



Advanced Programs Effectiveness Reports 2024-25 Academic Year

Included are the 2024–25 annual reports for our three advanced programs:

- Principal Preparation (MEd in Instructional Leadership)
- School Counseling (MA in School Counseling)
- Teacher Leadership / Learner-Centered Practices / Systems (MEd series)

Each report includes an executive summary to make them quicker and easier to review. The summaries highlight key data points, progress toward standards, and areas of focus for improvement.

Some overall highlights:

- Strong candidate outcomes and high pass rates on licensure exams
- Positive feedback from graduates—especially around equity, leadership prep, and field experience
- Continued state approval through EPSB, and solid progress toward CAEP standards
- Action plans in place for 2025–26 based on data and stakeholder input with explicit connections to Spalding’s Program Outcome Report Cards (PORC)



**Master of Education in Teacher Leadership
Master of Education in Learner-Centered Practices
Master of Education in Learner-Centered Systems
Program Effectiveness Report
2024-25 Academic Year**

Prepared by:

Glenn S. Baete, EdD
Director of Advanced Programs
College of Education
June 2025

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Program Redesign: Partnership with 2Revolutions	7
Program Review Process	
Follow Up Study of Graduates	8
Course Survey Data	13
Key Assessment Review	
Anchor Assessments	15
Capstone	17
Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year	19
Improvement Plan 2025-26 Academic Year	20
Action Plan for 2025-26 Academic Year	22
Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting	23

Executive Summary
Spalding University: Master of Education in Teacher Leader
Master of Education in Learner-Centered Systems
Master of Education in Learner-Centered Practices
2024-25 Annual Report

The 2024–25 Annual Report reflects a year of strong performance, innovation, and strategic advancement for Spalding University’s advanced education programs, including the Master of Education in Teacher Leadership (MEd-TL), Master of Education in Learner-Centered Practices (MEd-LCP), and Master of Education in Learner-Centered Systems (MEd-LCS). These programs continue to demonstrate alignment with national and state standards while preparing graduates to lead in learner-centered, equity-driven P–12 environments.

Program Innovation and Redesign

In collaboration with 2Revolutions and Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), Spalding advanced its integration of Competency-Based Learning (CBL) and launched three new post-baccalaureate certificates to expand access to learner-centered education frameworks. Curricular revisions ensured continued alignment with the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS) and the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, reinforcing the development of teachers as instructional leaders and change agents.

Teacher Leader Model Standards Integration

All program assessments and anchor tasks were mapped to TLMS domains. Analysis of 2024–25 Anchor Assessment data revealed exceptional candidate proficiency:

- Over 97% of assessment criteria across all programs were rated as “Accomplished” or “Exemplary.”
- TLMS domains with the highest mastery included Facilitating Improvements in Student Learning (97.22%), Fostering a Collaborative Culture (96.67%), and Promoting Professional Learning (95.83%).
- All TLMS domains exceeded the 94% benchmark threshold, reinforcing the program’s effectiveness in preparing educators to lead instructional improvement and systemic transformation.

Candidate and Stakeholder Feedback

Graduate follow-up surveys showed strong satisfaction with program preparation. The

2024–25 cohort reported an average score of 4.90/5.00 across 16 competencies, significantly outperforming previous cohorts. Course survey data from 226 responses indicated marked year-over-year gains in instructional design, faculty feedback, and course relevance—validating changes in teaching practices and program structure.

CAEP and EPSB Accreditation Work

Throughout the academic year, the College undertook significant efforts to ensure continued accreditation through both the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB):

- The CAEP Self-Study and Annual Report were submitted, with data satisfying standards A.5.1 through A.5.5, including measures of candidate progress, completer effectiveness, and program improvement.
- The EPSB Continued Program Review confirmed compliance with Kentucky’s requirements for advanced programs, specifically those related to TLMS and quality assurance indicators.
- The program’s use of multiple measures and sustained stakeholder engagement met the expectations outlined in CAEP’s continuous improvement framework and EPSB’s Domains of Program Quality.

Improvement Goals and Results (2024–25)

All five annual improvement goals were met, including:

- High rates of proficiency (96–100%) on culminating tasks in research, assessment, and instructional leadership courses.
- Successful integration of TLMS across coursework and assessments.
- Growth in enrollment, with 70 candidates participating in advanced programs.
- Compliance with state and national accreditation bodies.

Strategic Improvement Plan (2025–26)

The forthcoming improvement plan prioritizes:

- Deepened integration of TLMS-aligned competencies across all program components.
- Expanded partnerships with districts for CBL implementation and field-based learning.
- Improved calibration of faculty assessments and increased use of practitioner inquiry tools.
- Enhanced stakeholder engagement through biannual advisory meetings and completer outcome tracking.

Through sustained alignment with the Teacher Leader Model Standards, rigorous self-assessment against CAEP and EPSB expectations, and a culture of continuous improvement,

Spalding University's advanced programs remain a model for effective educator preparation. Graduates are well-equipped to lead innovation, equity, and excellence in schools across Kentucky and beyond.

Introduction

Assessment of candidate, program, and unit operations is an underpinning component of the professional education unit at Spalding University. Candidates in advanced programs are regularly assessed at various intervals throughout the program. The unit's continual collection and analysis of candidate provides program data purposed to identify patterns of performance. This analysis may lead to pausing questions about whether changes are needed. The feedback loop consists of formative feedback, plans for improvement, summative feedback, evaluation decisions, and revision and renewal. The sequence of these elements leads toward improved candidate outcomes.

Spalding University's College of Education (COE) is committed to recruiting, preparing, and graduating candidates that are prepared to positively impact the P-12 environments in which they serve. The GATES Unit Continuous Assessment System (GATES QAS) utilized by the COE is aligned with standards set forth by Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Specifically, CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity, requires the following:

3.4 – The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all these domains.

3.5 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the

profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards considering new results.

The UCAS established by the COE is designed to ensure a deliberate and thoughtful process for recruiting and selecting candidates for both Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Furthermore, the UCAS provides an objective framework that COE faculty can utilize for the purpose of substantive review of candidate progress through COE Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Additionally, the UCAS enables the Director of Advanced Programs to approve and conscientiously place candidates in field experiences that are congruent with the candidate's professional growth needs and area of certification.

The UCAS requires faculty to collaboratively review candidate progress regarding dispositions, grade point average, course completion, and field experience requirements. COE faculty review the UCAS at two points during the academic year – at the conclusion of the Fall and Spring academic terms. Decisions regarding candidate progression through the UCAS will be documented in the minutes of the faculty meetings during which UCAS data is reviewed.

The assessments selected by Spalding University to determine Teacher Leadership Preparation Program effectiveness (Anchor Assessments and Capstone) support quality and strategic evaluation and continuous improvements standards and indicators identified by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), Standard 5- Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement, and Education Administration Performance Assessment Areas identified by the Kentucky Department of Education's Office of Educator Licensure and Effectiveness (OELE). These areas include candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; professional capabilities; data and research-driven decision making; and integration of technology into the discipline.

Ongoing and continuous monitoring of candidate progress is the joint responsibility of program faculty and the Department Chair. Assessments and evaluations of candidates in initial and advance level education programs at Spalding University should be aligned to the appropriate state or national standards. The Master of Education in Teacher Leadership is

aligned to the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS) and InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards identified in 16 KAR 5:010.

This report contains information from the Program Review Process and data from each of the assessed areas of the program Quality Assurance Plan (QAP). These multiple measures are consistent with CAEP Standard A.5.1 to “monitor candidate progress, completer achievement, and provider operational effectiveness.” The annual report satisfies CAEP Standard A.5.2 to “rely on relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations are valid and consistent.”

The data outlined in this report will be used to compare progress towards meeting the TLMS and InTASC standards associated with a particular item, task, or assessment. This formal process that will be completed by university faculty and district partners aligns with CAEP Standard A.5.3 to “regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards, test innovations, use results to improve elements and processes.”

As the conclusion of this report, an improvement plan will be articulated to identify specific benchmarked goals and specific activities necessary to improve outcomes measured in the six analyses. Activities will include actions that include curriculum review and alignment, reviewing assessments, and collaboration with school districts to determine Teacher Leadership Program instructional priorities. The development of a collaborative plan aligns to CAEP Standard A.5.4 and A.5.5 that “involves alumni, employers, and practitioners” and ensures that outcomes are “benchmarking, shared, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.”

Program Redesign- Partnership with 2Revolutions

In the Fall of 2020, a collaboration between Spalding, Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) Teaching and Learning staff, and 2Revolutions, was formed to revise the Master of Education in Teacher Leadership to include a Competency-Based Learning (CBL) specialization and to develop a new Certificate in Competency-Based Education (CBE). 2Revolutions is a national education design lab striving to transform the American education system by working with entrepreneurial leaders and practitioners to design, build, and implement new learning

models. As Spalding and 2Revolutions had previously provided instructional training and support to Jefferson County Public Schools, a collaborative effort was established to provide teachers in JCPS with the skills and dispositions necessary to implement CBL and the JCPS Backpack of Success Skills.

Elements of the Spalding/2Revolutions Partnership Include:

- Recruiting and supporting adjunct instructors with a proven history of implementation and/or leading schools in Competency-Based Education,
- Review and Refinement of Teacher Leadership curriculum and assessments to include Competency-Based Education practices, and
- Collaboration between Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) and other school districts regionally and nationally to identify teachers to participate in the cohort and make programmatic adjustments to meet district strategic priorities.

Results from this Effectiveness Report include the third full-year cohort of the Certificate in Competency-Based Education, the Master of Education in Teacher Leadership with a Specialization in Competency-Based Learning, and two new programs launched in the Fall of 2023: Master of Education in Learner-Centered Practices (LCP) and Master of Education in Learner-Centered Systems (LCS). During the 2024-25 academic year, three (3) new post baccalaureate certificate programs were launched: Certificate in Learner-Centered Pedagogy, Certificate in Learner-Centered Mentoring and Coaching, and Certificate in Learner-Centered Mentoring and Coaching. In this report, results from the MEd in Teacher Leadership, MEd in Learner-Centered Practices, and MEd in Learner-Centered Systems programs will be combined for program analysis.

Program Review Process

Follow Up Study of Graduates

During the Spring of 2021, a mixed-methods explanatory study (Creswell et al., 2003) was developed to further analyze program effectiveness. During the qualitative phase of the study, the Program Director and the College of Education Department Chair facilitated a focus group containing Teacher Leadership Program graduates regarding their experiences in the Spalding program. Graduates were asked to reflect on their Spalding Teacher Leadership Preparation

experience, the program’s effectiveness in preparation for their current role as a teacher leader.

In the next phase of the study, a Teacher Leadership Program Survey was developed and sent to individuals completing the Teacher Leadership, Learner-Centered Practices, and Learner-Centered Systems programs during the 2024-25 academic year. The survey contains 16 items derived from InTASC standards and the Spalding University College of Education Conceptual Framework. To ensure validity of survey items, members of the program faculty and the Teacher Leadership Graduate Focus Group were asked to review items and provide commentary.

These individuals were asked to indicate their level of preparedness for the role of a teacher leader based on their experience in the Teacher Leadership, Learner-Centered Practices or Learner-Centered Systems programs at Spalding University. Three participants of the 2024-25 cohort (n = 3) responded to the survey with a response rate of xx%. The results of the survey are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Teacher Leader Program Survey: Item Analysis

Item	2024-25 Cohort (n = 3)		All Cohorts (n = 46)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>sd</i>
1. Design and implement learning experiences that are developmentally appropriate, challenging, and recognize learning and development patterns within and among learners (InTASC, 1)	5.00	.00	4.30	.69
2. Use understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures to enable students to meet high standards (InTASC, 2)	5.00	.00	4.26	.71
3. Create environments that support individual and collaborative learning and encourage positive interaction, engagement, and self-motivation (InTASC 3)	5.00	.00	4.26	.74
4. Understand standards and tools of inquiry to create learning experiences that	4.67	.58	4.13	.74

are meaningful to learners and ensure mastery of the content (InTASC 4)				
5. Connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problems in authentic learning tasks (InTASC, 5)	4.67	.58	4.28	.65
6. Utilize multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, monitor learner progress, and guide decision making (InTASC, 6)	4.67	.58	4.19	.71
7. Plan for instruction that supports every student in meeting learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum and cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy, and knowledge of learners and the community context (InTASC, 7)	4.67	.58	4.09	.83
8. Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and connections, and build skills to apply knowledge (InTASC, 8)	5.00	.00	4.17	.71
9. Engage in professional learning and use evidence to evaluate individual practice, its impact on others, and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner (InTASC, 9)	5.00	.00	4.26	.74
10. Seek leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for learning and to collaborate with others to ensure growth and advance the profession (InTASC, 10)	4.67	.58	4.11	.70
11. Demonstrate insight in creating a learning environment that empowers others to reach their potential (Spalding, 1)	5.00	.00	4.28	.74
12. Commit to fairness, and the principles of personal, academic, and professional integrity (Spalding, 2)	5.00	.00	4.45	.58
13. Show respect for self and others, open to diverse perspectives and cultures,	5.00	.00	4.51	.62

and perseveres in serving learners, families, schools and communities (Spalding, 3)				
14. Believes that all students can learn and is able to evaluate teaching and learning experiences for personal and professional growth (Spalding, 4)	5.00	.00	4.55	.58
15. Demonstrate flexibility in meeting student needs and use best practices to promote student learning (Spalding, 5)	5.00	.00	4.49	.59
16. Devotes self to acquiring knowledge about the context, pedagogy, and professional areas of teaching (Spalding, 6)	5.00	.00	4.47	.62
Average	4.90	.18	4.30	.68

An analysis of the results revealed that the 2024–25 cohort had an average mean score of 4.90 (out of 5) across the 16 survey items, with an average standard deviation of .18. These scores are substantially higher than the overall cohort mean ($M = 4.30$, $SD = .68$), which includes candidates from the 2022–23 through 2024–25 academic years. Higher-than-average mean responses, coupled with extremely low variability, suggest strong agreement among respondents and highly positive perceptions of the Teacher Leadership, Learner-Centered Practices, and Learner-Centered Systems programs.

It is important to note that only 3 of the 9 program graduates (33%) completed the 2024–25 survey. The small sample size ($n = 3$) limits the generalizability of the findings to the full graduating cohort. However, the uniformity and consistency of responses indicate that, for those who did participate, the program was perceived very positively. Approximately 42 candidates are projected to graduate in December 2025, and future reports will include data from this larger cohort to strengthen trend analysis and programmatic insights.

