

**UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**TEAC Annual Report – June, 2013**  
**Teacher Education Program**

Utah State University's Teacher Education Programs were granted *accreditation (7 years) on June 11, 2012, with one weakness and no stipulations*. The weakness identified was in Quality Principle 1.5 – *Investigations aimed at the establishment or reliability of measures have been unevenly implemented*. This annual report will provide a brief overview of the changes made since our 2012 Inquiry Brief, report current assessment data, as well as summarize the efforts being made to address the weakness identified.

Since the completion of our initial Inquiry Brief, the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services has maintained its "Top 25" ranking with the "US News and World Report." This is the 14<sup>th</sup> consecutive year the college has ranked in the top tier of the nation's colleges of education. In 2014, our overall ranking was 24<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> in total research dollars (#2 amongst public institutions).

### **Updated Appendix E – Inventory of Evidence**

The elementary and secondary programs have designed and implemented new student teaching assessments based on "Utah's Effective Teaching Standards" which were based on the framework adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in the *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)* standards. These standards were also aligned with the teaching skills needed to successfully teach the *Utah Common State Core*. These new student teaching assessments were initially used fall semester 2012.

Also during fall 2012, portfolio data was collected for all three program options – elementary education, secondary education, and special education. The elementary and secondary students complete their portfolios using Livetext. The grading rubric for the Livetext portfolios is based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards. These ten standards include: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Learning Environments, Content Knowledge, Assessment, Instructional Planning, Instructional Strategies, Reflection and Continuous Growth, Leadership and Collaboration, and Professional and Ethical Behavior. The special education grading rubric for their portfolio is based on the Council for Exceptional Children's (CEC) teaching standards.

The university elected to drop the university Computer Information Literacy (CIL) exam on January 8, 2010, so this evidence will no longer be available. Assessments for technology competence for our teacher education candidates will now be based on the average GPA of the required "technology for teachers" course for each program option, as well as the average rating on specific technology competency items in the student teaching evaluations.

### **Data Results**

Praxis Tests (see Table 1)

During fall 2012 the Elementary Teacher Preparation Program Praxis Score (0014, 5014) pass rate was 90.22% with 18.48% receiving ETS Recognition of Excellence Award (ROE). The Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT – 0522) pass rate for the Elementary Teacher Preparation Program was 100% with 20.83% receiving the ROE award.

The Special Education Teacher Preparation Program Praxis Score (0014, 5014) pass rate was 66.67% and the Middle School Mathematics (0069) pass rate was 92.86%.

The Secondary Teacher Preparation Program Praxis Score pass rate for English, Language, Literature, and Composition was 78.57% with 21.43% receiving the ROE award. Pass rate for Mathematics Content was 82.35% with 41.18% receiving the ROE award. The Social Studies Content pass rate was 90.91% with 27.27% receiving the ROE award. The World & US History Content pass rate was 50%. The Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT - 0524) for the Secondary Teacher Preparation program was 100% with 25% receiving the ROE award.

#### Student Teaching Assessments (see Table 2)

The student teachers were rated using the following scale: 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Excellent; 3 = Proficient; 2 = Emergent; 1 = Unacceptable. The overall student teaching ratings ranged between the “excellent” to “exceptional” categories.

The student teaching assessment items were disaggregated to reflect our student teachers’ competencies in TEAC’s 1.0 Quality Principle. Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations for each TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle area for each program option. The data indicates that the student teachers were found to be “proficient” to “excellent” in each TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle category. The Elementary Teacher Preparation Program’s means for each TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle areas ranged from 3.79 – 4.49 for the university supervisors and 3.83 – 4.40 for the cooperating teachers. The range for Secondary Teacher Preparation Program for university supervisors was 3.74 – 4.52 and 4.05 – 4.63 for cooperating teachers. Special Education’s ranges were 4.31 – 4.53 for university supervisors and 4.05 – 4.63 for cooperating teachers.

#### Portfolios (see Table 3)

Fall 2012 was the first semester that portfolio data was collected for each program option. All students submit their portfolio electronically. Students in the Elementary and Secondary Teacher Preparation Programs use Livetext and the Special Education students submit their portfolio through the Canvas system. The overall mean ratings for all programs’ portfolios were found to be near the “excellent” or “achieved mastery independently” ranking.

