxis/prepare/materials/5412>), administered by ETS, is required for licensure in the state of Utah, with a passing score of 146. For 2020-2021 completers, final passing Praxis scores ranged from 153 - 189, with a mean score of 171.12, and modes of 171 and 175. The initial pass rate (passing on the first try) is 94% (two students who did not pass the Praxis on the first try passed on their second try).

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

Program Completers: 2020-2021

Program completers complete the INSPIRE, an annual survey conducted by the Utah Education Policy Center at the University of Utah (<https://uepc.utah.edu/our-work/inspire-leadership/>) and completed by all principal preparation programs within the state of Utah. Our survey completion rate for 2020-2021 program completers was 92.3% ($n = 36$ responders) and a summary of our survey findings (aggregated, as raw data on the specific program strand of the student-ASC only or M.Ed. are not available). Items are rated on a "1" to "5" scale (with a mid-point of 2.5 = average, 3.75-5 = highly above average).

Program Relevance and Rigor. Completers rated the relevance and rigor of their program and coursework. **All items were rated, on average, from 4.0 – 4.3,** indicating that program completers rated the **program’s relevance and rigor (e.g., coherence, challenge, reflection, integrated theory and practice, varied and engaging instruction, strong orientation towards profession) as highly above average.**

Faculty Quality. Completers rated the program faculty on their: knowledge, instructional competence, responsiveness to students, respectfulness of diversity, and value and support of students. **All items under this category were rated, on average, 4.2 – 4.3,** indicating that completers rated the **program’s quality of faculty as highly above average.**

Peer Relationships. Completers rated to what extent peer relationships developed through the program are close in nature and influenced their professional and personal growth. **Survey items within this component were rated, on average, 2.7 – 3.8,** indicating that completers rated the **program’s effectiveness in fostering peer relationships as above average to highly above average.**

Program Accessibility. Under program accessibility, completers rated the: convenience of timing and location of course offerings, effectiveness of online options, costs, and admission requirements. **These items were rated, on average, 3.0 – 4.3** indicating that completers rated the **program’s accessibility as average to highly above average.** Note: costs incurred by students (e.g., tuition, fees, books), was rated the lowest ($M = 3.0$) under this topic.

Curriculum. In the area of curriculum, completers rated their preparation in core leadership concepts: organizational culture, instructional leadership, school improvement, management, family and community relations, and technology. **These areas were rated, on average, 3.3 – 4.2,** indicating that completers rated the **program’s curriculum as above average to highly above average.** Note: technologies to relevant future administrative work was rated the lowest ($M = 3.3$) under this topic.

Candidate Assessment. This area was a newly added area of the survey to assess to what extent the program makes decisions about students’ knowledge and skill development throughout the program (e.g., formative assessments, mid-program review, final summative assessment). **These areas were rated, on average, 3.6 – 4.1,** indicating that completers rated the **program’s curriculum as above average to highly above average.**

Internship Residency/Quality. Completers rated the effectiveness of their internship, including experiences, developing important perspectives, engagement with colleagues, experience with relevant responsibilities, regular evaluation, adequate opportunities for application, and access and engagement with students from a variety of backgrounds. **These items were rated, on average, 3.4 – 4.5,** indicating that completers rated the **program’s internship as above average to highly above average.**

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

- Ethics and Professional Norms (item means: 4.1 – 4.4)
- Strategic Leadership (item means: 3.9 – 4.2)
- Operations and Management (item means: 3.8 – 3.9)
- Instructional Leadership (item means: 3.7 – 3.9)
- Professional and Organizational Culture (item means: 3.9 – 4.2)
- Supportive and Equitable Learning Environment (item means: 4.0 – 4.1)
- Family and Community Engagement (item means: 3.8 – 4.1)

Across all 45 learning outcomes, 44 or 97.78% were rated as highly above average.

Overall Quality of Preparation. Completers rated, on average, the preparation program a 4.1 for preparing candidates for the duties and responsibilities of an education leader (87% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement). Completers rated, on average, the preparation program a 4.3 for having a good reputation in the state or region (94% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement).