Items with the highest mean scores ($M = 5.00$, $SD = .00$), reflecting unanimous and exceptionally positive responses from the 2024–25 respondents, include:

- Believe that all students can learn and are able to evaluate teaching and learning experiences for personal and professional growth (Spalding, 4)
- Demonstrate flexibility in meeting student needs and use best practices to promote student learning (Spalding, 5)

- Show respect for self and others, open to diverse perspectives and cultures, and perseveres in serving learners, families, schools, and communities (Spalding, 3)
- Devotes self to acquiring knowledge about the context, pedagogy, and professional areas of teaching (Spalding, 6)
- Commit to fairness, and the principles of personal, academic, and professional integrity (Spalding, 2)
- Demonstrate insight in creating a learning environment that empowers others to reach their potential (Spalding, 1)
- Design and implement learning experiences that are developmentally appropriate, challenging, and recognize learning and development patterns within and among learners (InTASC, 1)
- Use understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures to enable students to meet high standards (InTASC, 2)
- Create environments that support individual and collaborative learning and encourage positive interaction, engagement, and self-motivation (InTASC, 3)
- Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and connections, and build skills to apply knowledge (InTASC, 8)
- Engage in professional learning and use evidence to evaluate individual practice, its impact on others, and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner (InTASC, 9)

Items that, while still highly rated, had slightly lower means and/or standard deviations

included:

- Understand standards and tools of inquiry to create learning experiences that are meaningful to learners and ensure mastery of the content (InTASC, 4) (M = 4.67, SD = .58)
- Connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problems in authentic learning tasks (InTASC, 5) (M = 4.67, SD = .58)
- Utilize multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, monitor learner progress, and guide decision making (InTASC, 6) (M = 4.67, SD = .58)
- Plan for instruction that supports every student in meeting learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum and cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy, and knowledge of learners and the community context (InTASC, 7) (M = 4.67, SD = .58)
- Seek leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for learning and to collaborate with others to ensure growth and advance the profession (InTASC, 10) (M = 4.67, SD = .58)

While the 2024–25 results suggest exceptionally strong program satisfaction among respondents, the small sample size highlights the need for broader participation in future survey

administrations. Faculty will review these data and utilize insights to inform the Improvement Plan for the 2025–26 Academic Year.

Course Survey Data

During the 2024–25 academic year, 226 course surveys were completed by candidates enrolled in the Teacher Leadership, Learner-Centered Practices, and Learner-Centered Systems programs. The survey included 13 items designed to capture learners' perceptions of culminating tasks, instructional quality, course materials, application of skills, and interactions with peers and instructors for the following course topics:

- EDU 520- Assessment for Teaching and Learning (n = xx)
- EDU 625- Teaching Seminar (n = 40)
- EDU 645- Learner-Centered Approaches to Growth and Outcomes (n = 36)
- EDU 648- Group Dynamics (n = 36)
- EDU 673- Instructional Design (n = 7)
- EDU 687- Curriculum of the Schools (n = 32)
- ETL 615- Leadership Behavior and Promoting Change (n = 18)
- ETL 620- Professional Learning for School Transformation (n = 9)
- ETL 625- Learner-Centered Design and Evaluation (n = 38)
- ETL 630- Leadership for Instructional Improvement/Deeper Learning (n = 10)

The results of the survey are reported in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Course Survey Data- 2022-2025 Cohorts

Item	2022-23 Cohort		2023-24 Cohort		2024-25 Cohort	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
The course culminating task(s) prompted me to engage in meaningful work that had a direct impact upon my classroom practice/leadership.	4.15	.76	4.02	.90	4.56	.61
The course culminating task(s) were challenging but ultimately doable.	4.10	.76	4.06	.82	4.50	.66
The course resources, learning activities, reflections, and collaborations with colleagues prepared me to successfully engage with the culminating task(s).	4.18	.69	4.03	.84	4.50	.71
This course gave me some ideas, skills, or techniques that I can apply in my classroom or in my leadership.	4.33	.65	4.21	.84	4.65	.55
The course resources were valuable to my learning.	4.32	.68	4.12	.87	4.64	.55
The course learning activities (readings, reflections, structured activities, etc.) were valuable to my learning.	4.21	.74	4.03	.91	4.59	.55

Collaborative interactions with other colleagues taking this course were valuable to my learning.	4.06	.84	4.02	.87	4.46	.84
I felt supported by my course facilitator(s) throughout my course experience.	4.22	.89	4.06	1.03	4.66	.61
I had the “right amount” of timely feedback from my course facilitator	4.00	1.05	3.89	1.17	4.47	.87
The teach-ins for this course were valuable to my learning.	3.88	.96	3.82	1.02	4.48	.80
The teach-ins for this course were engaging and kept me interested	3.89	.77	3.77	1.06	4.48	.81
Average	4.13	.80	3.99	.92	4.54	.81

Items with either the highest mean score and/or low standard deviation that would indicate high levels of satisfaction across learners during 2024-25 include:

- Felt supported by course facilitator(s): M = 4.66, SD = .61
- Gained applicable skills or techniques: M = 4.65, SD = .55
- Course resources were valuable: M = 4.64, SD = .55
- Course learning activities were valuable: M = 4.59, SD = .55

All items improved in 2024-25 over the past two years, reflecting programmatic changes have positively impacted learner experiences. The most significant gains were observed in “teach-in” engagement and value (+.6 points) and timeliness of facilitator feedback (+.5 points). The 2024–25 course survey results provide clear evidence of strengthened instructional design, enhanced facilitator engagement, and alignment with state and national expectations for advanced educator preparation. The program’s actions demonstrate responsiveness to prior data and stakeholder input, meeting the intent of completer satisfaction with the effectiveness of their preparation (CAEP RA4.2), using results for continuous program improvement (CAEP RA5.4), and instructional relevance, rigor, and responsiveness to data (EPSB Domains 2, 6).

These results reinforce the quality of the program’s implementation and support its continued development through sustained feedback loops and collaboration with district and community partners. This information will be used to create the Improvement Plan for the 2025-26 Academic Year.

Key Assessment Review

The Master of Education in Teacher Leadership, Master of Education in Learner-Centered Systems, and Master of Education in Learner-Centered Practices program assessments include a

comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures used to monitor candidate performance; and to manage and to improve unit programs and unit operations. The unit assessment system collects and analyzes data on candidates, graduates, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at transition points. The plan incorporates continuous assessment with systematically administered procedures.

All programs (Initial and Advanced) identify as a benchmark, a major assignment or experience (Capstone) that occurs in a course that candidates take during or near the end of their program. Through this assessment, candidates are expected to demonstrate mastery of subject matter or level of expertise in the field as well as standard-based proficiencies.

During the 2024-25 academic year, the Master of Education in Teacher Leadership at Spalding University utilized Anchor Assessments to determine program effectiveness. A description of the assessments and results are as follows:

Anchor Assessments:

Anchor assessments are administered to candidates throughout coursework to assess candidate knowledge and skills, reflect upon clinical practice experiences, demonstrate appropriate use of data for decision making, integrate technology into professional work, and demonstrate professional capabilities. Anchor Assessments with individual criteria were given to students enrolled in program clinical courses and assessed using rubrics created by the College of Education Faculty. The results from the 2024-25 academic year are displayed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Percent of Anchor Assessments Meeting Rubric Criteria- 2024-25 Academic Year

Course	Attempts	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
EDU 520	22	0	0	3	19
EDU 625	38	0	8	22	70
EDU 645	43	1	1	41	55
EDU 648	49	0	4	22	72
EDU 673	9	0	0	56	44
EDU 687	20	0	0	20	80
ETL 610	4	0	0	3	1
ETL 615	13	0	3	7	90

ETL 620	13	0	0	0	100
ETL 625	45	2	2	23	73
ETL 630	12	0	0	65	33
ETL 660	50	0	0	24	76
TOTAL/AVG	318	.2	1.5	23.8	59.4

During the 2024–25 academic year, 97.2% of criteria assessed on all Anchor Assessments were rated as either “Accomplished” or “Exemplary.” Individual analysis of course-specific Anchor Assessments revealed that the percentage of candidates meeting or exceeding the benchmark target (Accomplished + Exemplary) ranged from 85% to 100% across all courses. These results represent a continued trend of strong candidate performance and mark a slight improvement over the prior year’s total of 94.5%.

Specifically, the highest levels of candidate mastery were observed in:

- ETL 620 – *Professional Learning for School Transformation*, with 100% of submissions rated “Exemplary”
- EDU 687 – *Curriculum of the Schools*, with 100% of submissions rated “Accomplished” or higher
- ETL 630 – *Leadership for Instructional Improvement/Deeper Learning*, with 97% of submissions rated “Accomplished” or higher
- EDU 645 – *Learner-Centered Approaches to Growth and Outcomes*, with 96% of submissions meeting benchmark

Courses with slightly lower, though still strong, benchmark attainment included:

- ETL 625 – *Learner-Centered Design and Evaluation* (96% meeting benchmark)
- ETL 615 – *Leadership Behavior and Promoting Change* (92% meeting benchmark)
- EDU 625 – *Teaching Seminar* (92% meeting benchmark)

These Anchor Assessment results, in combination with additional clinical and program assessment data, will be used to create the Improvement Plan for the 2025–26 Academic Year.

Table 4 below reports Anchor Assessment data by Teacher Leader Model Standards.

Table 4: Teacher Leader Percent Mastery of Teacher Leader Model Standard (TLMS) Domains-2024-25 Academic Year

TLMS Domain	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
I: Fostering a Collaborative Culture	0	1	29	69
II: Accessing and Using Research	1	3	29	67
III: Promoting Professional Learning	1	2	28	69
IV: Facilitating Improvements in Student Learning	0	1	27	70
V: Promoting the Use of Assessments and Data	0	4	23	72
VI: Improving Outreach and Collaboration with Families and Community	1	2	28	68
VII: Advocating Student Learning and the Profession	1	2	26	71

Teacher Leader Model Standards that had higher than average (94.65%) overall percent mastery include:

- Facilitating Improvements in Student Learning (97.22%)
- Fostering a Collaborative Culture (96.67%)
- Promoting Professional Learning (95.83%)
- Improving Outreach and Collaboration with Families and Community (95.83%)
- Advocating for Student Learning and the Profession (95.83%)

Teacher Leader Model Standards that had lower than average (94.65%) percent mastery include:

- Accessing and Using Research (94.44%)
- Promoting the Use of Assessments and Data (94.44%)

These results reflect sustained high levels of candidate proficiency across all TLMS domains, with all standards exceeding the 94% mastery threshold. Notably, the standard *Facilitating Improvements in Student Learning* demonstrated the highest mastery, with 97.22% of candidates rated as “Accomplished” or “Exemplary.”

Although Accessing and Using Research and Promoting the Use of Assessments and Data fell just below the cohort average, their mastery percentages remain strong and consistent with previous years. This continued pattern of performance across domains provides insight into both

areas of program strength and opportunities for targeted instructional emphasis. This information will be used to create the Improvement Plan for the 2025–26 Academic Year.

Capstone:

At the conclusion of the program, candidates in the Teacher Leadership Program are required to complete a Capstone Seminar Course (ETL 660) that demonstrates the depth and breadth of content learned during the Teacher Leadership Program. The Capstone consists of the submission of artifacts, a candidate presentation, and a defense of learning conducted by Spalding faculty. During the 2024-25 Academic Year, 50 students participated in the Capstone course and 100% successfully passed the course.

Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year

During the 2024-25 Academic Year, an improvement plan was implemented with five (5) goals of improving candidate proficiency and expanding the Teacher Leadership Program.

Regarding Goal 1 (Candidates will demonstrate the ability to apply educational research to identify and implement strategic shifts in practice and analyze evidence of impact):

- 100% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 650 (Assessing Learning for Student Achievement) (85% Target- **Target Met**)
- 96% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 625 (Instructional Design and Evaluation for Teacher Leaders) (85% Target- **Target Met**)
- 96% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for EDU 645 (Learner-Centered Approaches to Growth and Outcomes) (85% Target- **Target Met**)

Regarding Goal 2 (Candidates will demonstrate the ability to observe and reflect on content-specific teaching and learning situations to develop a data-based school or program improvement plan):

- 100% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for EDU 673 (Instructional Design) (85% Target- **Target Met**)
- 97% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 615 (Leadership Behavior and Promoting Change) (85% Target- **Target Met**)
- 98% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 630 (Learner-Centered Approaches to Growth and Outcomes) (85% Target- **Target Met**)

Regarding Goal 3 (Candidates will demonstrate the ability to utilize assessment theory to develop a comprehensive assessment plan for a unit of study):

- 100% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 610 (Philosophy, Interpretation, and Application of Learning) (85% Target- **Target Not Met**)
- 100% of students met proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 650 (Assessing Learning for Student Achievement) (85% Target- **Target Met**)

Regarding Goal 4 (The MEd in Teacher Leader Program will maintain compliance with Kentucky requirements):

- The 2024-25 Annual Report contains all data specific to candidate performance on the Teacher Leader Model Standards (**Target Met**)
- The 2024-25 Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board (EPSB) Continued Program Review and CAEP Self-Study were submitted for review and program approval (**Target Met**)

Regarding Goal 5 (The Program Director will effectively coordinate the program):

- During the 2024-25 academic year, 70 students enrolled in the program (60% Target- **Target Met**)

Improvement Plan for 2025-26 Academic Year

As result of the review process that included data review and discussion with faculty and external stakeholders, the following improvement plan has been identified for the 2025-26 Academic Year.

