



AAQEP Annual Report for 2020

For instructions on how to complete this report, who should complete which sections, and how to submit the final report, please refer to [this guidance document](#).

Provider/Program Name:

Utah State University—Teacher Education Programs

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

2026

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

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

Utah State University 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.

Public Posting URL

If the provider is publicly posting data from this report, that information can be found at the following URL (web address):

<https://cehs.usu.edu/about/annual-report-teacher-education>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

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

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2019-2020

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution/organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates currently enrolled	Number of Completers in 2019-20
Elementary Education	Elementary	88	135
Early Childhood Education	Early Childhood	5	25
Deaf Ed and ELED or EC	Deaf Education/ELED	23	4

Special Education	Special Education	134	63
Ag Ed BS	Ag Ed	38	19
Business Ed BS	Business Ed	56	8
Family and Consumer Science BS	Family and Consumer Science	48	10
Technology and Engineering Ed	Technology and Engineering Ed	24	5
Art Ed BFA	Visual Arts	1	3
Theater Ed	Theater 6-12 and K-12	29	3
Music Ed Band/Choral/Orch/Guitar Emphasis	Music Ed	44	12
English Teaching BA/BS and Composite majors	English	98	21
History Teaching BA/BS	History	17	7
Spanish Teaching BA	World Languages-Spanish	10	5
French Teaching BA	World Languages-French	3	1
German Teaching BA	World Languages-German	1	0
Biological Sciences Composite BS	Biological Science	16	1
Chemistry Teaching BS	Chemistry	11	2
Physical Sciences Composite BS	Physical Sciences	2	1
Physics BS	Physics	6	1
Earth Sciences Composite BS	Earth Science	6	1
Math Ed or Math/Stats Composite BS	Math Level 4	63	14
Social Studies Composite BS	Social Studies	6	13
Physical Education	Physical Education	40	18
TOTALS:		769	372

Added or Discontinued Programs

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

We have added the OPTT (Online Practical Teacher Training) program, an alternate route to certification program for special education that enrolls students who are seeking a 1st bachelor's degree or a 2nd bachelor's in special education, with specializations in mild/moderate, severe, and early childhood disabilities. The program is considered "alternate" preparation by the state because the 2nd Bachelor students are working as the teacher of record in local education agencies and are counted as such in our annual Title II reports. The first bachelor students are working as para-educators in their district. Because OPTT students are enrolled in a bachelor's degree program, the enrollment count is included with the traditional special education numbers.

3. Program Performance Indicators

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

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

1. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
780
2. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
362
3. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
499 (excludes School Counseling and Instructional Leadership, which report separately)

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

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 completion rates data is provided on the Annual Report webpage:
<https://cehs.usu.edu/files/accreditation/8-yearCompletionData.xlsx>

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

The current pass rates for tests taken by completers between September 1, 2019 and August 31, 2020 indicate that for ELED and Special Education, the social studies and reading/language arts subtests of the multiple subjects Praxis present challenges. The social studies pass rate is below 80%.

Test Name	SEP 2019-AUG 2020		
	N	# Pass	% Pass
Mathematics	46	40	87%
Reading Lang Arts	60	40	67%
Science	50	42	84%
Social Studies	54	41	76%

Praxis scores are only required for secondary education when students are seeking an endorsement in an area that is not their major. This is in accordance with new state rules that do not require Praxis scores if students are seeking licensure in their major area. Our students all seek licensure in their major; some seek an endorsement to add to their license in another area such as library science, PE, etc. Because the Praxis is not required, pass rates are not reported here.

