

**Annual Summary of Program Performance and Student Achievement
Utah State University
Teacher Education
2020**

1. Overview and Context

Provide an overview of your institution and a brief explanation of the accredited educator preparation programs. Provide readers with a clear understanding of the provider, its mission, and its context. Four or so brief paragraphs should suffice.

Utah State University is a land-grant, research institution with a main campus in Logan, Utah and several regional campuses. USU began as an agricultural college, but in the 1920s began offering courses related to teaching. In 1927, Utah State University started a school of education. The university now plays an important research role with particular emphasis in space, agriculture, and teaching. The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services is the largest college on campus.

In 2019, Utah State University was granted accreditation for the Teacher Education Program, which provides initial licensure in the areas of elementary, secondary, and special education at the undergraduate level. These programs are housed within two separate departments, the Department of Special Education and the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (TEAL). Majors within these departments include early childhood, elementary, and special education (mild/moderate disabilities, severe disabilities, early childhood disabilities). Those seeking license for secondary teaching have majors in other departments (22 other departments) housed in other colleges (with the exception of social studies composite teaching) and complete pedagogy courses within TEAL. The program received accreditation for all undergraduate, initial licensure majors.

Because USU is the land grant university within the state, we are responsible for providing programming at our statewide campuses and centers. Students take the same coursework and complete the same requirements whether they attend at a statewide campus or center or in Logan. Courses are delivered both synchronously, through interactive video conferencing of various kinds, or asynchronously through high-quality online delivery. The Center for Innovative Design and Instruction provides extensive support to faculty and programs who teach online courses.

Students complete practica/clinical experiences and student teaching/internships all over the state of Utah (including Logan students). Students at statewide campuses and centers are encouraged and supported to stay in their community for their entire program, thus supporting school districts' "grow your own" initiatives. USU graduates are highly sought after by school districts and charters schools.

2. Program Specifics Update

In the table below, provide enrollment and completer data for each of your AAQEP-accredited programs for the most recently completed academic year:

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for 2018-2019 year

Degree/Program Name and Level (list specific programs and levels, e.g., bachelor's, master's, post-baccalaureate, certificate only)	Corresponding State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential (use a separate line for each certificate, license, endorsement, or other program)	Number of Candidates (currently enrolled—identify year in title line above)	Number of Completers (most recently completed academic year—identify year above)
Art Ed BFA	Visual Arts endorsement	14	7
Music BM	Music endorsement	38	7
Theater Education BFA	Theatre endorsement	18	4
Agricultural Education BS	Agricultural Science endorsement	90	22
Business Education BS	Business/Marketing endorsement	43	3
Family Consumer Sciences Education BS	Family Consumer Sciences endorsement	75	16
Biological Sciences Composite BS	Biological Sciences endorsement	15	3
Math Ed BS BA	Math Level 4 endorsement	46	8
Math/Statistics Composite BS BA	Math Level 4 endorsement	44	22
Chemistry Teaching BS	Chemistry endorsement	5	1
Physical Science Composite BS	Physical Science endorsement	5	2
Earth Science Composite BS	Earth Science endorsement	0	2
English Teaching BA, BS	English Language Arts	121	25
History Teaching BA, BS	History endorsement	23	8
World Languages (French, Spanish, German) BA	World Languages	20	15
Physical Education BS	Physical Education	69	17
Social Studies Composite BS, BA	Social Studies Composite	37	15
Elementary Education BS, BA	Elementary	346	154
Early Childhood Education BS, BA	Early Childhood	34	22
Special Education BS, BA	Special Education	267	184
Secondary Education, 2 nd BS BA	Various	8	3
	TOTALS	1272	540

Program Performance Indicators

The following indicators of program performance are reported annually.

Table 2: Program Performance Indicators

1. Total enrollment in educator preparation programs for the most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by you (unduplicated count of those enrolled in your programs--i.e., count individuals seeking more than one certificate or license only once).
1272
2. Total number of completers (across all programs) in most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by provider (an unduplicated count, as above).
540
3. Number of completers recommended for certification or licensure in most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by provider. Please note numbers, if any, that are recommended for more than one certificate or license.
425 total, with 36 of those recommended for more than one license area of endorsement, for example Math Level 2 endorsements were recommended for 10 students who were ELED majors. In addition, geography, psychology, sociology, and political science are teaching minors; typically history teaching majors are recommended for history endorsement plus another endorsement such as sociology or psychology.
4. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs in each respective program's expected timeframe and in 1.5 times each respective program's expected timeframes.
Our expected time frame is 6 years, and 1.5 times that is 8 years. In Utah, many students take 18-24 months to complete church-sponsored service, which affects completion rates. A spreadsheet with the raw data is provided on the Annual Report webpage: https://cehs.usu.edu/about-us/files-accreditation/8-yearCompletionData.xlsx

5. Summary of State license examination results, including teacher performance assessments (you may include link to publicly available external reporting sites). Please specify any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) were below 80%. All students must pass the Praxis for their content area in order to be recommended for licensure, so the highlighted percentages below are eventually 100%.