Goal 1: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to apply educational research to identify and implement strategic shifts in practice and analyze evidence of impact

Assessment 1: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 650 (Assessing Learning for Student Achievement)

Assessment 2: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 625 (Instructional Design and Evaluation for Teacher Leaders)

Assessment 3: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for EDU 645 (Learner-Centered Approaches to Growth and Outcomes)

Goal 2: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to observe and reflect on content-specific teaching and learning situations to develop a data-based school or program improvement plan

Assessment 4: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for EDU 673 (Instructional Design)

Assessment 5: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 615 (Leadership Behavior and Promoting Change)

Assessment 6: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 630 (Leadership for Instructional Improvement/Deeper Learning)

Goal 3: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to utilize assessment theory to develop a comprehensive assessment plan for a unit of study

Assessment 7: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 610 (Philosophy, Interpretation, and Application of Learning)

Assessment 8: 85% of students will meet proficient (or higher) criteria on the Culminating Task for ETL 650 (Assessing Learning for Student Achievement)

Goal 4: The Program Director will work within KY state requirements to ensure that Teacher Leader Model Standards are embedded in the program curriculum

Assessment 9: The 2024-25 Annual Report will contain data specific to candidate performance on all Teacher Leader Model Standards

Goal 5: The Program Director will work with the School of Education Chair to identify mutually beneficial community partnerships for the program

Assessment 10: At least one (1) new additional CBL partnership will be added during the 2025-26 Academic Year

Action Plan: 2025-26 Academic Year

Activity	Goals Addressed	Impact on Program Candidates
Review/revise ETL 650 and ETL 625 to ensure integrated research application and data analysis case studies	Goal 1, Goal 3	Strengthens candidates' ability to conduct research-based instructional improvements and use assessment data to inform teaching, directly addressing CAEP RA1.1 and TLMS Domains II and V.
Embed practitioner inquiry tools and real-world problem-solving into EDU 645	Goal 1	Encourages application of theoretical learning to authentic classroom issues, improving candidate confidence and readiness to lead innovation.
Facilitate faculty calibration sessions to ensure scoring consistency on research-based culminating tasks	Goal 1, Goal 3	Enhances reliability of candidate assessment and supports continuous improvement (CAEP RA5.2, EPSB Domain 5).
Review/revise ETL 610 culminating assessments to emphasize equitable assessment planning and formative feedback cycles	Goal 3	Increases candidate proficiency in culturally responsive and inclusive assessment practices, supporting CAEP RA1.1 and EPSB Domain 2.
Review/revise feedback and reflection protocols in EDU 673 and ETL 615	Goal 2	Build stronger reflective leaders able to evaluate teaching/learning environments and propose improvement plans.
Conduct TLMS-aligned curriculum mapping across program courses	Goal 4	Ensures vertical and horizontal alignment of standards, improving coherence and transparency of program design.
Host biannual advisory council meetings with community partners and alumni	Goal 5	Fosters continuous stakeholder engagement and responsive program evolution (CAEP RA5.3, EPSB Domain 6).
Establish one new CBL-focused partnership with a district or school site	Goal 5	Expands field-based opportunities aligned to learner-centered, equity-driven instruction. Increase program relevance and practical impact.
Expand LTS data system to include completer outcomes	All Goals (especially 1, 2, 4, 5)	Strengthens program monitoring and decision-making; meets CAEP RA5.4 and supports data-informed continuous improvement.

Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting

In accordance with CAEP's guidance on the ethical and responsible use of emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI), Spalding University's Principal Preparation Program incorporated AI tools to support the development of its 2024–25 Annual Report. These tools were utilized under faculty supervision to aid in data visualization, draft generation, and synthesis of program assessment findings.

The purpose of integrating AI was to:

- Enhance the efficiency and accuracy of data reporting and interpretation,
- Support transparent, evidence-based program improvement; and
- Model future-ready leadership practices that responsibly engage with advanced technologies.

All content generated or supported by AI tools was reviewed, edited, and validated by faculty and leadership team members to ensure academic integrity, contextual accuracy, and alignment with CAEP standards. The program recognizes that AI serves as a complementary tool, not a replacement for human judgment, professional expertise, or ethical decision-making.

This use of AI reflects Spalding's commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in educator preparation, preparing leaders who are equipped to engage critically and responsibly with emerging technologies in P–12 environments.



**Master of Arts in School Counseling
Program Effectiveness Report
2024-25 Academic Year**

Prepared by:

Glenn S. Baete, EdD
Director of Advanced Programs
College of Education
June 2025

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Program Review Process	
Follow Up Study of Graduates	8
State and CAEP Review Process	12
Key Assessment Review	
Anchor Assessments	14
Dispositions Evaluation	17
Candidate Portfolio	22
Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year	24
Improvement Plan for 2025-26 Academic Year	26
Action Plan for 2025-26 Academic Year	28
Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting	30

Executive Summary
Spalding University: Master of Arts in School Counseling
2024-25 Annual Report

The 2024–25 academic year marked a period of continued development and external validation for the Master of Arts in School Counseling Program at Spalding University. Aligned with the Kentucky Standards for Preparation of School Counselors (KSPSC, 2019), the Kentucky Framework of Best Practices for School Counselors (KFBPSC, 2020), and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards for Advanced Programs, the program implemented a data-informed continuous improvement cycle through its Quality Assurance System (QAS).

Key internal findings include:

Candidate Performance: 100% of candidates scored “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” across all five KSPSC core areas. Anchor Assessments and Candidate Portfolios showed particularly strong proficiency in professional identity, ethical practice, and counseling relationships.

Graduate Feedback: 2024–25 completers reported increased preparedness and consistency across all standards. Strengths included ethical decision-making, leadership, equity, and data use, while growth areas included short-term counseling, referral-making, and assessment literacy.

Disposition evaluations confirmed candidates’ professional conduct, collaboration, and advocacy skills, with over 85% of ratings categorized as “Exemplary” across most indicators. In addition, external validation through EPSB and CAEP reviews further affirmed the program’s effectiveness:

In Spring 2025, the program received continued approval from the Kentucky EPSB, meeting or exceeding expectations in all six program review domains, including admissions, pedagogy, clinical experiences, and continuous improvement. The review highlighted the program’s strategic use of the Leader Tracking System (LTS) and strong partnerships with local school districts such as Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS).

The 2025 CAEP Annual Accreditation Report and program self-study documented alignment with Standards A.5.1–A.5.5, with evidence of reliable assessments, completer

achievement, and responsive curriculum updates. CAEP reviewers noted strong use of data to inform decisions and highlighted the program's efforts to address prior areas of improvement.

Next steps based on internal and external review findings include:

- Enhanced training in group and short-term counseling, assessment design, and referral skills in partnership with Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CHMC) faculty.
- Rubric calibration and curricular revisions to improve scoring reliability and skill development in areas of variability.
- Launching a revised Graduate Counselor Survey (modeled after the validated Principal Preparation tool) to meet CAEP R4.2 expectations for systematic completer feedback.
- Continued monitoring of licensure and employment trends using the Leader Tracking System, ensuring alignment with CAEP R4.3 and EPSB workforce goals.

As the program looks ahead to 2025–26, the Improvement and Action Plans prioritize growth in cultural diversity, counseling relationships, group facilitation, and candidate retention. Faculty remain committed to leveraging data, stakeholder input, and continuous reflection to ensure candidates graduate as ethical, effective, and equity-driven school counselors.

Introduction

Assessment of candidate, program, and unit operations is an underpinning component of the professional education unit at Spalding University. Candidates in advanced programs are regularly assessed at various intervals throughout the program. The unit's continual collection and analysis of candidate provides program data purposed to identify patterns of performance. This analysis may lead to pausing questions about whether changes are needed. The feedback loop consists of formative feedback, plans for improvement, summative feedback, evaluation decisions, revisions, and renewal. The sequence of these elements leads toward improved candidate outcomes.

Spalding University's College of Education (COE) is committed to recruiting, preparing, and graduating candidates that are prepared to positively impact the P-12 environments in which they serve. The GATES Unit Continuous Assessment System (GATES QAS) utilized by the COE is aligned with standards set forth by Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Specifically, CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity, requires the following:

3.4 – The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all these domains.

3.5 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards considering new results.

The UCAS established by the COE is designed to ensure a deliberate and thoughtful process for recruiting and selecting candidates for both Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Furthermore, the UCAS provides an objective framework that COE faculty can utilize for the purpose of substantive review of candidate progress through COE Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Additionally, the UCAS enables the Director of Advanced Programs to approve and conscientiously place candidates in clinical field experiences that are congruent with the candidate's professional growth needs and area of certification.

The UCAS requires faculty to collaboratively review candidate progress with regard to dispositions, grade point average, course completion, and field experience requirements. COE faculty review the UCAS at two points during the academic year – at the conclusion of the Fall and Spring academic terms. Decisions regarding candidate progression through the UCAS will be documented in the minutes of the faculty meetings during which UCAS data is reviewed.

The assessments selected by Spalding University to determine Counseling Preparation Program effectiveness (Disposition Evaluation, Anchor Assessments, and Candidate Portfolio) support quality and strategic evaluation and continuous improvements standards and indicators identified by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), Standard 5- Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement, and Education Administration Performance Assessment Areas identified by the Kentucky Department of Education's Office of Educator Licensure and Effectiveness (OELE). These areas include candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; professional capabilities; data and research-driven decision making; and integration of technology into the discipline.

Ongoing and continuous monitoring of candidate progress is the joint responsibility of program faculty and the Department Chair. Assessments and evaluations of candidates in initial and advance level education programs at Spalding University shall be aligned to the appropriate state or national standards. The Master of Arts in School Counseling aligned to the Kentucky Standards of Preparation for School Counselors (KSPSC, 2019) and the Kentucky Framework of Best Practices for School Counselors (KFBPSC, 2019) identified in 704 KAR 3:060

This report contains information from the Program Review Process and data from each of the three (3) assessed areas of the program Quality Assurance Plan (QAP). These multiple

measures are consistent with CAEP Standard A.5.1 to "monitor candidate progress, complete achievement, and provider operational effectiveness." The annual report satisfies CAEP Standard A.5.2 to "rely on relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations are valid and consistent."

The data outlined in this report will be used to compare progress towards meeting the KSPSC standards associated with a particular item, task, or assessment. This formal process that will be completed by university faculty and district partners aligns with CAEP Standard A.5.3 to "regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards, test innovations, use results to improve elements and processes."

As the conclusion of this report, an improvement plan will be articulated to identify specific benchmarked goals and specific activities necessary to improve outcomes measured in the six analyses. Activities will include actions that include curriculum review and alignment, reviewing assessments and clinical field experiences, and collaboration with school districts to determine School Counseling Program instructional priorities. The development of a collaborative plan aligns to CAEP Standard A.5.4 and A.5.5 that "involves alumni, employers, and practitioners" and ensures that outcomes are "benchmarked, shared, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction."

Program Review Process

Follow Up Study of Graduates

During the Spring of 2021, a mixed-methods explanatory study (Creswell et al., 2003) was developed to further analyze program effectiveness. During the qualitative phase of the study, the Program Director and the College of Education Department Chair facilitated a focus group containing School Counseling Program graduates regarding their experiences in the Spalding program. Graduates were asked to reflect on their Spalding School Counseling Preparation experience, the program’s effectiveness in preparation for their current role as a school counselor, and additional needs given the changes in the role of the counselor.

In the next phase of the study, a School Counseling Program Survey was developed and sent to individuals completing the program in the past 7 years. The survey contains 19 items derived from Kentucky Framework of Best Practices for School Counselors (KFBPSC, 2019) and the Spalding University College of Education Conceptual Framework. To ensure validity of survey items, members of the program faculty and the School Counseling Program Graduate Focus Group were asked to review items and provide commentary.

The survey was distributed to School Counseling Program candidates who completed the program within the past 7 years, including completers of the School Counseling Preparation Program during the 2024-25 academic year. These individuals were asked to indicate their level of preparedness for the role of a school leader based on their experience in the Principal Preparation Program at Spalding University. Seven participants of the 2024-25 cohort (n = 5) responded to the survey with a response rate of 28%. The results of the survey are displayed in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: School Counseling Program Survey: Cohort Information (N = 34)

Cohort	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
2025	5	28
2024	5	38
2023	6	20
2022	2	7

2021	3	10.34
2020	9	31.03
2019	4	13.79

Table 2: School Counseling Program Survey: Item Analysis

Item	Overall (N = 34)		2024-25 Cohort (n = 5)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Demonstrate a professional identity of ethical and legal school counseling practices and engage in ongoing professional learning (KSPSC, 1)	4.34	1.03	4.60	.55
2. Supporting students' academic success, career goals, and social-emotional wellness (KSPSC, 1)	4.35	1.04	4.60	.55
3. Provide instruction based on the Kentucky Framework for Best Practices for School Counselors and the ASCA National Model (4th ed.) (KSPSC, 2.1)	4.14	1.14	4.60	.55
4. Create counseling beliefs and vision and mission statements (KSPSC, 2.2)	4.26	1.07	4.20	.84
5. Monitor student performance and progress in multiple settings (KSPSC, 2.3)	4.11	1.11	4.60	.55
6. Provide short-term counseling in small group and individual settings (KSPSC 2.4)	4.11	.87	4.40	.55
7. Make referrals to appropriate school and community resources (KSPSC 2.5)	3.97	1.12	3.80	.84
8. Consult and collaborate with multiple stakeholders for student achievement and success (KSPSC 2.6)	4.20	1.11	4.40	.55
9. Submit records in a timely fashion (KSPSC 2.7)	4.20	.93	4.20	.84
10. Use assessment and testing to deliver effective services to students (KSPSC 2.8)	3.91	1.25	4.20	.45
11. Engage in a cycle of continuous improvement using data to identify needs, plan and implement programs, evaluate impact and work through reflective analysis (KSPSC, 3)	4.26	1.07	4.60	.55

12. Serve as a leader and advocate for all students through management of the school counseling program and collaboration with stakeholders (KSPSC, 4)	4.26	1.07	4.60	.55
13. Serve as a change agent through the development and refinement of a comprehensive school counseling program (KSPSC, 4)	4.31	.90	4.60	.55
14. Demonstrate insight in creating a learning environment that empowers others to reach their potential (Spalding, 1)	4.29	.96	4.60	.55
15. Commit to fairness, and the principles of personal, academic, and professional integrity (Spalding, 2)	4.43	.92	4.60	.55
16. Show respect for self and others, open to diverse perspectives and cultures, and perseveres in serving learners, families, schools and communities (Spalding, 3)	4.49	.78	4.60	.55
17. Believes that all students can learn and is able to evaluate teaching and learning experiences for personal and professional growth (Spalding, 4)	4.49	.85	4.60	.55
18. Demonstrate flexibility in meeting student needs and use best practices to promote student learning (Spalding, 5)	4.37	.94	4.40	.55
19. Devotes self to acquiring knowledge about the context, pedagogy, and professional areas of teaching (Spalding, 6)	4.34	.84	4.60	.55
Average	4.25	1.0	4.6	.55

An analysis of the results revealed that mean responses from the 2024–25 cohort were higher than the overall group on 17 of the 19 items (89%), with a lower average standard deviation ($SD = 0.55$), indicating greater consistency in responses. These results suggest an increased sense of preparedness and alignment with the program’s intended outcomes among this year’s completers.