The grading rubrics for the Elementary and Secondary Education portfolios are based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards and use a four-point scale (4 – excellent; 3 – competent; 2 – weak; 1 – poor/missing). The overall mean for elementary students was 3.84 with a standard deviation of 0.44 and for secondary education 3.87 and 0.40. Special Education’s grading rubric is based on the Council for Exceptional Children’s standards and uses a 3-point scale (4 – Achieved mastery independently; 2 – Proficient – mastery with minimal correction; 1 – Basic – mastery with moderate correction; 0 – No mastery / unacceptable response to correction. Special Education’s overall portfolio rating was 2.90 with a standard deviation of 0.14.

#### Student Teaching Classroom Surveys (see Table 4)

The students in our secondary and elementary (Grades 4-6) classrooms evaluate their student teachers using our “Student Classroom Survey.” Student teachers from both the elementary and secondary programs received positive evaluations from their students. Students’ responses were between “agree” and “strongly agree.” The children in our elementary student teachers classrooms (Grades 4-6) evaluated their student teachers’ pedagogical knowledge, their subject matter knowledge, and their care and concern for them as students. The scale the students used ranged from 4 – Strongly Agree to 1 – Strongly Disagree. The students’ responses ranged from 3.54 – 3.71 for the three areas. Secondary student teachers were rated by their students in pedagogical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, caring and concern, and technology. The students’ rating ranged from 3.48 – 3.59.

#### Beginning Teacher Surveys (see Table 5)

First-year teachers are asked to rate how well prepared they were and their building principals are asked to rate how well prepared the beginning teachers were. The survey matches the student teaching assessment form that was used during their student teaching experiences. The Elementary Education’s rating scale uses a 3-point scale (3 – Performs task exceptionally well; 2 – Performs task adequately; 1 – Performs task inadequately). The Secondary Education and Special Education use a 4-point scale (4 – Exceptionally well prepared; 3 – Well prepared; 2 – Somewhat prepared; 1 – Insufficient preparation). All first-year teachers rated their preparation between “adequate” and “well prepared.” Building principals’ ratings were similar to the first-year teachers’ ratings. The Elementary Education ratings for first-year teachers ranged from 2.44 – 2.75, for principals it was 2.36-2.64. Secondary Education ratings for first-year teachers ranged from 2.58 – 3.31; for principals, 3.13 – 3.59. Special Education’s first-year teacher ratings ranged from 3.26 – 3.53; for principals, 3.56 – 3.67.

### **Reliability of Measures**

#### Internal Reliability (see Table 6)

A concerted effort was made to provide more consistent reliability measures for our various assessments. Table 6 summarizes the Cronbach alphas that were obtained within each TEAC Quality Principle 1 category for each of our program option’s student teaching assessments, the classroom surveys, and the beginning teacher surveys. All alphas obtained indicated a strong internal consistency within our assessments, ranging from .697 - .969.

Our student teacher surveys are comprised of two parts – an effective teacher disposition section and an effective teacher competencies section. The Elementary Education’s student teaching assessment resulted in Cronbach alphas ranging from .907 - .926 for our dispositions and .844 - .938 for our effective teaching competencies. The Secondary Education’s student teaching assessments resulted in Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .893 - .923 for the dispositions section and .799 - .941 for the teaching effectiveness section. The Special Education’s student teaching assessments resulted in Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .894-.919 for the dispositions and .900 - .969 for the teaching effectiveness section.

The Beginning Teacher Surveys yielded strong Cronbach alphas for all three program options’ assessments. In Elementary Education the range was .828 - .954; for Secondary Education the range was .788 - .883; and for Special Education the range was .741 - .900.

The Student Teaching Classroom Survey for Elementary Education (Grades 4-6) resulted in a Cronbach alpha range of .906 - .921 and for Secondary Education, .697 - .914.

#### Correlations (see Tables 7 and 8)

Correlations were calculated to establish inter-rater reliability of the student teaching assessments' scores given by the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors. The correlation coefficients for the cooperating teacher and university supervisors are all positive which does show some degree of association with the mean cooperating teacher and university supervisor ratings. For elementary education the correlations range from .20 - .37 for the disposition section and .25 - .58 for the teaching effective section. For secondary education the correlations ranged from .09 - .22 for the dispositions and .04 - .33 for the teaching effectiveness section. The special education's correlations ranged from .24 - .44 for the dispositions and .20 - .36 for the teaching effectiveness section.

