Orientation to and Overview of

INSPIRE LEADERSHIP SURVEY SUITE

Initiative for Systemic Program Improvement through Research in Educational (INSPIRE) Leadership Survey Suite

A suite of surveys intended for educational leadership preparation program accountability and program improvement
INTRODUCTION

This document is designed to introduce you to the INSPIRE Leadership Survey Suite, that is, the Initiative for Systemic Program Improvement through Research in Educational (INSPIRE) Leadership Survey Suite. This suite of surveys is intended to aid educational leadership preparation programs in program accountability (e.g. program reviews and accreditation) and program improvement efforts. Additionally, cross-program data from the suite of surveys may be used to learn more about effective leadership preparation program features and strategies.

The INSPIRE Suite currently consists of four surveys, including:

1. **Preparation Program Features Survey (INSPIRE-PP)**: a descriptive survey of the preparation program’s key features;
2. **Graduate Survey (INSPIRE-G)**: a survey of recent program graduates focusing on their perceptions of program quality and their own learning outcomes;
3. **INSPIRE Leader in Practice / 360° Survey (INSPIRE-LP/360)**: a survey of graduates who have become school leaders and the school leaders’ subordinate educators and supervisor(s) concerning the leader’s practices, behaviors, and effectiveness in shaping healthy and productive school conditions known to enhance student learning outcomes.

Guiding Conceptual Framework for INSPIRE Preparation Program Evaluation and Improvement

**WHAT CAN INSPIRE DO FOR YOUR LEADER PREPARATION PROGRAM?**

Participation in the INSPIRE Leadership Survey Suite can be beneficial to your program in many ways. The full set of INSPIRE Leadership Surveys provides tools for program evaluation or accountability and program improvement by understanding graduate student experiences and their practice once they assume leadership roles. Using the INSPIRE Leadership Surveys, programs can unpack the elements of program delivery, curriculum, and learning experiences.
that contribute to the strong leadership development of students in their individual programs through mutual self-study of program features and program outcomes. Moreover, faculty members and programs can learn from one another about optimal program design and innovative practices that improve the field as a whole.

Program Improvement

Program Accountability

Accreditation Review

Research on Program Processes and Outcomes

Uses for Program Evaluation Data

Quotes from Subscribers about the Value of INSPIRE Survey Data

Virginia Tech
This was the first alumni survey that we had conducted as a program. One of the biggest benefits was that it substantiated a lot of the quality that we knew was present in our programs, allowing us to celebrate our successes. The survey was easy to use, and the INSPIRE support staff was an extraordinary resource to us during the administration process. The results of our alumni survey were used as data to inform a faculty retreat focused on our UCEA application. During this retreat, we used a protocol with the survey results to inform a discussion of our learning goals, objectives, and long term plans as a program. The survey results were part of the evidence that we submitted along with our UCEA application.

University of Washington
We frequently connect with our graduates in the field through their work as principals and assistant principals. These leaders frequently shared how well they felt prepared by the UTAPP program but we lacked a systematic way to tap into our graduates’ perceptions. The INSPIRE survey data were particularly powerful and allowed us to compare perceptions by cohort. The comparison data from other institutions reinforced the strength of some of our program components and most importantly helped us to identify curriculum areas that required further refinement and development.

U of Denver
We had been struggling with moving forward with changing some of our assessments. When the INSPIRE Graduate Survey revealed that graduate perceptions of preparedness across the learning outcomes varied, we were able to select two areas of focus and create a game plan. Without these type of data, I’m afraid we would still be trying to decide where to focus.
New Leaders
The INSPIRE survey results were shared with our city and national program teams to use for conversations around what went well during the program year, and to inform program improvements. We also used the survey data to determine if we met our program goals around participant satisfaction and program delivery. Finally, survey data was used to speak to some of the metrics laid out in our grant agreements, and to market the program to potential new funders. We shared the data with RAND who wrote up a summary of the results, looking for trends by program city. A summary of the results, with potential additional cuts of data and analyses will be used in the end of year report that RAND is writing up for us.

Moving forward we plan to compare annual results to the survey to explore program implementation across time, and to measure improvement in our growth areas. We hope to incorporate further cuts into our analysis of the survey results in the future to better understand how our program is being receive by out participants. For example, we might explore trends by school level or school type.

The fact that the survey aligned so closely with our program’s theory of action was extremely helpful because it allowed us to measure those components of the program that we felt were most important to understand. The flexibility of the INSPIRE team to incorporate our program specific language into the survey and to work on our timelines (which sometimes required very quick turnaround) was very much appreciated!