Survey items with the highest ratings from the 2024–25 cohort included:

- Supporting student learning, development, and career success (4.60)
- Demonstrating ethical practice and continuous professional growth (4.60)
- Using data for continuous program improvement (4.60)
- Leading and advocating for students through program design (4.60)
- Commitment to equity, fairness, and professional integrity (4.60)

Despite strong ratings across most indicators, several items from the 2024–25 cohort revealed lower perceived preparedness and higher variability. These include:

- Make referrals to appropriate school and community resources – 3.80 (SD = 0.84)
- Create counseling beliefs and vision and mission statements – 4.20 (SD = 0.84)
- Submit records in a timely fashion – 4.20 (SD = 0.84)
- Use assessment and testing to deliver effective services – 4.20 (SD = 0.45)

These responses align with areas for development identified in the CAEP Self-Study and EPSB Report, which noted the following:

- Need for enhanced clinical fieldwork connected to group counseling and community-based practice
- Gaps in performance data related to referral-making and short-term counseling skills
- Candidate feedback indicating desire for deeper integration of practical applications of the ASCA model

Next Steps

In response, the program will collaborate with clinical partners and Spalding University Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CHMC) faculty to strengthen small- and large group counseling skills, training and field experiences, and assignments and rubrics related to assessment literacy to ensure clarity and rigor and enhance fidelity. These actions will be incorporated into the 2025–26 Continuous Improvement Plan to address specific content and field-based development needs while reinforcing the program’s commitment to equity-centered, data-informed practice. It is important to note that the low number of survey responses limits the generalizability of findings. As a result, increasing completer survey participation remains a priority in the 2025–26 Program Improvement Plan.

To strengthen program evaluation and align with CAEP Standard R4.2, which calls for systematic collection of data from program completers, School Counseling program faculty will develop a revised *Graduate Counselor Survey* for implementation in 2025–26. This updated instrument will be modeled after the validated Graduate Leader Survey used in the Principal Preparation Program and will assess both perceived preparation and professional satisfaction of

graduates who are currently working as school counselors or in positions requiring school counseling certification.

The survey will draw on key frameworks including the Kentucky Standards of Preparation for School Counselors (KSPSC) and CAEP expectations for advanced-level programs and completer feedback. The survey will include both quantitative and qualitative items to measure candidate readiness across multiple domains (e.g., ethical practice, data use, collaboration, and counseling leadership), and will be reviewed by program faculty and recent alumni to ensure validity and relevance. This effort reflects Spalding's commitment to continuous improvement and alignment with CAEP's requirement for actionable, representative feedback from graduates. Results from this enhanced survey will be used to inform curriculum revisions, clinical experience design, and stakeholder engagement strategies in future annual reports.

Finally, to ensure accurate and actionable insight into graduate impact, the School Counseling Program will continue to use the *Leader Tracking System (LTS)* to monitor employment outcomes of program completers. This includes identifying graduates currently serving as school counselors or in roles requiring school counselor certification within Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) and other regional districts.

In collaboration with JCPS and the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), the program faculty will triangulate employment and certification data to:

- Verify job placement in appropriate P–12 counseling roles
- Analyze long-term completer trends by cohort and certification pathway
- Inform advising, recruitment, and curriculum alignment decisions

This ongoing data-sharing and tracking initiative ensures the program remains aligned with state certification standards and district workforce needs, while also supporting CAEP expectations related to R4.3: Employment Milestones and program completer success.

State and CAEP Review Process

During the Spring of 2025, the School Counseling Program at Spalding University completed the Continued Program Review process with the Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board (KYEPSB). This process involved comprehensive self-study, external evaluation

by KYEPSB staff and a peer institution (Georgetown College), and a formal presentation to the state Program Review Committee. The review focused on six domains: candidate admissions and progression, coursework, pedagogy-andragogy, clinical practice, performance assessment, and continuous improvement.

The review affirmed numerous strengths of the School Counseling Program, including its alignment with the Kentucky Standards for Preparation of School Counselors (KSPSC), strategic use of the Leader Tracking System (LTS) for data-informed decision-making, and strong partnerships with Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). In addition, clinical field experiences are scaffolded through a revised Clinical Field Experience Guide, ensuring candidates progress from observation to leadership. These practices directly support CAEP Standard RA2.2 on meaningful, practice-based clinical experiences.

As a result of the Continued Program Review, Spalding University was informed by the KYEPSB that they had met or exceeded the requirements in all categories for continued approval of the Principal Preparation Program.

During the Spring of 2025, Spalding University's School Counseling Program submitted both a program Self-Study and the Annual Accreditation Report to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). These submissions highlighted the program's continued alignment with state and national standards, its commitment to continuous improvement, and its progress toward addressing prior areas for improvement.

Program-Specific Highlights

- **Advanced-Level Graduate Data (2023–2024):**
The report documented 71 graduates from advanced certification programs, including completers from the School Counseling Program. These candidates were prepared to assume school leadership roles in P–12 settings across Kentucky.
- **Leader Tracking System (LTS):**
A key innovation in the School Counseling Program is the Leader Tracking System, a centralized platform designed to monitor candidate performance, clinical fieldwork, assessment results, and post-graduation placement. The LTS tracks alignment with the Kentucky Standards of Preparation of School Counselors (KSPSC). It also supports disaggregation by demographic variables, helping the program evaluate equity and access.

Key Assessment Review

The Master of Arts in School Counseling program assessments include a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures used to monitor candidate performance; and to manage and to improve unit programs and unit operations. The unit assessment system collects and analyzes data on candidates, graduates, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at transition points. The plan incorporates continuous assessment with systematically administered procedures.

All programs (Initial and Advanced) identify as a benchmark, a major assignment or experience (Practicum) that occurs in a course that candidates take during or near the end of their program. Through this assessment, candidates are expected to demonstrate mastery of subject matter or level of expertise in the field as well as standard-based proficiencies.

During the 2024-25 academic year, the Master of Arts in School Counseling at Spalding University utilized three (3) assessments to determine program effectiveness. A description of the assessments and results are as follows:

Anchor Assessments:

Anchor assessments are administered to candidates throughout coursework to assess candidate knowledge and skills, reflect upon clinical practice experiences, demonstrate appropriate use of data for decision making, integrate technology into professional work, and demonstrate professional capabilities. Eight (8) Anchor Assessments with individual criteria were given to students enrolled in program clinical courses and assessed using rubrics created by the College of Education Faculty. The results from the 2024-25 academic year are displayed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Percent of Anchor Assessments Meeting Rubric Criteria- 2024-25 Academic Year

	SC 600	SC 610	SC 620	SC 630	SC 640	SC 650	SC 660	SC 670	Average PCT
Ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developing	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0

Accomplished	13	39	6	23	4	53	76	100	31
Exemplary	87	61	94	77	96	47	5	0	69

During the 2024-25 academic year, 100% of criteria assessed on Anchor Assessments were rated as either “Accomplished” or “Exemplary,” with an average of 69% rated as “Exemplary” and 31% rated as “Accomplished.” No criteria were rated as “Developing” or “Ineffective” in seven of the eight assessed courses, with a single instance of a “Developing” rating occurring in SC 660. These consistently strong performance outcomes reflect candidates’ readiness across key competencies and will be used, alongside other clinical program data, to inform the development of the 2025–26 School Counseling Program Improvement Plan.

A subsequent analysis was conducted that examined performance of Anchor Assessment assignments into the core areas of the Kentucky Standards of Preparation for School Counselors (2019). These results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Percent of Anchor Assignment Meeting Kentucky Standards of Preparation for School Counselors- 2024-25 Academic Year

Core Area	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
2.2- Professional Identity and Ethical Practice	0	0	24	76
2.3- Social and Cultural Diversity	0	0	72	28
2.4- Human Growth and Development	0	9	43	48
2.6- Counseling and Helping Relationships	0	19	39	42
2.7- Group Counseling	0	0	100	0
4- Contextual Dimensions of the Leadership/Advocacy Role	0	0	13	87

During the 2024-15 academic year, 100% of candidates met or exceeded expectations (Accomplished or Exemplary) in all five core areas, indicating strong alignment between instructional content and performance expectations. The highest level of mastery was demonstrated in:

- Professional Identity and Ethical Practice (2.2): 76% Exemplary
- Leadership and Advocacy (Core Area 4): 87% Exemplary

Areas with greater variability in performance included:

- Counseling and Helping Relationships (2.6): 19% Developing
- Human Growth and Development (2.4): 9% Developing

These findings align with CAEP Self-Study data and recent Capstone reflections that highlight growth in ethical decision-making and leadership, while reinforcing the need to strengthen clinical application of counseling theory and interpersonal skills, especially in small group and helping relationship contexts.

Next Steps

These results indicate continued strengths in ethical practice and leadership development, while also pointing to the need for deeper engagement with counseling and helping relationships, particularly in areas involving skill application and clinical readiness. While no candidates were rated as Ineffective, the proportion of “Developing” ratings in Human Growth and Development and Helping Relationships suggests opportunities for scaffolding instruction and increasing structured practice. The following targeted next steps are aligned with the improvement strategies identified in the CAEP Self-Study and the EPSB Continued Program Review:

1. **Curricular Enhancements in Counseling Competencies** – Faculty will review and revise instructional content and anchor assessments related to all courses to ensure increased opportunities for skill practice, formative feedback, and integration of counseling models.
2. **Structured Practicum Experiences** – The Clinical Field Experience Guide will be used to intentionally embed hands-on counseling opportunities, including structured observation, co-facilitation, and leadership of group and individual sessions to reinforce learning across KSPSC standards.
3. **Assessment Calibration and Rubric Clarity** – Program faculty will participate in rubric calibration sessions focused on the Helping Relationships and Human Development

domains to ensure consistent expectations and inter-rater reliability across anchor assessments.

4. **Integration of Case-Based and Simulated Counseling Tasks** – To support growth in applied skills, the program will expand use of simulated counseling activities, case analysis, and peer feedback within key courses tied to anchor assessments in Core Areas 2.4 and 2.6.

Dispositions Evaluation

Faculty in the College of Education and educational practitioners supervising clinical field experiences settings evaluate all candidates' professional dispositions at regular points throughout each academic year. The Spalding University College of Education School Counselor Disposition Evaluation and rating scale is disseminated to all candidates at the point of program admission and discussed at subsequent times as necessary. The tool and rating scale have been validated through the Lawshe method of surveying content experts, a pilot study, and continued use with revision by the Spalding University College of Education faculty and school district partners.

The 18-question disposition evaluation is completed by School Counselor supervisors on program candidates at the completion of each clinical field experience completed during the program. The items are aligned to Spalding University College of Education student dispositions and the Kentucky Framework for Best Practices for School Counselors (2020). Results from the School Counselor Disposition Evaluation are reported in Table 5.

Table 5: School Counseling Program Candidate Disposition Evaluation: 2024-25 Academic Year (N = 91)

Candidate Disposition	Term and Academic Year Averages			Performance Rating Percent 2024-25 Academic Year				
	Fall 2024 Average	Spring 2025 Average	2024-25 Average	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Novice	N/A
Counselor candidate is active in the counselor's role and asks appropriate questions pertaining to the academic progress within the school community.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counselor candidate is able to collaborate with school partners by showing a positive attitude towards students and all school employees.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counselor candidate interacts in an appropriately professional manner with all school personnel.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counselor candidate show respect for the Site Counselor by completing all tasks that are assigned in a timely and appropriate manner.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counselor candidate interacts with diverse students in a positive, respectful, and safe manner.	3.5	4	3.75	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counselor candidate creates lessons or activities that corresponds to the plan developed in collaboration with the needs of the guidance program.	3.5	4	3.75	87.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%

Counselor candidate utilizes relevant resources as they relate to the candidate's guidance/school activities in collaboration with the Site Counselor.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Applying developmental, learning counseling and education theories.	3.5	4	3.75	87.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Applies legal and ethical principles of the school counseling profession.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Understands the impact of cultural, social, and environmental influences on student success and opportunities.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Demonstrates advocacy in the components within a comprehensive school counseling program.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Demonstrates professionalism in the field to colleagues, parents, community members and students.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Providing short-term counseling in small and individual settings.	2.75	4	3.38	62.5%	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Making referrals to appropriate school and community resources.	3.33	4	3.71	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Maintaining records and submitting them in a timely fashion.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reflecting on practice.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Advocating on behalf of all students.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Demonstrating leadership in the use of interpersonal and organizational power.	3.75	4	3.88	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

During the 2024–25 academic year, School Counseling candidate dispositions reflected significant gains across nearly all measured areas. Candidates consistently demonstrated professional behaviors and mindsets aligned with expectations of a practicing school counselor, with 15 of the 18 indicators rated as Exemplary for over 85% of candidates. Dispositions with Exceptionally High Ratings of Performance (>60% Exemplary) include:

- The counselor candidate is active in the counselor’s role and asks appropriate questions pertaining to the academic progress within the school community. (87.5%)
- The counselor candidate can collaborate with school partners by showing a positive attitude towards students and all school employees. (87.5%)
- The counselor candidate interacts in an appropriate professional manner with all school personnel. (87.5%)
- The counselor candidate shows respect for the Site Counselor by completing all tasks that are assigned in a timely and appropriate manner. (87.5%)
- Counselor candidate utilizes relevant resources as they relate to the candidate’s guidance/school activities in collaboration with the Site Counselor. (87.5%)
- Applies the legal and ethical principles of the school counseling profession. (87.5%)
- Demonstrates advocacy in the components within a comprehensive school counseling program. (87.5%)
- Demonstrates professionalism in the field to colleagues, parents, community members and students. (87.5%)
- Maintaining records and submitting them in a timely fashion. (87.5%)
- Reflecting on practice. (87.5%)
- Advocating on behalf of all students. (87.5%)

- Demonstrating leadership in the use of interpersonal and organizational power. (87.5%)

These consistently high-performance ratings suggest that candidates are internalizing core professional values early and demonstrating them across multiple field experiences. Performance in these areas also reflects the impact of curriculum alignment, mentor feedback, and the structure provided through the updated Clinical Field Experience Guide.