Table 8 summarizes the correlations between the surveys completed by the students in the student teachers' classrooms and the cooperating teacher. For secondary education the correlations ranged from .23 - .40. The elementary correlations were nonexistent. The Elementary Classroom Survey is very short is comprised of only 10 items, whereas the Secondary Classroom Survey includes 17 items.

In addition to the above reliability measures, we plan to calculate Cronbach alphas on each program options' portfolio data. We are in the process of coordinating our efforts with Livetext so that our data can be downloaded to enable additional statistical tests to be ran. Once the portfolio data is downloaded, we also plan to correlated portfolio ratings to our student teaching assessment ratings

**Table 1 - Praxis Tests – Pass Rates for Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education**

	Elementary Education		Special Education		Secondary Education				
	(0014) (5014) Cut = 150 ROE = 181+	PLT (0522) Grades K-6 Cut =160 ROE = 185+	(0014)(5014) Cut = 150 ROE = 181+	(0069) Cut = 145	(0041)(5041) Language Arts Cut = 168 ROE = 192+	(0061) Mathematics Cut = 138 ROE = 165+	(0081) Social Studies Cut = 159 ROE = 184+	(0941) (5941) World & US History Cut = 156	PLT (0624) Grades 7-12 Cut = 160 ROE = 185+
N taking	92	24	18	14	14	17	11	12	16
N Passing	83 (90.22%)	24 (100%)	12 (66.67%)	13 (92.86%)	11(78.57%)	14 (82.35%)	10 (90.91%)	6 (50%)	16 (100%)
ROE <small>Recognition of Excellence</small>	17 (18.48%)	5(20.83%)	0	0	3 (21.43%)	7 (41.18%)	3 (27.27%)	N/A	4 (25%)
Range	143-198	162-190	143-178	136-192	164-198	122-196	156-190	142-180	162-191
S.D.	12.97	8.43	12.09	14.49	12.53	21.35	11.30	12.40	17.95
Mean	168.74	178.31	157.34	157.14	178.00	158.82	174.82	158.50	179.00

**Table 2 – Student Teaching Assessments for Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education**

	Elementary Education		Special Education		Secondary Education	
	University Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher
N	124	124	80	101	32	43
Pedagogical Knowledge	4.18 (0.72)	4.13 (0.77)	4.36 (0.67)	4.43 (0.73)	3.93 (0.79)	4.20 (0.80)
Subject Matter Knowledge	4.16 (0.70)	4.03 (0.69)	4.46 (0.67)	4.53 (0.70)	3.86 (0.77)	4.14 (0.81)
Caring	4.08 (0.72)	4.01 (0.78)	4.53 (0.62)	4.58 (0.70)	4.04 (0.79)	4.24 (0.81)
Learning How to Learn	4.49 (0.65)	4.40 (0.74)	4.51 (0.69)	4.62 (0.72)	4.09 (0.87)	4.39 (0.78)
Multicultural	3.79 (0.71)	3.83 (0.79)	4.31 (0.68)	4.43 (0.74)	3.84 (0.74)	4.05 (0.75)
Technology	4.31 (0.73)	4.25 (0.74)	4.44 (0.73)	4.48 (0.76)	3.74 (0.77)	4.14 (0.81)
Overall Score	4.21 (0.52)	4.36 (0.55)	N/A	N/A	4.52 (0.49)	4.63 (0.56)

Student Teaching Evaluation Scale: 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Excellent; 3 = Proficient; 2 = Emergent; 1 = Unacceptable

( ) Standard Deviation

**Table 3 – Portfolio Data Summary**

	Elementary Education	Special Education	Secondary Education
Learner Development	3.81 (0.49)	* 2.51 (0.61)	3.95 (0.22)
Learning Differences	3.89 (0.38)		3.89 (0.31)
Learning Environment	3.87 (0.42)		3.89 (0.39)
Content Knowledge	3.86 (0.38)	* 2.67 (0.40)	3.87 (0.49)
Assessment	3.89 (0.37)		3.86 (0.42)
Instructional Planning	3.88 (0.39)	* 2.68 (0.46)	3.87 (0.36)
Instructional Strategies	3.81 (0.52)		3.87 (0.41)
Reflection/Continuous Growth	3.87 (0.44)	* 2.71 (0.40)	3.89 (0.41)
Leadership/Collaboration	3.89 (0.37)		3.93 (0.34)
Professional/Ethical Behavior	3.82 (0.54)		3.84 (0.59)
Overall	3.84 (0.45)	* 2.90 (0.14)	3.87 (0.40)