Viterbo University
The INSPIRE survey results were shared with our faculty and with our Advisory Committee. Based on the results, recommendations were made for program improvements. Further, we had a renewal review site visit in May, 2014 and these data were shared. The specific program indicators and areas were helpful in identifying needs for improvement and to be able to “brag” about strengths. The survey was very easy to use and complete and the report data were compiled in a very user-friendly format.

BACKGROUND
In 2013, the INSPIRE-Leadership Survey Suite was launched to assist educational leadership preparation programs with program accountability and program improvement responsibilities. The INSPIRE Leadership survey development work was initiated by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and the Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group (LTEL Sig), which began in 2000. The subsequent survey and evaluation work of the Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice began in 2008. In 2011, the Center refocused its efforts on creating a valid and reliable survey suite with reduced ease of administration and reduced administration time. From this development work, the INSPIRE Leadership Survey Suite emerged.
SURVEY CONTENT

Preparation Program Features Survey (INSPIRE-PP)
The INSPIRE Preparation Program Features (INSPIRE-PP) Survey is designed to describe core features of educational leadership preparation programs. These descriptive data may be used for multiple purposes including program description, improvement, program approval or accreditation. These data may also be used as part of a larger multi-institutional state or national database that could capture trends in educational leadership preparation.

The Program Features survey includes questions concerning candidate selection practices, program design, core content, instructional delivery approaches, candidate assessment practices, program improvement, staffing, and accreditation (see more details below). Completing the survey enables a program to document program design and delivery at one point in time, and if repeated can establish a longitudinal program history. The Program Features survey is to be completed by program directors or coordinators, department chairs, or persons most familiar with the design and details of the educational leadership program. One program survey should be completed for each leadership preparation program in a Department or organizational unit.

All institutions that intend to utilize or administer any of the other INSPIRE Leadership surveys (i.e., Graduate Edition, Leader in Practice Edition, or 360 Edition) are encouraged to complete the Program Features Edition. The data from the Program Features Survey can be linked to graduates’ perceptions of program quality elements as well as other leadership preparation outcomes assessed in the INSPIRE suite of surveys.

Preparation Program Survey Descriptive Questions include:

- Program identifying information such as program name, department and institution name and type, location, academic year(s) for which information is provided
- Degree, licensure, standards, and accreditation information associated with the program described
- Program focus (e.g. school leadership, district leadership, teacher leadership, higher education leadership, and/or other leadership focii)
- Admission and program selectivity information
- Credit hour requirements and program duration
- Program design elements – e.g. cohort model, class scheduling arrangements, course offering locations, course delivery methods, partnership characteristics
- Program content focus and priorities
- Candidate learning experiences – e.g. instructional strategies, clinical experiences
- Candidate assessment and evaluation information
- Program staffing
- Graduates’ post-program support and tracking
- Program enrollment and completion data
Graduate Survey (INSPIRE-G)
The INSPIRE Graduate Edition (INSPIRE-G) is intended to gather feedback from recent graduates on their preparation program experiences and learning outcomes. The survey includes two broad components, including (1) program quality elements and experiences and (2) national standards-based learning outcomes and preparation for leadership practices. Data collected also include candidate demographics, candidate professional experience background, and candidate career intentions and aspirations.

The Learning Outcome variable scales on the Graduate survey are closely aligned with the national Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (PSEL). Additionally, pilot testing of the graduate survey yielded strong construct validity and strong reliability (internal consistency) of the instrument’s variable scales. The respondent data set utilized to assess the instrument’s psychometric properties included over 300 responses from graduates of ten national programs that completed the INSPIRE Graduate Edition. The resulting variable scales include items with strong construct validity as evidenced by the factor loadings. Most scale reliabilities were quite strong, with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .85 to .96; only “Program Accessibility” yielded a more moderate reliability. Subsequent administration of the INSPIRE-G survey has yielded similarly strong or stronger reliability and validity evidence. Below is a summary of the major survey components and associated subscales.

Program Quality
- Program quality is assessed with 8 subscales, including 26 items
- The stem for these items is, “To what degree do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your educational leadership preparation program?”
- The subscale items are assessed on 5-point scales (1 = strongly disagree; 2 – disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Sample Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigor &amp; Relevance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“The program was challenging and intellectually stimulating.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was asked to reflect on practice and analyze how to improve it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“The faculty/instructors were knowledgeable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The faculty/instructors were instructionally competent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“My interactions with fellow students have had a positive influence on my professional growth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Accessibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Program classes and activities were offered at convenient times and days.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum | 6 | “The program prepared me well in the following areas…..” (Includes curricular areas aligned with national leadership standards.)