Program Completers (~ 2015- on): Longitudinal Evidence

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

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

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

- Other (8.2%)

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

Perceptions of Preparation. Those who responded to the survey indicating they held a building-level leadership position ($n = 51$) were asked to rate how well their principal preparation program prepared them to be a successful school leader as rated on the [Utah Educational Leadership Standards](#) (UELS; 2018), using a Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well). The UELS (2018) represent 40 indicators that organize into 7 leadership strands. **Survey respondents employed as building-level leaders reported their principal preparation program as preparing them, on average (across all 39 items), a 3.97 out of 5 (adequately).** Item means organized by strand are presented below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

In response to the need to gather better evidence *on our completers after they complete our program and their effectiveness once they adapt to the profession*, in fall 2021 the Instructional Leadership program worked in collaboration with Dr. Sylvia Read

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Program Completers: 2020-2021

The INSPIRE survey for 2020-2021 completers is administered at the conclusion of the semester in which students complete their program. At the time of survey administration responders ($n = 36$; 92.3% of our graduates), 18.7% of 2020-2021 completers were employed as an assistant principal or principal. An additional 21.9% were employed as a teacher leader or district leader. 46.9% were currently employed as a teacher, and 12.5% listed "other" as employment. Of those not employed as a school leader, 44% indicated the intent to go into school leadership as soon as possible. 56% indicated plans to go into school leadership "some day". No responders were undecided or indicated they did not plan to go into school leadership.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Praxis	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 Instructional Leadership: Administration and Supervision (5412). Completers must achieve a passing score of 146 to qualify for licensure.	Final passing Praxis scores for 2020-2021, final passing Praxis scores ranged from 153 - 189, with a mean score of 171.12, and modes of 171 and 175. The initial pass rate (passing on the first try) is 96% (two students who did not pass the Praxis on the first try passed on their second try). Pass rate, considering all attempts, is 100%.

	For successful performance, we expect an initial pass rate of 95% and an all-attempt pass rate of 100%.	Our expectations for successful performance were met.
Internship Experiences List	<p>Students in our program are asked to complete a list of Internship Experiences. While 41 experiences are listed, not all are required.</p> <p>For successful performance, we expect that a majority of students have acquired all 41 experiences.</p>	For completers in which data were readily accessible ($n = 30$), completers completed on average, 33.26 experiences with a range of 19 – 41 and a mode of 41. 73% of completers completed at least 75% of the internship experiences (at least 30 of the experiences). While we determine this to be reflective of COVID-19 operating times and the additional strains placed on our completers, we are working to revise our Internship Experiences List to increase our number of required experiences.

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Survey of completers	We expect that completers will rate the program average to above average on all components of the INSPIRE survey.	On all Likert-rated components, completers rated all items on program effectiveness in the INSPIRE survey as above average or highly above average, exceeding our performance expectation.
Survey of graduates (longitudinal) – selected sub-set (those employed as building level school leaders)	We expect graduates to rate their program preparation as adequate or better (well, very well) on all UELS.	On all Likert-rated components, graduates (~2015 – on, employed as a building-level school leader) rated their preparation on

		all UELS as adequate or better, exceeding our performance expectation.
Survey of supervisors of graduates (longitudinal)	We expect supervisors of our graduates to rate their program preparation as adequate or better (well, very well) on all UELS (considering their effectiveness as current school leaders).	On all Likert-rated components, supervisors of our graduates (~2015 – on) who are currently employed as building-level school leaders rated the preparation of those graduates on all UELS as adequate or better, exceeding our performance expectation.

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, current priorities, and innovations that are in plan or process.

Due to changes in Instructional Leadership faculty, development of USU’s Principal Preparation Program Advisory Board was delayed until Fall 2021. During the fall of 2021, USU’s Principal Preparation Program Advisory Board was established with 8 participating districts. Our first kick-off meeting is scheduled to occur on January 14th, 2021. The district representatives consist of Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Principal Supervisors as part of the Advisory Group.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