Rating Scale: 4 – Excellent; 3 – Competent; 2 – Weak; 1 – Poor/Missing

\*Special Education Scale: 3 – Achieved mastery independently

2 – Proficient – mastery with minimal correction

1 – Basic – mastery with moderate correction

0 – No mastery/unacceptable response to correction

( ) Standard Deviation

**Table 4 – Student Teaching Classroom Surveys (completed by public school students)**

	Elementary Education (Grades 4-6)	Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)
N	53	68
Pedagogical Knowledge	3.54 (0.30)	3.52 (0.32)
Subject Matter Knowledge	3.71 ((0.27)	3.59 (0.32)
Caring	3.64 (0.32)	3.55 (0.33)
Technology	n/a	3.48 (0.37)

Evaluation Scale: 4 – Strongly Agree; 3 – Agree; 2 – Disagree; 1 – Strongly Disagree

( ) Standard Deviation



**Table 7 – Student Teaching Assessments Correlation - Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor**

	Elementary Education		Special Education		Secondary Education	
	Dispositions	Effective Teaching	Dispositions	Effective Teaching	Dispositions	Effective Teaching
Pedagogical Knowledge	n/a	0.35910	n/a	0.28107	n/a	0.257212
Subject Matter Knowledge	n/a	0.38819	n/a	0.22557	n/a	0.193713
Caring	0.37427	0.43924	0.43896	0.33907	0.178086	0.247995
Learning How to Learn	0.36941	0.41235	0.37251	0.32381	0.215195	0.044497
Multicultural	0.20225	0.30147	0.23814	0.20258	0.092167	0.329572
Technology	n/a	0.24667	n/a	0.36275	n/a	0.247476
Overall Score	n/a	0.58073	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.274785

**Table 8 – Classroom Survey Correlations – Cooperating Teacher and Classroom Students**

	Elementary Education (Grades 4-6)	Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)
Pedagogical Knowledge	0.047769	0.285501
Subject Matter Knowledge	- 0.142309	0.233132
Caring	0.035678	0.365374
Technology	n/a	0.402642

## Appendix E: Inventory of Evidence

**Table E: Inventory: Status of evidence from measures and indicators for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I**

Type of Evidence	Available and in the Brief		Not Available and Not in the Brief	
	Relied on <i>Reasons for inclusion in the Brief</i>	Not relied on <i>Reasons for not relying on this evidence</i>	For future use <i>Reasons for including in future Briefs</i>	Not for future use <i>Reasons for not including in future Briefs</i>
Pre-admission and Content Major GPA <i>(Program admission requirement standard)</i>	X <i>Establishes adequacy of 1.1 Candidate subject matter knowledge (TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I) for admission to teacher education programs</i>			
Teacher Education Course Grades <i>(Graduation requirement standard)</i>		X <i>Faculty use other measures to evaluate TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I/1.4 Cross Cutting Themes</i>		
Graduation GPA <i>(Graduation requirement standard)</i>		X <i>Faculty use other measures to evaluate TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I/1.4 Cross Cutting Themes</i>		
ACT Test Results <i>(Admission requirement standard)</i>	X <i>Establishes adequacy of candidate 1.1 subject matter knowledge (TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I) for admission to teacher education programs</i>			
PRAXIS Examination <i>(Admission requirement standard)</i>	X <i>Establishes adequacy of candidate 1.1 subject matter knowledge (TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I) for admission to teacher education programs</i>			
Writing Examination <i>(Admission requirement standard)</i>	X <i>Establishes adequacy of candidate writing/communication competence and TEAC 1.1 subject matter knowledge (TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I)</i>			
Computer Information Literacy Exam (CIL) <i>(Admission requirement standard)</i>	X <i>This is a university technology requirement</i>			X <i>The CIL was a university technology requirement that has been eliminated. Officially dropped January 18, 2010</i>
Level and Clinical Evaluations		X <i>Provide formative feedback as candidates develop teaching skills prior to student teaching (1.0 TEAC Quality Principle I/1.4 Cross Cutting Themes)</i>		