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

According to our annual survey of program completers (graduates who have completed one year of employment), the results show that the major area for improvement is ability to “provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners” (2.28) and “support students' growth in international and global perspectives” (2.42). 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 most criterion, which indicates that, in the aggregate, our program completers 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.	3.24	.80	96
Advocate for all students.	3.43	.80	96
Collaborate with colleagues to plan and evaluate instruction.	3.26	.81	96
Collaborate with families, colleagues, and other professionals to support student growth.	3.14	.88	96
Collaborate with your students to establish a respectful learning environment.	3.19	.90	96
Convey accurate information and concepts based on the content knowledge of your discipline(s).	3.31	.76	96
Create learning experiences based on your students' individual developmental levels.	3.01	.81	96
Design assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.00	.87	96
Differentiate instruction to meet the needs of your students.	2.86	.89	96
Engage in professional learning to strengthen your instructional practice.	3.28	.89	96
Engage your students in applying methods of inquiry.	2.79	.88	96
Engage your students in critical thinking.	2.70	.84	96
Facilitate your students' use of technology for learning.	2.94	.94	96
Implement activities and tasks that support your students' ability to communicate.	2.95	.85	96
Implement new ideas to improve your instruction.	3.26	.85	96
Incorporate a variety of digital media and technology tools to extend the learning environment.	2.98	.91	96
Integrate literacy and/or other content areas into instruction.	2.94	.81	96
Modify instructional strategies based on an analysis of student work.	3.17	.82	96
Participate in a collaborative decision-making culture.	3.25	.86	96
Plan instruction based on the Utah Core Standards.	3.46	.71	96
Provide instruction that addresses students' cultural differences.	2.69	.86	96
Provide instruction that addresses students' learning differences.	2.92	.87	96
Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.	2.28	1.0	96
Provide opportunities for your students to connect classroom learning to the real world.	2.9	.92	96
Provide opportunities for your students to demonstrate learning in different ways.	3.11	.88	96
Reflect on personal and professional biases.	3.16	.86	96
Select assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.07	.81	96
Set appropriately challenging learning goals for all students.	2.91	.86	96
Stay informed regarding current education policy and research.	2.59	.95	96
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	2.42	1.03	96
Use a variety of classroom management strategies to create and maintain a positive learning environment.	3.04	.96	96
Use a variety of questioning strategies to promote engagement.	2.84	.89	96

Use classroom routines, expectations, and procedures to create a learning environment that allows all students to be self-directed learners.	2.89	1.1	96
Use data from assessments to provide feedback to your students.	3.14	.76	96
Use technology effectively to support and enhance your instruction.	3.05	.85	96
Use your students' assessment/performance results to guide your instruction.	3.09	0.92	96

7. Narrative explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers , with a characterization of findings.			
<p>According to our annual survey of employers of our graduates that was deployed in June 2020, the results show that the lowest rated criteria were “provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners” (2.9) and “support students' growth in international and global perspectives” (2.78). Data table shown here. The scale is 0 = not at all, 1 = poorly, 2 = adequately 3 = well, 4 = very well.</p> <p>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 most criterion, which indicates that, in the aggregate, our graduates are rated as doing “well” or “very well” by their employers.</p> <p>It is striking that program completers and employers rated the same criteria as the lowest; however, employers rated program completers higher than they rated themselves.</p>			
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
Actively reflect on the effectiveness of his/her instruction to identify areas for improvement.	3.13	.86	120
Advocate for all students.	3.39	.73	120
Collaborate with colleagues to plan and evaluate instruction.	3.41	.72	120
Collaborate with families, colleagues, and other professionals to support student success.	3.33	.81	120
Collaborate with students to establish a respectful learning environment.	3.28	.83	120
Convey accurate information and concepts based on the content knowledge of the discipline.	3.32	.72	120
Create learning experiences based on students' individual developmental levels.	3.18	.76	120
Design assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.08	.72	120
Differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students.	2.97	.81	120
Engage in professional learning to strengthen his/her instructional practice.	3.36	.76	120
Engage students in critical thinking.	2.94	.76	120
Engage students in applying methods of inquiry.	2.99	.79	120
Facilitate students' use of technology for learning.	3.18	.81	120
Implement activities and tasks that support students' ability to communicate.	3.12	.72	120