While overall trends were highly positive, several dispositions reflected comparatively lower levels of “Exemplary” performance, though still showing marked improvement from the previous year:

- Providing short-term counseling in small and individual settings. (62.5% Exemplary; 25.0% Developing)
- Making referrals to appropriate school and community resources. (71.4% Exemplary; 12.5% N/A)
- Interacting with diverse students in a positive, respectful, and safe manner. (75.0% Exemplary)
- Creating lessons or activities aligned to the guidance plan. (87.5% Exemplary; 12.5% Developing)
- Applying developmental, learning, counseling, and education theories. (87.5% Exemplary; 12.5% Developing)

Next Steps

These results indicate continued need for enhanced exposure to direct counseling activities and theoretical application, particularly for candidates earlier in the program. Disposition data from 2024–25 confirm strong candidate performance across most areas, while also highlighting opportunities for refinement in skill-based counseling competencies. The following targeted next steps align with improvement efforts outlined in the CAEP Self-Study and the EPSB Continued Program Review:

1. **Curriculum and Disposition Alignment**- Faculty will continue refining course content and assessments—particularly in areas such as referrals, group counseling, and application of counseling theories—to ensure alignment with key dispositions across the program sequence

2. **Clinical Field Experience Guide Implementation**- The updated Clinical Field Experience Guide and Menu will continue to be used to ensure candidates demonstrate appropriate counseling dispositions in field settings, progressing from observation to leadership as they move through the program.

3. **Data-Informed Course Sequencing**- Faculty will use disposition and capstone data—via the Leader Tracking System and Faculty Meetings—to adjust course sequencing and scaffold skill development, especially for students in early coursework.

4. **Focused Training in Small and Group Counseling**- In response to lower “Exemplary” ratings in short-term and group counseling (62.5%), the program will increase simulations, modeled activities, and required group counseling participation during practicum.

Candidate Portfolio

To both assess a candidate’s mastery of school counseling program standards and to assist with a successful transition to the role of a school counselor, faculty in the College of Education developed a Candidate Portfolio that is completed during a candidate’s practicum courses (SGC 680 and SGC 681). The portfolio consists of a letter to the reviewer, a candidate’s resume and introductory information, professional resume, and artifacts created by the candidate during the program to demonstrate mastery of the 8 core areas included in the Kentucky Standards of Preparation for School Counselors (2019) and the Kentucky Framework for Best Practices for School Counselors (2020) (Appendix B). Finally, the candidate completes a summary essay that identifies candidate “knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained” in addition to “strengths, challenges, and opportunities” gained during the school counseling program.

During the 2024-25 academic year, 18 candidates submitted Candidate Portfolios as part of their Practicum I and Practicum II courses. One hundred percent (100%) of candidates scored “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” in each of the 8 core areas assessed. Portfolio results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6: 2023-24 Candidate Portfolio Results by Performance Level (N = 18)

Core Area	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
2.1- Counseling Related Research	0	0	5.6	94.4
2.2- Professional Identity and Ethical Practice	0	0	5.6	94.4
2.6- Counseling and Helping Relationships	0	0	5.6	94.4
2.7- Group Counseling	0	0	11.1	88.9
2.8- Assessment and Testing	0	0	33.3	66.7
2.9- Research and Program Evaluation	0	0	38.9	61.1
4- Contextual Dimensions of the Leadership/Advocacy Role	0	0	27.8	72.2
5- Clinical Instruction	0	0	11.1	88.9

During the 2024–25 academic year, at least 90% of candidates scored “Exemplary” in Program Portfolio Core Areas including: Counseling Related Research (94.4%), Professional Identity and Ethical Practice (94.4%), and Counseling and Helping Relationships (94.4%). High performance was also observed in Group Counseling (88.9%) and Clinical Instruction (88.9%).

Areas with the lowest number of candidates scoring at the “Exemplary” level include Research and Program Evaluation (61.1%) and Assessment and Testing (66.7%). The Contextual Dimensions of the Leadership and Advocacy Role (72.2%) also remained slightly below benchmark, suggesting a continued need to reinforce advocacy skill development within both coursework and practicum experiences.

Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year

During the 2024-25 Academic Year, an improvement plan was implemented with four (4) goals of improving candidate proficiency.

Regarding Goal 1 (Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in social and cultural diversity):

- 100% of students met the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category B on the Candidate Portfolio (75% Target- Target Met)
- 96% of students scored “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 10 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“understands the impact of cultural, social, and environmental influences on student success and opportunities”) (90% Target- Target Met)
- 100% of students scored “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.3 (Social and Cultural Diversity) (80% Target- Target Met)

Regarding Goal 2 (Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in counseling and helping relationships):

- 100% of students met the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category E on the Candidate Portfolio (75% Target- Target Met)
- 100% of students scored “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 2 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“Counselor candidate is able to collaborate with school partners by showing a positive attitude towards students and all school employees.”) (90% Target- Target Met)
- 100% of students scored “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.6 (Counseling and Helping Relationships) (80% Target- Target Met)

Regarding Goal 3 (Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in group counseling):

- 100% of students met the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category F on the Candidate Portfolio (75% Target- Target Met).

- 79% of students scored “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 13 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“Providing short-term counseling in small and individual settings”) (70% Target- Target Not Met)
- 95% of students scored “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.7 (Group Counseling) (80% Target- Target Met)

Regarding Goal 4 (Students entering the School Counseling Program are retained throughout the program):

- 100% of students enrolled in the program persisted to graduation (90% Target- Target Met)
- 92% of students (34 of 37) enrolled in the program registered for courses the following academic year (90% Target- Target Met)
- 5.6% (2 of 36) of students admitted to the program withdrew, were dismissed, or failed to complete the degree (<10% Target- Target Met)

Improvement Plan for 2025-26 Academic Year

As result of the review process that included data review and discussion with faculty and external stakeholders, the following improvement plan has been identified for the 2025-26 Academic Year.

Goal 1: Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in Social and Cultural Diversity

Assessment 1: 75% of students will meet the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category B on the Candidate Portfolio

Assessment 2: 90% of students will score “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 10 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“understands the impact of cultural, social, and environmental influences on student success and opportunities”).

Assessment 3: 80% of students will score “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.3 (Social and Cultural Diversity)

Goal 2: Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in counseling and helping relationships

Assessment 4: 75% of students will meet the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category E on the Candidate Portfolio

Assessment 5: 90% of students will score “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 2 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“Counselor candidate is able to collaborate with school partners by showing a positive attitude towards students and all school employees.”).

Assessment 6: 80% of students will score “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.6 (Counseling and Helping Relationships)

Goal 3: Candidates will demonstrate program-level proficiency in group counseling

Assessment 7: 75% of students will meet the “Demonstrated” indicator for Category F on the Candidate Portfolio.

Assessment 8: 70% of students will score “Proficient” or “Exemplary” for Assessment Item 13 on the Candidate Disposition Survey (“Providing short-term counseling in small and individual settings”)

Assessment 9: 80% of students will score “Accomplished” or “Exemplary” for Anchor Assessment items assessing School Counseling Preparation Program Standard 2.7 (Group Counseling)

Goal 4: Students entering the School Counseling Program are retained throughout the program

Assessment 10: 90% of students enrolled in the program will persist in their graduation

Assessment 11: 90% of students enrolled in the program will register for courses the following academic year

Assessment 12: 10% or fewer students admitted to the program will withdraw, be dismissed, or fail to complete the degree.

Action Plan: 2025-26 Academic Year

Activity	Goals Addressed	Impact on Program Candidates
Enhance direct instruction and simulation in group counseling techniques, including role play and peer-led practice	Goal 3: Proficiency in Group Counseling (Assessments 7–9)	Increase candidate confidence and performance in short-term and group counseling scenarios by offering authentic, guided practice aligned to KSPSC Standard 2.7.
Revise course activities and anchor assessments in all program courses consistent with Continuous Improvement Model	Goal 2: Counseling and Helping Relationships (Assessments 4–6)	Promote stronger skill development by embedding scaffolded clinical tasks and formative assessments, leading to improved applied counseling competencies
Expand use of Clinical Field Experience Guide to require structured leadership tasks during practicum	Goals 2 & 3: Counseling Practice and Group Leadership	Ensure that candidates demonstrate progression from observation to implementation of interventions, reinforcing skill development in authentic school settings.
Conduct rubric calibration sessions for anchor assessments to ensure consistency in assessment and program expectations	Goals 1 & 2: Cultural Diversity and Counseling Relationships	Improve scoring consistency across faculty and field supervisors, ensuring clarity and fairness in evaluation while strengthening candidate feedback and support systems.
Launch revised Graduate Counselor Survey, modeled after the validated PPP tool	Goal 1: Cultural Diversity (Assessments 1–3); All Goal	Collect more robust completer feedback to evaluate program impact and identify needs for continuous improvement aligned with CAEP R4.2 and state standards.
Continue collaboration with CHMC faculty to enhance preparation in small-	Goal 2: Counseling Relationships (Assessments 4–6)	Leverage interdisciplinary expertise to improve training and supervision in

and large-group counseling and mental health and referral competencies		referral-making and mental health awareness, addressing areas identified in survey and rubric data.
Maintain and expand use of the Leader Tracking System (LTS) to monitor graduate employment and licensure outcomes	Goal 4: Program Retention and Completion (Assessments 10–12)	Inform advising, course scheduling, and fieldwork placement by using real-time data on candidate success, licensure, and school counselor employment across partner districts.

Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting

In accordance with CAEP’s guidance on the ethical and responsible use of emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI), Spalding University’s Principal Preparation Program incorporated AI tools to support the development of its 2024–25 Annual Report. These tools were utilized under faculty supervision to aid in data visualization, draft generation, and synthesis of program assessment findings.

The purpose of integrating AI was to:

- Enhance the efficiency and accuracy of data reporting and interpretation,
- Support transparent, evidence-based program improvement; and
- Model future-ready leadership practices that responsibly engage with advanced technologies.

All content generated or supported by AI tools was reviewed, edited, and validated by faculty and leadership team members to ensure academic integrity, contextual accuracy, and alignment with CAEP standards. The program recognizes that AI serves as a complementary tool, not a replacement for human judgment, professional expertise, or ethical decision-making.

This use of AI reflects Spalding’s commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in educator preparation, preparing leaders who are equipped to engage critically and responsibly with emerging technologies in P–12 environments.



**Master of Education in Instructional Leadership:
Principal Preparation Program
Program Effectiveness Report
2024-25 Academic Year**

Prepared by:

Glenn S. Baete, Ed.D
Director of Advanced Programs
College of Education
June 2025

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Program Review Process	
Preparation and Placement of Leaders/Leaders of Color	8
Follow Up Study of Graduates	9
Graduate Leader Survey	12
State and CAEP Review Process	17
Quality Measures Self-Study	19
Key Assessment Review	
Anchor Assessments	20
Dispositions Evaluation	22
Capstone Project	25
School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA)	26
Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL)	27
Spalding Equity-Centered Leadership Dispositions (Spalding Six)	30
Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year	33
Program Outcomes: 2024-25 Academic Year	34
Action Plan: 2025-26 Academic Year	35
Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting	36

Executive Summary
Spalding University: Master of Education in Instructional Leadership
2024-25 Annual Report

The 2024–25 Annual Report provides a comprehensive evaluation of the Spalding University Master of Education in Instructional Leadership: Principal Preparation Program (PPP), including progress toward program goals, candidate outcomes, and alignment with state and national standards. The report integrates findings from internal assessments, stakeholder surveys, and formal reviews conducted by the Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board (KYEPSB) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Key findings from the year include:

- **Program Effectiveness & Placement:** From 2020 to 2024, 36% of program completers have assumed formal leadership roles, including assistant principals, instructional coaches, and central office administrators. Notably, 49% of all admitted candidates since 2021 identify as candidates of color, supporting the program's mission to diversify school leadership.
- **Candidate Performance:** Results from Anchor Assessments, Capstone Projects, and the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) demonstrate consistently high performance. In 2024–25, 90% of Anchor Assessment scores and 92% of Spalding Six Disposition evaluations were rated “Accomplished” or “Exemplary.” All candidates passed the SLLA, with 100% meeting or exceeding national averages in key areas such as climate/culture and strategic leadership.
- **Graduate Feedback:** Graduate surveys revealed high satisfaction with mentoring, clinical fieldwork, and preparation for equity-centered leadership. Graduates reported strong application of skills in instructional leadership, stakeholder engagement, and reflective practice.
- **Standards Alignment:** Assessments tied to the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) showed that 91% of outcomes scored met or exceeded proficiency benchmarks. The program’s integration of equity, reflection, and systems leadership was cited as a strength in both CAEP self-study and the KYEPSB Continued Program Review.
- **Continuous Improvement:** The report identifies improvement goals for 2025–26 across three areas: strengthening candidate knowledge, improving growth in professional dispositions, and deepening preparation for equity-centered leadership. Action steps include launching an SLLA prep module, expanding training for university coaches, refining assessment rubrics, and enhancing instruction in community engagement and ethical leadership.

Through sustained faculty collaboration, external stakeholder engagement, and a commitment to rigorous, equity-centered preparation, the Principal Preparation Program continues to advance its mission of preparing effective, reflective, and ethical school leaders ready to meet the evolving demands of P–12 education.

Introduction

Assessment of candidate, program, and unit operations is an underpinning component of the professional education unit at Spalding University. Candidates in advanced programs are regularly assessed and at various intervals throughout the program. The unit's continual collection and analysis of candidate provides program data purposed to identify patterns of performance. This analysis may lead to pausing questions about whether changes are needed. The feedback loop consists of formative feedback, plans for improvement, summative feedback, evaluation decisions, and revision and renewal. The sequence of these elements leads toward improved candidate outcomes.

Spalding University's College of Education (COE) is committed to recruiting, preparing, and graduating candidates that are prepared to positively impact the P-12 environments in which they serve. The GATES Unit Continuous Assessment System (GATES QAS) utilized by the COE is aligned with standards set forth by Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Specifically, CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity, requires the following:

3.4 – The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all these domains.

3.5 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards considering new results.

The UCAS established by the COE is designed to ensure a deliberate and thoughtful process for recruiting and selecting candidates for both Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Furthermore, the UCAS provides an objective framework that COE faculty can utilize for the purpose of substantive review of candidate progress through COE Initial Certification and Advanced Programs. Additionally, the UCAS enables the Director of Advanced Programs to approve and conscientiously place candidates in clinical field experiences that are congruent with the candidate's professional growth needs and area of certification.