Type of Evidence	Available and in the Brief		Not Available and Not in the Brief	
	Relied on <i>Reasons for inclusion in the Brief</i>	Not relied on <i>Reasons for not relying on this evidence</i>	For future use <i>Reasons for including in future Briefs</i>	Not for future use <i>Reasons for not including in future Briefs</i>
Student Teaching Assessments <i>(University Supervisor &amp; Cooperating Teacher)</i>	X <i>Based on INTASC and State Standards. Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes (1.1 Subject matter knowledge, 1.2 Pedagogical knowledge, 1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill; 1.4.1 Learning how to learn, 1.4.2 Multicultural perspective and accuracy, 1.4.3 Technology)</i>		X <i>New Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Assessments based on new State Teaching Standards (Fall 2012) Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes (1.1 Subject matter knowledge, 1.2 Pedagogical knowledge, 1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill; 1.4.1 Learning how to learn, 1.4.2 Multicultural perspective and accuracy, 1.4.3 Technology)</i>	
Teacher Educator Dispositions <i>(Cooperating Teacher)</i>	X <i>Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I (1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill &amp; 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes (1.4.1 Learning how to learn, 1.4.2 Multicultural perspectives and accuracy)</i>			
Student Teacher's Classroom Survey <i>(Student teacher's own students)</i>	X <i>Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I (1.1 Subject matter knowledge, 1.2 Pedagogical knowledge, 1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill)</i>			
Hiring Principal's Survey <i>(At completion of teacher's first year on the job)</i>	X <i>Based on INTASC and State Standards. Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes 1.4.1 (Learning how to learn, 1.4.2 Multicultural perspectives and accuracy)</i>			
Beginning Teacher's Self Survey <i>(At completion of teacher's first year on the job)</i>	X <i>Based on INTASC and State Standards. Evidence for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes (1.4.1 Learning how to learn, 1.4.2 Multicultural/Accuracy)</i>			
Group Process Interview <i>(Program admission requirement for elementary teacher preparation program)</i>	X <i>Limited to elementary teacher preparation program candidates. Limited data as evidence source for TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes</i>			
Portfolio <i>(Teacher preparation program requirement for all candidates)</i>		X <i>Required 3 years of data not available for 2012 Inquiry Brief</i>	X <i>New portfolio format adapted to TEAC 1.0 Quality Principle I and 1.4 Cross Cutting Themes – Data available Fall 2012</i>	
Course Syllabi		X <i>Insufficient reliability at this time for inclusion as evidence in Inquiry Brief</i>		

## Table of Program Options

Option Name	Level (UG, grad, post- bacc)	Number of completers in previous academic year (2011-2012)	Number of students enrolled in current academic year (2012-2013)
Early Childhood Education	UG	18	37
Elementary Education	UG	135	402
Special Education	UG	50	206
Secondary Education – Agriculture	UG	12	26
Secondary Education – Art	UG	6	26
Secondary Education – Biology	UG	12	13
Secondary Education – Chemistry	UG	6	13
Secondary Education – Earth Science	UG	0	1
Secondary Education – Economics	UG	0	0
Secondary Education – Engineering and Technology Education	UG	5	14
Secondary Education - English	UG	17	72
Secondary Education – Family Consumer Sciences	UG	21	44
Secondary Education – French	UG	0	5
Secondary Education – Geography	UG	1	7
Secondary Education – German	UG	1	0
Secondary Education – Health Ed	UG	8	20
Secondary Education – History	UG	28	64
Secondary Education – Integrated Science	UG	0	0
Secondary Education – Latin	UG	0	0
Secondary Education - Mathematics	UG	8	29
Secondary Education – Math/Stat	UG	20	50
Secondary Education – Music	UG	9	27
Secondary Education – Physical Ed	UG	15	37
Secondary Education – Physical Ed/ Coaching	UG	1	7
Secondary Education – Physical Science	UG	3	5
Secondary Education – Physics	UG	0	9
Secondary Education – Political Science	UG	6	14

Secondary Education – Psychology	UG	<b>6</b>	<b>43</b>
Secondary Education – Social Studies	UG	<b>13</b>	<b>41</b>
Secondary Education – Sociology	UG	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>
Secondary Education – Spanish	UG	<b>7</b>	<b>23</b>
Secondary Education – Speech	UG	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>
Secondary Education – Theater	UG	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>
School Library Media Endorsement	UG	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
English as a Second Language End.	UG	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>