Assessment | 3 | “Within course or other routine formative assessments offered relevant feedback to enhance my learning.”

Internship Design and Quality | 7 | “My internship/residency experience was an excellent learning experience for becoming an educational leader.”

Intern Mentor | 3 | “My mentor(s) effectively supervised my internship experience.”

Learning Outcomes: Preparation for Leadership Practices
The Learning Outcome variable scales on the Graduate survey are closely aligned with the national Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (PSEL) – see below.

- Preparation for leadership practices is assessed with 7 subscales, including 42 items.
- The stem for these items is, “Please rate how well your leadership program prepared you to do the following?”
- The subscale items are assessed on 5-point scales (1 = very poorly; 2 = poorly; 3 = adequately; 4 = well; 5 = very well).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome Subscales</th>
<th>PSEL Standards Alignment (10 standards)</th>
<th>NELP Standards Alignment (8 standards)</th>
<th>Sample Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical &amp; Professional Norms (7 items)</td>
<td>-Mission, Vision &amp; Core Values (1) -Ethics &amp; Professional Norms (2)</td>
<td>-Ethics &amp; Professional Norms (2) -Mission, Vision, &amp; Improvement (1)</td>
<td>“Act in an open and transparent manner.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Act as a moral compass for the school or district.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (5 items)</td>
<td>-School Improvement (10) -Mission, Vision, &amp; Core Values (1)</td>
<td>- Mission, Vision, &amp; Improvement (1) - Learning and Instruction (4)</td>
<td>“Design the school’s organization to enhance teaching and learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Management (6 items)</td>
<td>-Operations &amp; Management (6) -Building Professional Capacity (7)</td>
<td>-Operations &amp; Management (6) -Building Professional Capacity (7)</td>
<td>“Manage school resources effectively and efficiently to support school vision (e.g. technology, personnel, instructional time, public funds, and supplies/equipment).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instructional Leadership (9 items) | -Curriculum, Instruction, & Assessment (4)  
-Professional Capacity of Personnel (6)  
-Professional Community of Teachers & Staff (7) | -Learning & Instruction (4)  
-Building Professional Capacity (7)  
-Equity, Inclusiveness & Cultural Responsiveness (3) | “Provide constructive feedback for teachers to improve instruction.” |
| Professional & Organizational Culture (9 items) | -Professional Capacity of Personnel (6)  
-Professional Community of Teachers & Staff (7)  
-School Improvement (10) | -Building Professional Capacity (7)  
-Ethics & Professional Norms (2)  
-Equity, Inclusiveness & Cultural Responsiveness (3) | “Build a collaborative environment.”  
“Facilitate a culture of shared leadership.” |
| Supportive & Equitable Learning Environment (4 items) | -Equity & Cultural Responsiveness (3)  
-Community of Care & Support for Students (5) |  
-Equity, Inclusiveness & Cultural Responsiveness (3)  
-Learning & Instruction (4)  
-Building Professional Capacity (7) | “Create an environment to promote academic, social, & emotional support for students.” |
| Family & Community Relations (6 items) | -Meaningful Engagement of Families & Community (8) | Community & External Leadership (5) | “Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers.” |

**INSPIRE Leader in Practice / 360° Survey(s)**

The INSPIRE LP/360 includes parallel surveys for each of three respondent groups --- school leaders themselves, their subordinate educators, and their immediate supervisor(s). These surveys are intended to be used in tandem to assess perceptions of the leadership performance of graduates’ who are currently serving as principals or school leaders. However, depending on an organization’s needs, any one or combination of these three participant groups may be surveyed independently (leaders, subordinate educators, and/or supervisors). The INSPIRE LP/360 for leaders is intended to gather the self-perceptions of program graduates who are practicing principals/school leaders. The INSPIRE LP/360 for subordinate educators and supervisors is intended to gather perceptions of subordinate educators and supervisors about program graduates serving as principals/school leaders. These surveys include the same three broad components, including (1) professional background, (2) school leadership practices, and (3) school conditions. The constructs are aligned with those in INSPIRE – PP and INSPIRE – G to examine the relationship between program features, graduate outcomes, leadership practices, and school conditions.