The UCAS requires faculty to collaboratively review candidate progress regarding dispositions, grade point average, course completion, and field experience requirements. COE faculty review the UCAS at two points during the academic year – at the conclusion of the Fall and Spring academic terms. Decisions regarding candidate progression through the UCAS will be documented in the minutes of the faculty meetings during which UCAS data is reviewed.

The assessments selected by Spalding University to determine Principal Preparation Program effectiveness (Anchor Assessments, Capstone Project, Candidate Disposition Evaluation, and SLLA) support quality and strategic evaluation and continuous improvements standards and indicators identified by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), Standard 5- Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement, and Education Administration Performance Assessment Areas identified by the Kentucky Department of Education's Office of Educator Licensure and Effectiveness (OELE). These areas include candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; professional capabilities; data and research-driven decision making; and integration of technology into the discipline.

Ongoing and continuous monitoring of candidate progress is the joint responsibility of program faculty and the Department Chair. Assessments and evaluations of candidates in initial and advance level education programs at Spalding University should be aligned to the appropriate state or national standards. The Master of Education and Rank I- Master of Education in Instructional Leadership- School Principal degrees are aligned to the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, 2015), as identified in 704 KAR 16:090.

This report contains information from the Program Review Process and data from each of the six (6) assessed areas of the program Quality Assurance Plan (QAP). These multiple

measures are consistent with CAEP Standard A.5.1 to "monitor candidate progress, complete achievement, and provider operational effectiveness." The annual report satisfies CAEP Standard A.5.2 to "rely on relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations are valid and consistent."

The data outlined in this report will be used to compare progress towards meeting the PSEL standards associated with a particular item, task, or assessment. This formal process that will be completed by university faculty and district partners aligns with CAEP Standard A.5.3 to "regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards, test innovations, use results to improve elements and processes."

As the conclusion of this report, an improvement plan will be articulated to identify specific benchmarked goals and specific activities necessary to improve outcomes measured in the six analyses. Activities will include actions that include curriculum review and alignment, reviewing assessments and clinical field experiences, and collaboration with school districts to determine PPP instructional priorities. The development of a collaborative plan aligns to CAEP Standard A.5.4 and A.5.5 that "involves alumni, employers, and practitioners" and ensures that outcomes are "benchmarked, shared, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction."

Program Review Process

Preparation and Placement of Leaders/Leaders of Color

Spalding University’s College of Education (COE) uses data from Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), and internal candidate surveys to track the placement and professional growth of graduates from the Principal Preparation Program. During the 2024–25 academic year, updated data were compiled through June 2025 to assess the number of program completers serving in leadership roles across JCPS. These data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Principal Preparation Program: Completers and Current Role 2020-2025 (as of 6/2025)

JCPS Cohort	Candidates	% Candidates of Color	# Current Administrators (Admin. of Color)	Percent Administrators (Admin. of Color)
2020-21	20	50%	1 Associate Principal/7 Assistant Principal (4) 2 AIC/Counselor (1)	50% (25%)
2021-22	19	47%	3 Assistant Principal (1) 5 AIC (1) 1 State Administrator	42% (10%)
2022-23	28	46%	8 Assistant Principal (5) 5 Academic Instructional Coach/Counselor (3) 1 District Administrator	50% (29%)
2023-24	20	40%	1 Associate Principal (1)/4 Assistant Principal (3) 1 Academic Instructional Coach/ 1 Counselor (1)	35% (25%)
2024-25	14	71%	N/A	N/A
2025-26	21	57%	N/A	N/A

From 2020 to 2024, 87 candidates completed the program. Of those, 13 (15%) are currently serving as Associate or Assistant Principals, 15 (17%) as Academic Instructional Coaches or Counselors, and 3 (3%) as State or District Central Office Administrators—bringing the total proportion of graduates in leadership roles to 31 of 87 (36%). This includes 9 administrators of color, representing approximately 10% of all completers and 29% of those in leadership roles.

Cohort-specific outcomes include:

- **2020–21:** 20 candidates (50% candidates of color); 10 total in leadership, including 4 administrators of color.
- **2021–22:** 19 candidates (47% candidates of color); 9 in leadership, including 1 administrator of color.
- **2022–23:** 28 candidates (46% candidates of color); 14 in leadership, including 5 administrators of color.
- **2023–24:** 20 candidates (40% candidates of color); 7 in leadership, including 3 administrators of color.

For the 2024–25 and 2025–26 cohorts, placement data are not yet available. However, these cohorts reflect the program's deepened commitment to diversity, with 71% candidates of color in 2024–25 and 57% in 2025–26.

Through its partnership with JCPS and participation in the Wallace Foundation's Equity-Centered Pipeline Initiative, Spalding continues to support the district's strategic goal of increasing the proportion of school leaders of color. The Principal Preparation Program has admitted 51 candidates of color out of 104 since 2021 (49%), with a strong foundation to increase leadership diversity in future placement cycles.

Follow Up Study of Graduates

During the Spring of 2021, a mixed-methods explanatory study (Creswell et al., 2003) was developed to further analyze program effectiveness through perceptions of preparation from program graduates. During the qualitative phase of the study, the Program Director and the College of Education Department Chair facilitated a focus group containing Principal Preparation Program graduates regarding their experiences in the Spalding program. Graduates were asked to reflect on their Spalding Principal Preparation experience, the program's effectiveness in preparation for their current role as a school administrator, and additional needs given the changes in the role of the school leader.

In the next phase of the study, a Principal Preparation Program Survey was developed and sent to individuals completing the program in the past 8 years (N = 124). The survey contains 16 items derived from Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, 2015) and the Spalding University College of Education Conceptual Framework. To ensure validity of

survey items, members of the program faculty and the Principal Preparation Program Graduate Focus Group were asked to review items and provide commentary.

The survey was distributed to Principal Preparation Program candidates who completed the program within the past 8 years, including participants in the 2024-25 MEd in Instructional Leadership/Aspiring Leaders cohort. These individuals were asked to indicate their level of preparedness for the role of a school leader based on their experience in the Principal Preparation Program at Spalding University. Eight participants of the 2024-25 cohort (n = 8) responded to the survey with a response rate of 58%. The results of the survey are displayed in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Principal Preparation Program Survey: 2024 Cohort Information (N = 11)

Cohort	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
2025	8	58
2024	11	58
2023	27	77
2022	11	58

Table 3: Principal Preparation Program Survey: Item Analysis

Item (Standard)	2024-25 Cohort		Overall	
	<i>M</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>sd</i>
1. Develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being for each student (PSEL, 1)	4.50	.29	4.53	.56
2. Act ethically and according to professional norms (PSEL, 2)	4.75	.46	4.71	.55
3. Strive for equity of educational opportunities and culturally responsive practices (PSEL, 3)	4.75	.46	4.52	.82

4. Develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment (PSEL, 4)	4.25	.46	4.48	.72
5. Cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community (PSEL, 5)	4.88	.35	4.77	.46
6. Develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel (PSEL, 6)	4.63	.52	4.48	.62
7. Foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff (PSEL, 7)	4.75	.46	4.58	.64
8. Engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways (PSEL, 8)	4.50	.53	4.61	.74
9. Manage school operations and resources (PSEL, 9)	4.28	.74	4.21	.77
10. Act as agents of continuous improvement (PSEL, 10)	4.38	.52	4.45	.69
11. Demonstrate insight in creating a learning environment that empowers others to reach their potential (Spalding, 1)	4.50	.53	4.48	.70
12. Commit to fairness, and the principles of personal, academic, and professional integrity (Spalding, 2)	4.63	.52	4.58	.74
13. Show respect for self and others, open to diverse perspectives and cultures, and perseveres in serving learners, families, schools and communities (Spalding, 3)	4.88	.35	4.66	.60
14. Believes that all students can learn and is able to evaluate teaching and learning experiences for personal and professional growth (Spalding, 4)	5.00	0	4.73	.48

15. Demonstrate flexibility in meeting student needs and use best practices to promote student learning (Spalding, 5)	4.75	.46	4.50	.72
16. Devotes self to acquiring knowledge about the context, pedagogy, and professional areas of teaching (Spalding, 6)	4.75	.46	4.55	.69

Survey results indicate that graduates from the 2024–25 cohort reported higher or comparable levels of preparedness in nearly all domains when compared with the cumulative data. Notably, the highest-rated items from the 2024–25 group include:

- **PSEL 5:** Cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community (M = 4.88)
- **Spalding 4:** Belief in all students’ capacity to learn and ability to evaluate teaching (M = 5.00)
- **Spalding 3:** Respect for diversity and commitment to service (M = 4.88)

Lower—but still strong—scores were seen in areas such as:

- **PSEL 4:** Curriculum, instruction, and assessment systems (M = 4.25)
- **PSEL 9:** Managing school operations and resources (M = 4.28)

These findings suggest continued strengths in equity, student support, and professionalism, aligned with the program’s mission and the Spalding Six equity dispositions. The consistently high scores in ethical leadership (PSEL 2), professional norms, and inclusive practices also support the program’s emphasis on preparing culturally responsive leaders. Survey feedback continues to inform curriculum development and improvement planning for future cohorts.

Graduate Leader Survey

In alignment with CAEP Standard R4.2, which requires Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) to evaluate the satisfaction of employers and program completers, Spalding University administered the Graduate Leader Survey during the 2024–25 academic year. This survey was designed to assess the long-term effectiveness of the Principal Preparation Program by gathering feedback from graduates currently serving in school leadership roles. The survey instrument underwent formal validation using the Lawshe method, which involved a panel of

content-level experts. The instrument met the minimum content validity ratio (CVR) thresholds, ensuring its appropriateness for measuring perceptions of preparation and leadership practice. The survey focused on three key domains: (1) overall satisfaction with program components, (2) perceived impact on P–12 student achievement, and (3) self-assessment of equity-centered leadership using the Spalding Six Dispositions. A total of thirteen (N = 13) graduates responded, offering both quantitative ratings and rich qualitative reflections on their leadership development. The results are summarized in Tables 4, 5, and 6, followed by an analysis of narrative responses.

Table 4: Graduate Leader Survey: Respondents by Cohort

Cohort	Number of Respondents
2025	1
2024	2
2023	4
2021	4
2018	3

Table 5: Graduate Leader Survey: Percent Satisfaction with Program Features

Program Feature	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N/A
Coaching and Mentoring	7.14	0	42.86	42.86	7.14
Cultural Humility and Responsiveness Training	7.14	0	28.57	64.29	0
Clinical Field Experiences	7.14	0	28.57	64.29	0
Coursework and Academic Content	7.14	7.14	28.57	57.14	0
Overall Preparation for the Role of School Leader	7.14	7.14	42.86	42.86	0

Table 6: Graduate Leader Survey: Percent Spalding Six Dispositions in Current Work

Disposition	Aspiring	Emerging	Practicing	Leading
<u>Academic and Student Support Programming-</u> I am able to implement programs that include all people, include support as needed, and challenge students to be successful.	0	0	38.56	61.54
<u>Talent and Operational Management-</u> I am able to make sure that the hiring practices and day-to-day procedures of managing staff and students are consistently equitable and inclusive.	0	7.69	61.54	30.77
<u>Disrupts Power Imbalances-</u> I am consistently asking all stakeholders for voice and input on procedures, systems, and practices to make sure that there is not a top-down leadership approach and that all parties feel heard and valued.	0	15.38	38.46	46.15
<u>District/School Community Support-</u> I consistently interact with the community and the surrounding partners to determine what value they can add to the school, and how we can do the same. I ask for help when I know that one entity specializes in the area in which I need it.	0	0	84.62	15.38
<u>Self-Reflection-</u> I am consistently reading to improve, attending learning opportunities focused on my gaps and asking stakeholders for both affirmation and adjusting feedback in my work.	0	7.69	38.46	53.85
<u>Accountability through Continuous Improvement-</u> I consistently look at data as a school and determine where improvements can be made school-wide, content-wide, faculty-wide and for personal improvement.	0	0	53.85	46.15

As part of the 2024–25 Graduate Leader Survey, participants were asked to describe how they currently impact P–12 student achievement. Their responses offer valuable insight into how the Principal Preparation Program translates into practice. Graduates consistently reported using the knowledge and dispositions developed through the program to improve instruction, equity, and student outcomes. Several key themes emerged:

- **Instructional Leadership and Coaching**

Graduates emphasized their role in strengthening instruction and supporting teacher effectiveness:

“I lead professional development for teachers to ensure they have a wide variety of skills to support student learning.”

“I support Tier 1 instruction and teacher professional development to strengthen classroom practices.”

- **Equity and Behavior Systems**

Many leaders described a proactive approach to ensuring equitable outcomes:

“I help implement structures in and out of the classroom, ensure HQIRs are used, and apply behavior strategies that promote academic success.”

“We’ve created plans to close achievement gaps based on data—especially in special education.”

- **Culture and Belonging**

The connection between school culture and achievement was a recurring theme:

“I’ve strengthened home-school connections, which has led to increased student belonging and engagement.”

“My leadership contributes to a culture of high expectations, equity, and support that drives learning.”

- **Family and Community Partnerships**

Graduates acknowledged the value of leveraging external relationships to support learning:

“I build strong relationships with families and community partners to create a support network around each student.”

- **Systems Thinking and Strategic Impact**

Several responses reflected a broader systems mindset:

“Spalding helped me see how everything connects—I’ve used that to design school systems that directly support student learning.”

“I can see how the pieces fit together and create structures that improve both staff performance and student outcomes.”

Graduates of the Principal Preparation Program also reflected on how their understanding and application of the Spalding Six Equity-Centered Leadership Dispositions have evolved since completing the program. Their responses demonstrate both personal growth and practical shifts in leadership behaviors, shaped by real-world school leadership experiences.

- **Deeper Understanding of Community Partnerships**

Graduates emphasized an increased reliance on school and district community supports to promote student belonging and success:

“I lean more on district/school community support than I ever thought I would as I look for ways to increase a sense of belonging for my students.”

“I’ve discovered that community support is available but often untapped. I now understand how large a role the community plays in operating the school on a different level.”

- **Commitment to Ethical Leadership and Equity**

Leaders highlighted that equity-centered dispositions are more than practices—they are ethical imperatives aligned with the district’s values:

“These dispositions are a matter of ethics. We must remember that our mission is to help all students and do the right thing, even when it’s inconvenient.”