5002	ELED: Reading and Language Arts Subtest	691	991	69.73
5003	ELED: Mathematics Subtest	703	792	88.76
5004	ELED: Social Studies Subtest	695	1026	67.74
5005	ELED: Science Subtest	692	891	77.67
5032	ELEM EDUC: Reading and Lang Art Subtest	26	31	83.87
5033	ELEM EDUC: Mathematics Subtest	25	36	69.44
5034	ELEM EDUC: Social Studies Subtest	29	36	80.56
5035	ELEM EDUC: Science Subtest	26	32	81.25
5039	English Language Arts: CA	72	77	93.51
5051	Technology Education (computer)	2	2	100.00
5081	Social Studies: Content Knowledge	44	47	93.62
5091	Physical Education: Content Know	23	27	85.19
5101	Business Ed: Content Knowledge	11	12	91.67
5113	Music: Content Knowledge	24	24	100.00
5122	Family and Consumer Sciences	33	48	68.75
5134	Art: Content Knowledge	8	12	66.67
5161	Mathematics: CK	32	45	71.11
5169	Middle School Mathematics	65	120	54.17
5174	French: World Language	3	3	100.00
5195	Spanish: World Language	6	8	75.00
5235	Biology: Content Knowledge	6	6	100.00
5245	Chemistry	10	14	71.43
5265	Physics Content Knowledge	7	17	41.18
5391	Psychology (computer)	2	2	100.00
5435	General Science: Content Knowledge	2	2	100.00
5571	Earth Science Content Knowledge	4	4	100.00
5641	Theater	8	13	61.54
5701	Agriculture	43	47	91.49
5921	Geography	3	3	100.00
5931	Government/Political Science	5	5	100.00
5941	World & US History: CK	30	49	61.22
5952	Sociology	1	1	100.00
Total		3331	4423	75.31

Note: The data in this report is the cumulative attempts of Praxis examination by those in their last semester of the program (i.e., Student Teaching Semester)

6. Narrative explanation of evidence available from program completers, with characterization of findings. One to two paragraphs should be sufficient.

According to our annual survey of recent graduates, the results show that the major area for improvement is engaging students in applying methods of inquiry (2.8), provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners (2.49). Data table shown here. The scale is 0 = not at all, 1 = poorly, 2 = adequately 3 = well, 4 = very well.

Given that a score of 2 equals adequately, we are satisfied that our graduates are performing at or above the expected level (adequately or better). In fact, the means are above 3.0 for nearly every criterion, which indicates that, in the aggregate, our graduates rate themselves as able to do “well” or “very well” on nearly every criterion.

Based on the courses and experiences in your teacher preparation program (including courses in your major, minor, and education), how well can you do the following:	Mean	SD	N
Actively reflect on the effectiveness of my instruction to identify areas of strength and challenges.	3.22	0.7	69
Advocate for all students.	3.54	0.65	69
Collaborate with colleagues to plan and evaluate instruction.	3.39	0.75	69
Collaborate with families, colleagues, and other professionals to support student growth.	3.35	0.7	69
Collaborate with your students to establish a respectful learning environment.	3.32	0.9	69
Convey accurate information and concepts based on the content knowledge of your discipline(s).	3.43	0.63	69
Create learning experiences based on your students' individual developmental levels.	3.16	0.87	69
Design assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.23	0.83	69
Differentiate instruction to meet the needs of your students.	3.06	0.89	69
Engage in professional learning to strengthen your instructional practice.	3.38	0.75	69
Engage your students in applying methods of inquiry.	2.8	0.8	69
Engage your students in critical thinking.	3.1	0.73	69
Facilitate your students' use of technology for learning.	3.01	0.83	69
Implement activities and tasks that support your students' ability to communicate.	3.2	0.74	69
Implement new ideas to improve your instruction.	3.25	0.69	69
Incorporate a variety of digital media and technology tools to extend the learning environment.	2.96	0.93	69
Integrate literacy and/or other content areas into instruction.	3.01	0.78	69
Modify instructional strategies based on an analysis of student work.	3.1	0.86	69
Participate in a collaborative decision-making culture.	3.28	0.8	69
Plan instruction based on the Utah Core Standards.	3.36	0.8	69
Provide instruction that addresses students' cultural differences.	2.97	0.8	69
Provide instruction that addresses students' learning differences.	2.99	0.93	69
Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.	2.49	1.08	69
Provide opportunities for your students to connect classroom learning to the real world.	3.12	0.8	69
Provide opportunities for your students to demonstrate learning in different ways.	3.17	0.87	69
Reflect on personal and professional biases.	3.25	0.72	69
Select assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.2	0.81	69
Set appropriately challenging learning goals for all students.	3	0.82	69
Stay informed regarding current education policy and research.	2.71	0.89	69
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	2.42	0.91	69
Use a variety of classroom management strategies to create and maintain a positive learning environment.	3.3	0.79	69