A pilot study was initially conducted using the INSPIRE LP/360 survey with 135 teacher respondents to examine the underlying factor structures of the survey. The resulting variable scales represent strong construct validity based on the factor loadings, and strong reliability based on Cronbach’s alpha measure of internal consistency. Scale reliabilities ranged from .78 to .93. More recently a sample of 136 school principals in one state responded to the INSPIRE
360 items. The Leadership Practices subscales yielded reliabilities ranging from .710 to .902. The School Conditions subscales yielded reliabilities ranging from .815 - .898. Below is a summary of the three survey components and associated subscales.

**Professional Background and School Context**
- The INSPIRE LP/360 includes questions about the context and demographics of the school in addition to questions about the leader’s year of program completion and career path after graduation. The survey also includes questions about subordinate educators’ years of experience (cumulative and present school and district).

**School Leadership Practices**
- The School Leadership practices variable scales are closely aligned with the national Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (PSEL) and the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards.
- Execution of leadership practices is assessed with 7 subscales.
- The stem for these items for school leaders is, “Please rate how well you facilitate the following”
- The stem for these items for subordinate educators and supervisors is, “Please rate how well the principal/school leader facilitates the following”
- The subscale items are assessed on a 5-point scale (1 = very poorly; 2 = poorly; 3 = adequately; 4 = well; 5 = very well).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices Subscales</th>
<th>PSEL Standards Alignment (10 standards)</th>
<th>NELP Standards Alignment (8 standards)</th>
<th>Sample Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical &amp; Professional Norms (4 items)</td>
<td>-Mission, Vision &amp; Core Values (1) -Ethics &amp; Professional Norms (2)</td>
<td>-Ethics &amp; Professional Norms (2) -Mission, Vision, &amp; Improvement (1)</td>
<td>“Act in an open and transparent manner.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (5 items)</td>
<td>-School Improvement (10) -Mission, Vision, &amp; Core Values (1)</td>
<td>-Mission, Vision, &amp; Improvement (1) -Learning and Instruction (4)</td>
<td>“Design the school’s organization to enhance teaching and learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Management (5 items)</td>
<td>-Operations &amp; Management (9)</td>
<td>-Operations &amp; Management (6) -Building Professional Capacity (7)</td>
<td>“Manage school resources effectively and efficiently to support school vision (e.g. technology, personnel, instructional time, public funds, and supplies/equipment).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership (9 items)</td>
<td>-Curriculum, Instruction, &amp; Assessment (4) -Professional Capacity of Personnel (6)</td>
<td>-Learning &amp; Instruction (4) -Building Professional Capacity (7) -Equity, Inclusiveness &amp; Cultural Responsiveness (3)</td>
<td>“Provide constructive feedback for teachers to improve instruction.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Conditions
The school conditions variable scale is assessed with 7 subscales.

- The stem for these items is, “Please rate your agreement to the presence of the following school conditions.”
- These items are assessed on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 – disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Sample Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“The school has well-developed process for facilitating ongoing school-wide improvement &amp; long-range planning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Students are academically engaged in their course work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Families take an active role in their child’s education.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Teachers share and discuss student work with other teachers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Problem-Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Staff take action to solve problems; they don’t just talk about them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Teachers here have the skills needed to produce meaningful student learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“The district supports the school’s efforts to improve.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORTING
After survey data analysis is conducted by Center personnel, a report of findings is sent to the program or agency representative(s), along with aggregate comparison data from other programs where appropriate. See sample report(s) below.
See Sample Report for Preparation Program Survey
https://uepc.co1.qualtrics.com/WRRReport/?RPID=RP2_05v2nuiT9IVcABe&P=CP

See Sample Report for Graduate Survey
https://uepc.co1.qualtrics.com/WRRReport/?RPID=RP2_2T2hdQiocOfsBnV&P=CP

OTHER REFERENCE INFORMATION

See Graduate Survey Discussion Guide

ANNUAL PRICING INFORMATION – Please inquire about potential pricing revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSPIRE Survey Editions</th>
<th>UCEA Member Institutions</th>
<th>Non Member Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>INSPIRE</em> – School Leadership Preparation Program Features</td>
<td>Free with Membership</td>
<td>Included with Administration of Other Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INSPIRE</em> – School Leadership Graduate</td>
<td>Free with Membership</td>
<td>$1500/administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INSPIRE</em> – School Leaders in Practice / 360</td>
<td>$1,500 /administration plus $75 per practicing leader</td>
<td>$3000 /administration plus $75 per practicing leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Basic Item Descriptives</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>