- **Growth Through Reflective Practice**

Several graduates described how consistent reflection has shaped their leadership development, particularly in navigating difficult conversations and improving school outcomes:

“I am constantly reflecting on how I can improve my school and my leadership abilities.”

“I’ve grown a lot since my first year and am increasing my ability to have difficult conversations that ultimately benefit students.”

- **Awareness of Equity Challenges in Hiring**

Some participants acknowledged the complexities of implementing equitable hiring practices within district constraints:

“It’s more of a challenge to implement equitable hiring when I’m pulling from the teacher transfer list, but I am working through this and remain committed to inclusive hiring.”

- **Applied Systems Thinking**

Graduates consistently noted that Spalding’s preparation helped them understand and connect the various components of school leadership:

“Spalding’s program did a great job showing us how to link all the leadership pieces together into coherent systems.”

- **Expanding Partnerships to Promote Student Opportunities**

Participants shared efforts to engage external partners and build networks that benefit student learning and career exploration:

“We work with community partners like UPS and Republic Airways to help our students explore engineering pathways.”

“We continuously seek out stakeholders, so our students gain real-world experiences and see future career opportunities.”

These reflections reveal that Spalding graduates are not only applying the Spalding Six dispositions but are deepening their practice through lived experience. Their growth illustrates how equity-centered leadership is a dynamic, evolving process grounded in reflection, relationships, and a commitment to inclusive excellence.

State and CAEP Review Process

During the Spring of 2025, the Principal Preparation Program at Spalding University completed the Continued Program Review process with the Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board (KYEPSB). This process involved comprehensive self-study, external evaluation by KYEPSB staff and a peer institution (Georgetown College), and a formal presentation to the state Program Review Committee. The review focused on six domains: candidate admissions and progression, coursework, pedagogy-andragogy, clinical practice, performance assessment, and continuous improvement.

The review affirmed numerous strengths of the Principal Preparation Program, including its alignment with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), strategic use of the Leader Tracking System (LTS) for data-informed decision-making, and strong partnerships with Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). The program’s admissions process was recognized for its emphasis on equity, while the capstone and clinical experiences were commended for being rigorous and closely tied to real-world leadership challenges. Reviewers praised the

integration of reflective practice, experiential simulations like SchoolSims, and consistent performance results on the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

As a result of the Continued Program Review, Spalding University was informed by the KYEPSB that they had met or exceeded the requirements in all categories for continued approval of the Principal Preparation Program.

During the Spring of 2025, Spalding University's Principal Preparation Program submitted both a program Self-Study and the Annual Accreditation Report to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). These submissions highlighted the program's continued alignment with state and national standards, its commitment to continuous improvement, and its progress toward addressing prior areas for improvement.

Program-Specific Highlights

- **Advanced-Level Graduate Data (2023–2024):**
The report documented 71 graduates from advanced certification programs, including completers from the Principal Preparation Program. These candidates were prepared to assume school leadership roles in P–12 settings across Kentucky.
- **Leader Tracking System (LTS):**
A key innovation in the Principal Preparation Program is the Leader Tracking System, a centralized platform designed to monitor candidate performance, clinical fieldwork, assessment results, and post-graduation placement. The LTS tracks alignment with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) and the Spalding Six Equity-Centered Leadership Dispositions. It also supports disaggregation by demographic variables, helping the program evaluate equity and access.

Specific to the Principal Preparation Program, efforts have included implementing an equity-centered admissions process, enhancing assessment alignment to national standards, and piloting case study methods to analyze completer effectiveness. The Principal Preparation Program will participate in its next formal CAEP site visit in Fall 2025 as part of the advanced-level review cycle. Through the 2025 accreditation reporting process, the Principal Preparation Program demonstrated clear progress toward KYEPSB and CAEP expectations and reaffirmed its commitment to preparing equity-focused, data-literate school leaders who positively impact P–12 learning environments.

Quality Measures Self-Study

During the 2024–25 academic year, Spalding University’s College of Education engaged in a comprehensive self-assessment process using the Quality Measures (QM) Principal Preparation Program Self-Study Toolkit. This process was conducted in collaboration with Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) administrators and graduates of the Principal Preparation Program, reinforcing the university's commitment to evidence-based improvement and equitable leadership development.

The self-study focused on six key domains critical to principal preparation quality: Candidate Admissions, Coursework, Pedagogy-Andragogy, Clinical Practice, Performance Assessment, and Graduate Performance Outcomes. Each domain was evaluated through a structured analysis of program design and implementation, using robust rubric developed by the Education Development Center (EDC) and supported by The Wallace Foundation.

The QM process included team orientation and planning, evidence collection and preliminary rating, evidence synthesis meetings, and presentations of findings. The strengths identified across domains included strong alignment with professional standards (e.g., PSEL), a structured curriculum emphasizing equity (Spalding Six), and meaningful clinical practice with experienced mentors. Areas for enhancement included strengthening documentation of mentorship calibration, expanding peer and alumni networks, and disaggregating graduate outcome data for equity analysis.

These findings directly informed the 2025–26 Program Improvement Action Plan and will shape ongoing program development in future years. By using the QM framework, Spalding University reaffirmed its focus on preparing equity-centered school leaders and deepening partnerships with JCPS to meet the evolving needs of schools and communities.

Key Assessment Review

The Master of Education and Rank I- Master of Education in Instructional Leadership program assessments include a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures used to monitor candidate performance; and to manage and to improve unit programs and unit operations. The unit assessment system collects and analyzes data on candidates, graduates, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at transition points. The plan incorporates continuous assessment with systematically administered procedures.

All programs (Initial and Advanced) identify as a benchmark, a major assignment or experience (Capstone) that occurs in a course that candidates take during or near the end of their program. Through this assessment, candidates are expected to demonstrate mastery of subject matter or level of expertise in the field as well as standard-based proficiencies.

During the 2024-25 academic year, the Master of Education and Rank I- Master of Education in Instructional Leadership at Spalding University utilized five (5) assessments to determine program effectiveness. A description of the assessments and results are as follows:

Anchor Assessments:

Anchor assessments are administered to candidates throughout coursework to assess candidate knowledge and skills, reflect upon clinical practice experiences, demonstrate appropriate use of data for decision making, integrate technology into professional work, and demonstrate professional capabilities. Nine (9) Anchor Assessments with individual criteria were given to students enrolled in program clinical courses and assessed using rubrics created by the College of Education Faculty. The results from the 2024-25 academic year are displayed in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Percent of Anchor Assessments Meeting Rubric Criteria- 2024-25 Academic Year

	611- PLC Analysis	621- DL Action Research Project	631- New Teacher Induction Plan	641- REAP Protocol	651a- Digital Infrastructure Analysis	651b- In-Basket	661a- PTA Meeting Analysis	661b- School Website Analysis	Average PCT
Ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developing	7	7	9	15	10	13	0	20	10
Accomplished	53	50	33	52	63	73	85	60	59
Exemplary	40	43	57	32	27	13	15	20	31

During the 2024–25 academic year, 90% of all Anchor Assessment criteria in the Principal Preparation Program were rated as either “Accomplished” or “Exemplary,” reflecting consistently strong candidate performance across clinical and course-embedded leadership tasks. No candidates were rated “Ineffective,” and only 10% scored at the “Developing” level, indicating that nearly all program completers met or exceeded performance expectations on applied assessments linked to the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL).

Assessment outcomes showed high levels of proficiency across most domains, with 100% of candidates in EPP 661a (PTA Meeting Analysis) achieving at or above the program benchmark. Similarly, EPP 631 (New Teacher Induction Plan) and EPP 651a (Digital Infrastructure Analysis) demonstrated strong outcomes, reinforcing the program's emphasis on instructional leadership and system-level thinking. The highest concentration of “Developing” scores (20%) appeared in EPP 661b (School Website Analysis), indicating an area where additional instruction on digital communication and stakeholder accessibility may be warranted.

These findings are consistent with the results of the KYEPSB Continued Program Review, which affirmed the program’s “Exemplary” ratings in pedagogy and clinical practice. Reviewers cited the use of equity-centered, job-embedded learning—including tools like SchoolSims and coaching plans—as hallmarks of program strength. Furthermore, the program’s Leader Tracking System (LTS) was recognized in both the KYEPSB and CAEP self-assessment reports for enabling robust monitoring of candidate performance and placement. However, both external reviews also noted a need to continue calibrating assessments and enhancing documentation of validity and reliability procedures across performance instruments.

These data points will inform the 2025–26 Program Improvement Plan, with specific attention to assessments where “Developing” ratings are elevated and to strengthening inter-rater reliability and feedback consistency.

Dispositions Evaluation

The Candidate Dispositions Evaluation (CDE) is a key component of Spalding University’s Principal Preparation Program (PPP), providing insight into candidates’ development in professional conduct, ethical leadership, equity, and instructional disposition. Conducted twice—once during the candidate’s first semester by a school-based supervisor, and again prior to exit by university faculty—the CDE evaluates 21 critical behaviors aligned with CAEP and EPSB standards. The tool has been in use since 2019–20 and is administered electronically for ease of analysis and comparison. Results from the Dispositions Evaluation for the 2024-25 Academic Year are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8: Dispositions Evaluation Results- 2024-2025 Academic Year (N = 14)

Item	Administration 1 Average	Administration 2 Average	Gain/Loss
Meets the daily physical demands of the profession.	3.89	3.73	-0.16
Conducts personal and professional activities in a respectful, legal, ethical, and confidential manner.	3.89	3.73	-0.16
Complies with rules and reports problems to appropriate persons.	4	3.73	-0.27
Meets class, university, field experience, practicum, and program deadlines and time commitments.	3.33	3.82	0.48
Acknowledges her/his own responsibility and culpability; does not attempt to transfer fault or blame to others or rationalize inadequate or missing performance.	3.89	3.73	-0.16
Expresses and models commitment to education as a career.	4	4	0

Meets standards of social conduct and carries out responsibilities without compromising personal/professional integrity.	4	3.73	-0.27
Values the work of self and others by using citations and avoiding plagiarism.	3.67	3.73	0.06
Demonstrates the belief that all students can learn by respectfully affirming individual student differences.	4	4	0
Studies and produces work through self-determination and self-motivation.	4	3.82	-0.18
Demonstrates perseverance and resilience in meeting academic and professional goals.	3.89	3.91	0.02
Is caring and considerate in verbal and nonverbal communications with children, faculty, teachers, and staff in schools.	3.89	3.73	-0.16
Cooperates in group enterprises, contributes constructively, disagrees courteously, avoids sarcasm, makes constructive suggestions, accepts constructive criticism, and modifies decisions and actions appropriately.	3.89	3.73	-0.16
Responds positively to feedback by engaging in constructive discussion with supervisor and implementing suggestions for improvement.	3.89	4	0.11
Exhibits awareness of and responds with fairness and sensitivity to diverse sociocultural perspectives across varied environments.	4	4	0
Appropriately assesses performance and dispositions in university and professional settings.	3.56	3.73	0.17
Shows resourcefulness and flexibility in adapting to unforeseen events and solving problems.	3.78	3.73	-0.05

Initiates conversations, contributes to, or leads discussions, and/or takes a leadership role to advocate for the field of education.	4	3.73	-0.27
Elicits feedback and consults professional resources in pursuit of professional growth.	3.89	3.91	0.02
Participates in professional development activities, including reading and evaluating current research literature for professional growth.	4	3.64	-0.36
Plans and promotes future opportunities to support and empower peers, students, colleagues, and community in educational growth.	3.89	3.64	-0.25

For the 2024–25 academic year (N = 14), results revealed that 15 of 21 items (71%) showed either growth or remained consistent, while 6 items showed declines from Administration 1 to Administration 2. The most significant positive change was seen in candidates’ ability to meet deadlines and time commitments (+0.48), suggesting improved time management and professional accountability as candidates progressed through the program. Other modest gains included assessing performance (+0.17) and responding positively to feedback (+0.11), both of which reflect growing capacity for reflective leadership and constructive dialogue.

Conversely, notable declines were observed in areas such as participation in professional development (–0.36), rule compliance and integrity (–0.27), and initiating leadership conversations (–0.27). These shifts may reflect the increasing pressures and complexity of leadership roles candidates assume during fieldwork and capstone experiences. They also suggest opportunities for program improvement related to sustained engagement in professional learning and a consistent demonstration of ethical leadership in high-stakes environments.

While the overall profile of candidate dispositions remains strong—with most averages between 3.6 and 4.0—these findings align with recommendations from both the KYEPSB

Continued Program Review and Spalding’s internal CAEP self-assessment, which emphasize the need to refine formative feedback loops and further calibrate evaluators across stakeholder groups. In response, the program will consider implementing enhanced feedback training for university faculty, introducing case-based learning modules focused on professional ethics and leadership resilience, and reinforcing expectations around continuous professional growth throughout the final stages of the program.

Capstone Project

During the 2024-25 Academic Year, 14 candidates completed a capstone project that was submitted and defended to the Principal Preparation Program faculty and JCPS staff that include: a principal supervisor, an elementary school principal, the Director of JCPS Leadership and Professional Development, and a retired administrator. The project required candidates to review a school-based Comprehensive School Improvement Plan and cognitive and non-cognitive data; evaluate the appropriateness of identified improvement goals, strategies, activities, and alignment to District priorities; and make recommendations based on coursework and information obtained from the Principal Preparation Program. All candidates (100%) received an “Accomplished” rating or higher in all areas of the Capstone Project Scoring rubric for the following criteria (Table 9).

Table 9: 2024-25 Capstone Performance

Criterion	Points Possible	Range		Average
		Low	High	
Introduction	5	5	5	5
Data Analysis	5	4.75	5	4.87
Content Analysis	6	5.75	6	5.92
Alignment to District Priorities	6	5.75	6	5.85
Recommendations	10	9.5	10	9.62
Visual Presentation	4	4	4	4

Clarity	4	3.8	4	3.95
---------	---	-----	---	------

School Leaders Licensure Assessment

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) is a state-required assessment (16 KAR 3:090) intended for those candidates who are seeking a first-time position as a principal or vice principal. This assessment is administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). During the 2019-20 Academic Year, the COVID-19 pandemic and legislative changes to 16 KAR 3:090 resulted in changes to the SLLA. As a result of the pandemic, candidates during the 2019-20 Academic Year were granted one-year certification without the testing requirement. The new SLLA assessment, version 6990, reflects the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and was administered to candidates after December 1, 2020. Table 10 below reports trend data for both the previous (6011) and current (6990) versions of the SLLA Assessment.