Use a variety of questioning strategies to promote engagement.	2.96	0.85	69
Use classroom routines, expectations, and procedures to create a learning environment that allows all students to be self-directed learners.	3.12	0.93	69
Use data from assessments to provide feedback to your students.	3.2	0.85	69
Use technology effectively to support and enhance your instruction.	3.16	0.76	69
Use your students' assessment/performance results to guide your instruction.	3.19	0.79	69

7. Narrative explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers, with characterization of findings. One to two paragraphs should be sufficient.

According to our annual survey of employers of our graduates, the results show that the major area for improvement is engaging students in applying methods of inquiry (2.9), provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners (2.9). Data table shown here. The scale is 0 = not at all, 1 = poorly, 2 = adequately 3 = well, 4 = very well. It is striking that employers and graduates agree on the areas in need of improvement.

Given that a score of 2 equals adequately, we are satisfied that our graduates are performing at or above the expected level (adequately or better). In fact, the means are above 3.0 for nearly every criterion, which indicates that, in the aggregate, our graduates are rated as doing “well” or “very well” by their employers.

Based on your interactions and observations of the USU first year teacher in your building, how well can he/she do the following?	M	SD	N
Advocate for all students.	3.4	0.8	78
Collaborate with colleagues to plan and evaluate instruction.	3.4	0.8	78
Plan instruction based on the Utah Core Standards.	3.3	0.9	78
Collaborate with families, colleagues, and other professionals to support student success.	3.4	0.8	78
Participate in a collaborative decision-making culture.	3.4	0.8	78
Engage in professional learning to strengthen his/her instructional practice.	3.4	0.7	78
Collaborate with students to establish a respectful learning environment.	3.3	0.8	78
Convey accurate information and concepts based on the content knowledge of the discipline.	3.3	0.8	78
Actively reflect on the effectiveness of his/her instruction to identify areas for improvement.	3.3	0.8	78
Use classroom routines, expectations, and procedures to create a learning environment.	3.2	1	78
Create learning experiences based on students' individual developmental levels.	3.2	0.8	78
Set appropriately challenging learning goals for all students.	3.2	0.8	78
Provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning in different ways.	3.2	0.8	78
Reflect on personal and professional biases.	3.2	0.8	78
Implement new ideas to improve their instruction.	3.2	0.8	78
Use students' assessment/performance results to guide instruction.	3.2	0.9	78
Use a variety of classroom management strategies to create and maintain a positive classroom environment.	3.1	1	78
Use technology effectively to support and enhance instruction.	3.1	0.8	78
Design assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.1	0.8	78
Implement activities and tasks that support students' ability to communicate.	3.1	0.8	78
Incorporate a variety of digital media and technology tools to extend the learning environment.	3.1	0.9	78
Select assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.1	0.8	78
Use data from assessments to provide feedback to students.	3.1	0.8	78
Provide opportunities for students to connect classroom learning to the real world.	3	0.8	78
Provide instruction that addresses students' learning differences.	3.1	0.8	78
Facilitate students' use of technology for learning.	3.1	0.8	78
Integrate literacy and/or other content areas into instruction.	3	0.9	78

Use a variety of questioning strategies to promote engagement.	3.1	0.9	78
Differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students.	3.1	0.9	78
Modify instructional strategies based on an analysis of student work.	3	0.8	78
Stay informed regarding current education policy and research.	3	0.7	78
Engage students in critical thinking.	3	0.8	78
Engage students in applying methods of inquiry.	2.9	0.9	78
Provide instruction that addresses students' cultural differences.	3	0.7	78
Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.	2.9	0.8	78
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	2.8	0.8	78

8. Employment (and/or more schooling) rates for immediate prior year's completers, if known. Comment on means of accessing this information and challenges encountered in gathering this information.