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

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing growth and improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Std.	Strengths, Needs, and Goals/Opportunities by Standard		Priorities to Be Addressed	Action Plan/ Steps to Be Taken	Steps Taken/ Outcomes (Reflection)
1	Strength	We have quality data to indicate that we demonstrate effectiveness in meeting Standard 1.			
	Need	Continue to engage in re-design to enhance how we address USBE-adopted competency-based approach	Utah Educational Leadership Standards (UELS) (https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/888a20c7-60f1-40d5-bc86-a7d2952a10bc) has driven program re-design (also see Standard 3)	Continue to engage in re-design all ASC courses to meet the new standards	We have completed an MOU to re-design coursework, met regularly to plan re-design efforts and align standards with re-designed courses; engaged in regular meetings with USBE, superintendents, and other preparation programs on rubrics and related competencies.
	Goal				Monitor status of re-design efforts that were disrupted by faculty

					turnover and re-start efforts when fully staffed.
2	Strength	Strong INSPIRE survey data completion rates (92.3%) in combination with strong response rates (approximately 40%) of graduates from the last 5 years and supervisors of those graduates and data from those three surveys provide strong evidence of the program's effectiveness in meeting Standard 2. The latter two surveys were developed and launched in the last year.			
	Need	Gather more and better feedback from and engage in more collaboration with stakeholders on program development.	Need to also gather feedback from partner districts on high need areas for leadership development.	Develop Principal Preparation Advisory Board	Developed Principal Preparation Advisory Board (composed of 10 districts)
	Goal				First PPAG meeting is scheduled for January 14 th , 2022. Hold meetings annual to gather feedback.
3	Strength	Internship experiences (evidence of experiences) and ratings by program completers in INSPIRE survey provide strong evidence of meeting Standard 3; ASC			

		interview questions updated to reflect new UELS			
	Need	Re-design to address the recently USBE-adopted competency-based approach; increase number of required experiences in Internship Experiences List	The removal of the required 450 internship hours in favor of a competency-based approach has driven program re-design (in combination with changes addressed in Standard 1); determine which experiences are most important in Internship Experiences List	Re-design all ASC courses to embed competency-based measures as well as identify basic concept knowledge, application, and demonstration of all UELS across courses; gather initial feedback from Internship Supervisors on Internship Experience List	We have completed an MOU to re-design coursework, met regularly to plan re-design efforts and align standards with re-designed courses; engaged in regular meetings with USBE, superintendents, and other preparation programs on rubrics and related competencies; we met with Internship Supervisors in August 2021 and gathered feedback on additional required experiences.
	Goal				Monitor status of re-design efforts that were disrupted by faculty turnover and re-start efforts when fully staffed; Gather additional feedback on required experiences from Principal Preparation Advisory Board

4	Strength	Strong INSPIRE survey data completion rates (92.3%) in combination with strong response rates (approximately 40%) of graduates from the last 5 years and supervisors of those graduates and data from those three surveys provide strong evidence of the program's effectiveness in meeting Standard 4. The latter two surveys were developed and launched in the last year.			
	Need	Data matrix exercises (described in our Plan of Action from original accreditation visit) indicated a gap in Standard 6A - community engagement	Make a plan to increase a focus on Standard 6A	Have designated a course to address this in our re-design plans	Have designated a course (TEAL 6330: Leadership in the School Community Engagement) to address this in our re-design plans, used qualitative feedback from INSPIRE surveys and the USBE application open-ended responses to identify a course to remove (or swap out). We assigned a faculty member to the course re-design efforts.
	Goal				TEAL 6330 has gone through the USU approval process and will be approved in time

					to be offered Summer 2022. Due to staffing challenges, we hope to have a new faculty member to develop and offer this course for the first time Fall 2022.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Overall Comments in Response to Evidence

Optional explanation or elaboration on the findings noted in the final column of Table 5.

N/A.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted).

N/A.

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

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

Current challenges include being under-staffed with significant retirement/turnover within Instructional Leadership faculty in recent years. We intended to be a faculty group of four this year, but the program is currently being run by only two faculty members. This reduction in resources has slowed our efforts towards re-design – a challenge we noted last year that unfortunately has persisted and is even more dire in the current year. Hiring two outstanding faculty members is our main priority for the 2021-2022 year.

9. Regulatory Changes

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

N/A.

10. Sign Off

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

Date sent to AAQEP:

12/20/21