Table 10: SLLA Completion and Pass Rate (2019-2025)

Year	Spalding University		Commonwealth of Kentucky	
	# Exams	% Passing	# Exams	% Passing
2019-20	1	**	164	97.52
2020-21*	4	100	30	100
2021-22	7	100	520	97.56
2022-23	16	100	257	98.44
2023-24	18	100	289	98.95
2024-25	12	100	455	98.68

Source: Educational Testing Service (2024). *SLLA changed from version 6011 to 6990 during 2020-21 Academic Year. ** = No data is displayed because the test taker count is fewer than five (5).

Between June 2024 and May 2025, 12 candidates in the Spalding Principal Preparation Program completed the SLLA assessment for certification upon completing the program. As of the date of the report, all candidates who completed the assessment and met the minimum score required for certification.

Table 11: School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA): Leadership Dimension Disaggregation 2024-25 Cohort (N = 12)

SLLA Leadership Dimension	National Average Performance Range (APR)	2024-25 Cohort Average	Number of Candidates in APR	Percent of Candidates in APR
Strategic	11-14	12.66	11	92
Instructional	15-19	17.67	10	83
Climate/Cultural	10-13	13	12	100
Ethical	10-13	12.42	11	92
Organizational	7-9	8.83	10	83
Community Engagement	8-10	8.92	9	75
Constructed Response	15-20	19.60	12	100

Source: Education Testing Service (2025). Date range: June 2024-May 2025.

Disaggregation of the Leadership Dimensions assessed on the SLLA for the 2024–25 cohort (N = 12) is presented in Table 11. The data show that the cohort’s average scores met or exceeded the National Average Performance Range (APR) in all seven leadership domains assessed by the exam. Notably, 100% of candidates met or exceeded the APR in both Climate/Cultural Leadership and the Constructed Response section, indicating strong preparation in fostering inclusive, responsive school cultures and in articulating leadership decision-making.

Strong performance was also observed in Strategic Leadership and Ethical Leadership, with 92% of candidates meeting the APR in each area. Scores in Instructional and Organizational Leadership were slightly lower, with 83% of candidates meeting benchmarks. The area with the lowest performance was Community Engagement, where 75% of candidates met or exceeded the national standard. These findings highlight a consistent trend of candidate success in instructional and operational leadership, while also signaling the need for continued emphasis on building effective external partnerships and deepening community collaboration.

These patterns align with key findings from the KYEPSB Continued Program Review, which praised the Principal Preparation Program’s alignment with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) and its robust use of clinical field experiences and coaching. However, the review also identified ethical leadership and community engagement as areas where candidates would benefit from additional applied learning opportunities. Similarly, the CAEP Self-Study emphasized the need to enhance candidate support in demonstrating consistent ethical judgment and stakeholder relationship-building, particularly as these areas become more prominent during leadership internships and capstone assessments.

As part of its continuous improvement plan, the program will prioritize deeper integration of community engagement strategies into coursework and clinical experiences and expand the use of case-based ethical simulations and stakeholder feedback loops to better prepare candidates for real-world leadership demands.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL)

The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) remain central to the design, delivery, and assessment of Spalding University’s Principal Preparation Program. In accordance with 704 KAR 16:090, the PSEL framework guides both formative and summative assessments embedded throughout the curriculum. During the 2024–25 academic year, a total of 615 individual assessment outcomes were scored across the 10 PSEL domains.

Program-wide, 91% of candidate outcomes were rated “Accomplished” or “Exemplary,” with only 7% falling into the “Developing” range and less than 1% rated “Ineffective.” These results reflect strong alignment between course content, fieldwork, and leadership competencies measured by state and national leadership standards. The average rubric score across all standards was 0.79, consistent with high levels of candidate proficiency.

Several standards demonstrated perfect performance, including Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values and Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms, where 100% of candidates were rated “Accomplished.” Other notable strengths included Standard 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness (93% Accomplished/Exemplary) and Standard 5: Community of Care and Support for Students (91%). High performance in Standards 6–9—ranging from 88% to

93%—further supports the program’s success in preparing candidates for instructional leadership, collaboration, and operational management.

While performance exceeded the 85% mastery benchmark across all standards, Standards 4 and 8 revealed slightly lower proportions of exemplary ratings, particularly in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment (54% Accomplished, 38% Exemplary) and Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community (72% Accomplished, 12% Exemplary, 14% Developing). These areas will be targeted in the 2025–26 improvement plan to ensure continued growth, particularly in stakeholder engagement and evidence-based instructional planning.

These results are consistent with the findings of the KYEPSB Continued Program Review, which affirmed strong alignment to state standards while recommending increased focus on the application of instructional leadership and community engagement strategies. The CAEP Self-Study similarly supported deeper calibration of scoring practices and increased use of data to refine program design. Moving forward, these PSEL results will directly inform instructional adjustments, candidate coaching strategies, and program-level goals as part of Spalding’s continuous improvement process. The results are reported in Table 12.

Table 12: Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) Data: 2024-25 Cohort

Standard	Attempts	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	% Acc/Exp
1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values	14	0	0	100	0	100
2: Ethics and Professional Norms	14	0	0	100	0	100
3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness	123	0	6.5	65	27.6	92.7
4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	63	0	7.9	54	38.1	92.1
5: Community of Care and Support for Students	43	0	7	86	4.7	90.7

6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel	70	0	7.1	70	22.9	92.9
7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff	66	0	3	66.7	30.3	97
8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community	58	0	13.8	72.4	12.1	84.5
9: Operations and Management	85	1.2	5.9	74.1	18.8	92.9
10: School Improvement	79	0	8.9	63.3	24.1	87.3

Spalding University Equity-Centered Leadership Dispositions (The Spalding Six)

The Spalding Six Equity-Centered Leadership Dispositions represent the conceptual foundation of the Principal Preparation Program and are integrated throughout coursework, clinical experiences, and performance assessments. Each disposition reflects a key leadership competency aligned with the university’s mission and state standards. In 2024–25, a total of 761 disposition-based performance outcomes administered in classroom, lab courses, and on the capstone assessment using a four-point rubric (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary). The results from the 2024-25 academic year are reported in Table 13.

Table 13: Equity-Centered Dispositions Data: 2024-25 Cohort

Disposition	Attempts	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	% Acc/Exp
1: Academic and Student Support Programming	120	0	9.2	58.3	32.5	90.8
2: Talent and Operational Management	167	0.6	6.6	77.2	15	92.2

3: Disrupts Power Imbalances	99	0	6.1	84.8	8.1	92.9
4: District/School /Community Support	160	0	7.5	79.4	11.9	91.3
5: Self-Reflection	56	0	5.4	64.3	28.6	92.9
6: Accountability /Continuous Improvement	159	0	7.5	78	14.5	92.5

Across all six dispositions, 92% of candidate outcomes were rated as “Accomplished” or “Exemplary,” with only 7% rated as “Developing” and fewer than 1% rated as “Ineffective.” This indicates strong alignment between program instruction and the development of core leadership values such as reflection, continuous improvement, and equity-informed decision-making.

High-performing domains included:

- Disrupts Power Imbalances (93% Accomplished/Exemplary)
- Self-Reflection (93% Accomplished/Exemplary)
- Talent and Operational Management (92% Accomplished/Exemplary)
- Accountability through Continuous Improvement (92% Accomplished/Exemplary)

These results reinforce the program’s emphasis on building reflective, system-minded leaders who advocate for inclusive and equitable school practices. Notably, Academic and Student Support Programming (91%) and District/School/Community Support (91%) also exceeded the 85% benchmark, demonstrating candidates’ ability to center students and stakeholders in their leadership decisions.

While performance was consistently strong, slightly lower percentages of “Exemplary” ratings in Community Support (12%) and Disrupting Power Imbalances (8%) suggest areas where candidates may benefit from more direct instruction or applied practice. These findings align with the KYEPSB and CAEP recommendations to strengthen stakeholder engagement strategies and embed community voice more deeply into leadership simulations and capstone experiences.

Moving forward, the program will enhance simulation-based learning tied to the Spalding Six and integrate stakeholder feedback mechanisms in clinical assessments to ensure candidates consistently demonstrate equity-centered leadership across diverse educational contexts.

Review of Improvement Goals for 2024-25 Academic Year

During the 2024-25 Academic Year, an improvement plan was implemented with three (3) goals of improving candidate proficiency.

Goal 1 (Demonstrate Knowledge and Skills Appropriate for the Role of School Principal):

- Principal Preparation Candidates did not meet the Assessment 1 Target, with 66% (8 of 12) candidates meeting or exceeding all 7 Domains on the SLLA Assessment (90% Target).

Goal 2 (Demonstrate Dispositions Appropriate for the Position of School Principal):

- Principal Preparation Candidates met the Assessment 2 Goal, with 91% of second Dispositions Assessment administration results having an average score of 3.75 or higher on 80% of the items.
- Principal Preparation Candidates did not meet Assessment 3 goal, as candidate dispositions decreased by .20 between Administrations I and II (.25 increase Target)

Goal 3 (Principal Preparation Program Candidates Will Demonstrate Skills and Dispositions Necessary for an Equity-Centered Leader):

- Principal Preparation Candidates met the Assessment 4 Target, with 100% of candidates meeting the Climate and Cultural Leadership Annual Performance Range Average on the SLLA Assessment (90% Target).
- Principal Preparation Candidates met the Assessment 5 Target, with 93% of candidates meeting the mastery target (85%) on program assessments specific to PSEL Standard 3 (Equity and Cultural Responsiveness).
- Principal Preparation Candidates met the Assessment 6 Target, with 92% of candidates meeting the mastery target (85%) on program assessments linked to the Spalding Equity-Centered Leadership Framework (Spalding Six).

Program Outcomes: 2025-26 Academic Year

As result of the review process that included data review and discussion with external stakeholders, the following Program Outcomes has been identified for the 2025-26 Academic Year.

Goal 1: Principal Preparation Candidates will demonstrate knowledge appropriate for the role of School Principal.

Assessment 1: 90% of Principal Preparation Candidates will exceed the national Annual Performance Range (APR) on all 7 of the domains of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

Goal 2: Principal Preparation Candidates will demonstrate dispositions appropriate for the position of School Principal.

Assessment 2: Principal Preparation Candidates will have an average score of 3.75 or higher on 80% of the items in the second Dispositions Assessment administration.

Assessment 3: Principal Preparation Candidates will show an improvement of .25 or higher between the Administration I and Administration II Disposition Assessments.

Goal 3: Principal Preparation Candidates will demonstrate skills and dispositions necessary for an equity-centered school leader.

Assessment 4: 90% of Principal Preparation Program Candidates will meet the Annual Performance Range Average on Dimension 3 (Climate and Cultural Leadership) on the SLLA.

Assessment 5: 85% of Principal Preparation Program Candidates will demonstrate mastery of content, knowledge and skills on program assessments specific to PSEL Standard 3 (Equity and Cultural Responsiveness).

Assessment 6: 85% of Principal Preparation Program Candidates will demonstrate mastery of content, knowledge and skills on program assessments specific to the Spalding Equity-Centered Leadership Framework (Spalding Six).

Action Plan: 2025-26 Academic Year

Activity	Goals Addressed	Impact on Program Candidates
Design and launch a SLLA preparation module in Canvas that includes aligned study resources, practice questions, and access to digital study tools (ETS Resources)	Goal 1: Knowledge for Principal Role (SLLA Domains)	Increase candidate readiness for the School Leaders Licensure Assessment, particularly in strategic, instructional, and community engagement leadership, leading to higher pass rates and better-prepared school leaders who positively impact student achievement
Revise and scaffold coursework to deepen instruction in instructional leadership, curriculum development, and assessment design.	Goal 1: Knowledge for Principal Role Assessment 1 (SLLA Domains)	Increase the number of candidates who exceed the national APR in all 7 SLLA domains, especially instructional and organizational leadership, resulting in improved instructional quality and student learning.
Refine feedback processes during clinical supervision, including standardized faculty training for inter-rater reliability on disposition assessments.	Goal 2: Principal Dispositions Assessments 2 & 3	Improve consistency and rigor in formative assessment, leading to more meaningful growth in candidate professionalism, self-awareness, and ethical behavior.
Develop and implement a structured training series for university coaches focused on clinical supervision, equity-centered mentoring, and inter-rater reliability.	Goal 2: Principal Dispositions Goal 3: Equity-Centered Leadership Assessments 2 & 3	Strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of university coaching by equipping faculty with tools to deliver actionable, equitable, and standards-aligned feedback.
Integrate case-based learning focused on instructional coaching, ethical dilemmas, and community engagement across all program courses.	Goal 3: Equity-Centered Leadership Assessments 4, 5, 6	Improve ethical decision-making and leadership effectiveness in authentic scenarios, supporting school environments that foster equity, inclusion, and strong family-community partnerships.
Develop a post-Wallace ECPI Grant Sustainability Plan to identify key features of the program and ensure continued implementation of redesigned coursework, equity-centered coaching, and leadership simulations.	Goal 3: Equity-Centered Leadership Cross-cutting across all Assessments	Ensure long-term sustainability of proven program elements by institutionalizing practices that promote equity, instructional leadership, and personalized coaching, thereby maintaining high-quality candidate preparation and impact on P-12 student achievement.

Artificial Intelligence Use in Annual Reporting

In accordance with CAEP’s guidance on the ethical and responsible use of emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI), Spalding University’s Principal Preparation Program incorporated AI tools to support the development of its 2024–25 Annual Report. These tools were utilized under faculty supervision to aid in data visualization, draft generation, and synthesis of program assessment findings.

The purpose of integrating AI was to:

- Enhance the efficiency and accuracy of data reporting and interpretation,
- Support transparent, evidence-based program improvement; and
- Model future-ready leadership practices that responsibly engage with advanced technologies.

All content generated or supported by AI tools was reviewed, edited, and validated by faculty and leadership team members to ensure academic integrity, contextual accuracy, and alignment with CAEP standards. The program recognizes that AI serves as a complementary tool, not a replacement for human judgment, professional expertise, or ethical decision-making.

This use of AI reflects Spalding’s commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in educator preparation, preparing leaders who are equipped to engage critically and responsibly with emerging technologies in P–12 environments.