USU's Office of Graduation, Educator Licensure, and Accreditation sends an electronic placement survey to each of our teacher education graduates when we complete their institutional recommendation to the Utah State Board of Education for their educator license. This data is compiled each October in preparation for our annual Council on Teacher Education's Executive Faculty Senate Report, which provides a summary of all teacher education activities for the previous academic year and is due each November. In September there is a comprehensive push for all outstanding placement data from our Summer, Fall, and Spring graduates. Additional surveys are sent both electronically and snail mail to increase our response rate.

Column 4 shows the total (of those who responded) number of graduates teaching in Utah, Column 5 shows the total of those teaching out of state. Note that in the critical shortage areas of science and special education, the placement rate is near 100% (of those who responded).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
License Area	Total No. Certified	Total No. Responded	In State	Outside State	Other Employment	Seeking Teaching Position	Not Seeking Teaching Position	Continuing Formal Education	% Placement in Teaching of Total Responded
Ag Ed	22	18	14	2		2			88.89%
Art Ed	7	7	3		1	3			42.8%
Biological Science	3	3	3						100%
Business	3	3	3						100%
Chemistry	4	2	2						100%
Early Childhood	4	4	2		1	1			50%
Earth Science	1	1				1			0%
Elem Ed (1-8)	125	108	90	3	9	6			86.11%
Elem Ed (K-6)	4	3	1	2					100%
Elem Ed/ECE	18	16	13		1	2			81.25%
English	23	20	15		2	2		1	75%
Family Consumer Science Ed	13	12	10		1			1	83.33%
Geography	2	2	1			1			50%
History	10	7	4	1				2	71.4%

Math	20	20	13	2	2	3			75%
Music Ed	7	5	4	1					100%
PE	6	4	2	1		1			75%
Physical Science	2	1	1						100%
Physics	2	2	2						100%
Sch Library Media	2	1	1						100%
Social Studies	16	10	7			2			70%
Special Education	59	55	52	1	1	1			96%
Theater	4	3	3						100%
TOTALS	461	395	329	15	21	25	0	4	87%
<p>NOTES</p> <p>1. Column 10 percent = (Col 4 + Col 5) / Col 3</p> <p>2. Graduate may be teaching in major or minor content area.</p>									

3. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

This section reports on your own expectations for candidate/completer performance and indicators of their success in meeting those expectations. For each of AAQEP's Candidate and Completer Performance Standards (Standards 1 and 2), please specify 3 to 5 expectations in Table 3 and:

- List your chosen measures of performance (these may be taken from your Quality Assurance Report)
- Indicate the performance expectations for each measure (i.e. your definition of minimally adequate performance, though you may also specify other levels of performance as well)
- Summarize candidate/completer success in relation to those expectations

Table 3. Academic Performance Expectations and Level of Success

Std.	Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation		
			Average total score	Mentor teacher	Supervisor
1	Student teaching evaluation (Performance Assessment Evaluation System-PAES)	The student teaching evaluation instrument is scored on a 0-3 scale with 0 = not effective, 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, and 3 = preservice proficient. Note that the scores have a ceiling at preservice proficient. 80% as performance criteria for the UTC-PAES. This translates to a total of 53/66 total points. Note that items 10.1 and 10.2 have point values of 0=no and 3=yes. Ideally, a student should have a minimum total score of 53 to pass student teaching (with no ratings of zero for any criteria and no marks of NO for 10.1 and 10.2). However, because the teachers have not been trained on the instrument and the instrument has not been			
			SPED Sp 19	61.1	59.33
			SPED Fa 19	60.57	61.51
			ELED Sp 19	61.92	64.05
			ELED Fa 19	62.78	64.45
			SecEd Sp 19	61.16	61.98
			SecEd Fa 19	61.77	63.26
			Grand Mean	61.55	62.43
			Detailed data available here: https://cehs.usu.edu/about-us/annual-report-teacher-education		

		through a rigorous psychometric validation and reliability testing, scores lower than 53 are acceptable as long as there is other evidence that the student has performed proficiently as a preservice teacher candidate.	
1	Praxis	All students must pass the content praxis for their major prior to student teaching. Other challenging areas are math and science; nevertheless, the Utah State Board of Education is no longer requiring Praxis scores for those seeking licensure in their major. Students seeking an endorsement for a teaching minor will continue to take the Praxis content test for that secondary endorsement area.	The pass rates indicate that for ELED and Special Education, the social studies, science, and reading/language arts subtests of Praxis presents challenges. We have recently made ELED 3100, a reading methods course, available as a pre-program course, which we expect will help that area. We have also provided extensive Praxis study content available for free. Students are advised to take any subtests that they did not pass the first time one at a time to reduce test anxiety and to allow for focused studying.
1	Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers	This is a valid and reliable instrument developed and scored by ETS. We have not yet established an expectation for PPAT, but based on the ETS recommended cut score of 40, our students are, in the aggregate, on pace to meet that expectation.	In spring 2020, due to the closing of the schools on March 16, student teachers were not able to complete task 4 of PPAT. The data for tasks 2 and 3 are mildly encouraging. The average score on task 2 was 7.91 out of 12; the average score on task 4 was 10.2 out of 16. Task 4 is worth 32, so extrapolating from that (doubling the task 3 score to get a predicted score for task 4), the average overall score would have been 38.5. This includes data that could be characterized as extreme outliers (scores of 0 on one or more tasks indicating that the student submitted nothing); when outliers are removed, and the same extrapolation is applied, the average predicted score is 40.18. All in all, given that this was the first semester of implementation and that students were aware that the scores were not consequential, the PPAT scores give us a positive indication of our students' pedagogical skill.
2	Survey of graduates	We expect that graduates will rate themselves at least a 2 (adequately) or higher (well = 3; very well = 4) when responding to the prompt: Based on the courses and	See table 2, section 6 above. Our graduates rate themselves at an average of 2 or above on every item. Most criteria have an average rating of at least 3. This indicates to us that our

		experiences in your teacher preparation program (including courses in your major, minor, and education), how well can you do the following...	students have the skills and abilities referenced in the aspects of Standard 2.
2	Survey of employers	We expect that employers will rate our graduates at least a 2 (adequately) or higher (well = 3; very well = 4) when responding to the prompt: Based on your interactions and observations of the USU first year teacher in your building, how well can he/she do the following...	See table, section 7 above. The average rating employers gave our graduates was at least 3 on nearly every item. This indicates that our employers are satisfied with the preparation of our graduates. Interestingly, both the employers of our graduates and the graduates themselves seem to agree that there is room for improvement in graduates' ability to provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.
2	Dispositions assessment	<p>Although we did not report this data in our Quality Assurance Report, we have data on dispositions that is gathered at the end of student teaching.</p> <p>Our expectation is that the average score is at least a 4 on every item (1 = unacceptable, 2 = emergent, 3 = proficient, 4 = excellent, 5 = exceptional).</p>	<p>For aspect b of Standard 2, "engage in culturally responsive practices," item 4 on the dispositions assessment sheds light: The student teacher appreciated and valued student diversity; exhibited cultural sensitivity; was impartial, open-minded, and unprejudiced. On this item, the mean score (given by mentor teachers) was 4.66 out of 5.</p> <p>Similarly, for aspect f of Standard 2, "collaborate with colleagues," item 2 on the dispositions assessment sheds light: The student teacher was collaborative, cooperative, and shared responsibility in a group endeavor. On this item, the mean score (given by mentor teachers) was 4.64 out of 5. Detailed data available here: https://cehs.usu.edu/about-us/annual-report-teacher-education</p>

4. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

Describe recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, priorities in your current agenda, and innovations that are on the horizon. Please limit comments to no more than two pages.

The current challenge within our state is changes to licensing rules and teacher preparation program rules. For licensing, a significant change is that in order to be recommended for a "professional" license, students must pass a pedagogical performance assessment. This will become a consequential requirement in Fall 2021. In order to be ready, Utah State University teacher education programs adopted the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). This, along with new requirements listed in board rule for teacher preparation programs has presented a need to map our curriculum to the PPAT and to the list of required elements for teacher preparation programs (e.g., curriculum must include "trauma-informed instructional practices").

In spring 2020, all students were required to attempt the PPAT. Schools were shut down due to COVID-19 just after students submitted tasks 2 and 3. Students were not able to complete task 4. We will use the available data to inform curriculum revisions. We have 2 more semesters (Fall 2020 and Spring 2021) to acquaint ourselves with the PPAT language and expectations.