Implement new ideas to improve their instruction.	3.20	.74	120
Incorporate a variety of digital media and technology tools to extend the learning environment.	3.28	.78	120
Integrate literacy and/or other content areas into instruction.	2.98	.80	120
Modify instructional strategies based on an analysis of student work.	3.08	.74	120
Participate in a collaborative decision-making culture.	3.38	.81	120
Plan instruction based on the Utah Core Standards.	3.30	0.9	120
Provide instruction that addresses students' cultural differences.	2.98	.76	120
Provide instruction that addresses students' learning differences.	3.02	.78	120
Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.	2.90	.82	120
Provide opportunities for students to connect classroom learning to the real world.	2.99	.78	120
Provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning in different ways.	3.13	.79	120
Reflect on personal and professional biases.	3.10	.87	120
Select assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.15	.73	120
Set appropriately challenging learning goals for all students.	3.10	.79	120
Stay informed regarding current education policy and research.	2.98	.76	120
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	2.78	.87	120
Use a variety of classroom management strategies to create and maintain a positive classroom environment.	3.09	.94	120
Use a variety of questioning strategies to promote engagement.	3.01	.82	120
Use classroom routines, expectations, and procedures to create a learning environment.	3.13	1	120
Use data from assessments to provide feedback to students.	3.03	.74	120
Use students' assessment/performance results to guide instruction.	3.12	.71	120
Use technology effectively to support and enhance instruction.	3.14	.78	120

8. Employment (and/or more schooling) rates for the immediate prior year's completers, if known.

Of the 372 students who were recommended for licensure, we know that 258 of them are employed in Utah.

Of interest is the distribution of our graduates throughout the state.

Early Childhood Education	6
Elementary	16
Elementary Education (1-8)	78
Elementary Education (K-6)	3
Secondary Education	78
Special Education (K-12+)	77
Grand Total	258

Advantage Arts Academy	4
Alpine District	12
Athenian eAcademy	1
Bear River Charter School	2
Box Elder District	8
Cache District	35
Canyons District	8
Carbon District	4
Davis District	24
Duchesne District	3
Emery District	2
Fast Forward High	2
Garfield District	1
Granite District	28
Intech Collegiate Academy	1
Jordan District	25
Juab District	1
Lakeview Academy	2
Lincoln Academy	1
Logan City District	18
Merit College Preparatory Academy	1
Murray District	2
Nebo District	5
North Sanpete District	1
Ogden City District	6
Promontory School of Expeditionary Learning	1
Providence Hall	1
Salt Lake District	3
San Juan District	1
Sevier District	2
South Sanpete District	3
Summit Academy	3
Thomas Edison	5
Tooele District	8
Uintah District	7
Utah Virtual Academy	1
Vista School	1
Voyage Academy	1
Wasatch District	5
Wasatch Peak Academy	1
Washington District	6
Weber District	12
Grand Total	258

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation		
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, 3 = preservice proficient. 80% is the expected performance level, which translates to a total of 53/66 points.	Average total score	Mentor teacher	University supervisor
		SPED Fa 19	60.57	61.51
		SPED Sp 20	59.42	59.00
		ELED Fa 19	62.78	64.45
		ELED Sp 20	64.73	66.96
		SecEd Fa 19	61.77	63.26
		SecEd Sp 20	63.94	64.80
Praxis	<p>All early childhood, elementary, and special education teacher candidates must pass the multiple subjects Praxis in order to be recommended for licensure. The Utah State Board of Education is no longer requiring Praxis scores for those seeking licensure in the secondary teaching major.</p> <p>Cut scores for the ELED Praxis subtests are: Reading and Language Arts-157 Math-157 Social Studies-155 Science-159</p>	The current pass rates for tests taken by completers between September 1, 2019 and August 31, 2020 indicate that for ELED and Special Education, the social studies and reading/language arts subtests of the multiple subjects Praxis present challenges. This data represents multiple attempts. All students must pass all four sections in order to be recommended for licensure.		
		Test Name	SEP 2019-AUG 2020	
			N	# Pass % Pass
		Mathematics	46	40 87%
		Reading Lang Arts	60	40 67%
		Science	50	42 84%
		Social Studies	54	41 76%

Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers	<p>This is a valid and reliable instrument, developed and score by ETS. We currently expect all students to attempt it. Beginning Fall 2021, the cut score will be 36 in order to be recommend for professional licensure upon graduation.</p>	<p>This is a new assessment for teacher education at Utah State. We began requiring all students to attempt it in spring 2020, but due to the closing of the schools on March 16, student teachers were not able to complete task 4 of the PPAT. The data for tasks 2 and 3 was mildly encouraging. The average score on task 2 was 7.91 out of 12; the average score on 3 was 10.2 out of 16. Task 4 is worth 32 points, 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.</p> <p>In Fall 2020, we were able to get a complete set of data. The average overall score was 38.47, which is above the anticipated cut score of 36. Given that the score was not consequential for graduation or licensure and given that schools were functioning in multiple modes due to Covid-19, we find this mildly encouraging. When the data is disaggregated by major, there is certainly work to do in specific programs where the average scores were not at or above 36 (e.g., math and art).</p>
--	--	---

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Survey of graduates	<p>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 experiences in your teacher preparation program (including courses in your major, minor, and education, how well can you do the following...</p>	<p>See table 2, section 6 above. Our graduates rate themselves well above 2 on every item. Most criteria have an average rating of at least 3, which indicates to us that our students have the skills and abilities references in the aspects of Standard 2.</p>

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.
Dispositions assessment at exit	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>For aspect b of Standard 2, "engage in culturally responsive practices," item 4 on the disposition 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 4.8 out of 5 for special education teacher candidates and 4.64 for elementary and secondary education teacher candidates.</p> <p>Similarly, for aspect f of Standard 2, "collaborate with colleagues," item 2 on the disposition 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 4.67 out of 5 for special education teacher candidates and 4.53 for elementary and secondary teacher candidates.</p>

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

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

We are currently developing a paraprofessional certificate that can serve as a steppingstone toward an associate degree in Education. We do not anticipate seeking accreditation for this program because it will not lead to licensure, but it is a response to school district partner needs

for better prepared paraprofessionals and the need to “grow your own” teachers in the rural areas of Utah. This speaks to Standard 4, aspect b: “seeks to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversity participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support.”

We are also in the initial implementation phase of using the PPAT as an exit assessment for teacher education. This is in response to Utah State Board of Education rule R277-301: <https://rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-301.htm>

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

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

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

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

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Std.	Strengths, Needs, and Goals/Opportunities by Standard		Priorities to Be Addressed	Action Plan/ Steps to Be Taken	Steps Taken/ Outcomes (Reflection)
1	Strength	We have quality sources of data to support Standard 1.			
	Need	Praxis passing rates for ELED and SPED	We have recently changed an introductory reading methods course, ELED 3100, so that it is available prior to admission to the program, which we expect will help the Praxis scores for reading/language arts. We have also provided extensive Praxis study content and adjusted the general education course recommendations in order to better prepare students for the science and social studies subtests.	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.	It should be noted that by the time students graduate and apply for licensing, the pass rates reach 100%. ELED and SPED students cannot qualify for licensure without passing all four subtests.
	Goal	Choose or develop a dispositions instrument that can be administered at multiple points in program.		Investigation of dispositions instruments is underway.	

2	Strength	We successfully administer the completer and employer surveys every spring. Since beginning online survey administration, response rates have improved.			
	Need				
	Goal	To have a better sense of completers' success after graduation, it would be useful to conduct focus groups.			
3	Strength	Clinical partnerships are strong.			
	Need	Need to map curriculum to determine alignment with PPAT.			This work has begun.
	Goal				
4	Strength	We work with school districts to provide pathways to licensure as well as post-licensure endorsements and grant-supported professional development opportunities.			
	Need				
	Goal				

Overall Comments in Response to Evidence

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

--

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

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

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

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

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider’s response to those changes (“n/a” indicates that no changes have been made or are anticipated).

The Utah State Board of Education changed their licensing rules, and effective as of January 2020, Praxis tests are no longer required for secondary licenses if the students’ majors match the area of licensure. Thus, we will have fewer Praxis scores to report moving forward.

The Utah State Board of Education now requires that EPPs use a teacher performance assessment to assess teacher candidates prior to recommendation for professional licensure. Utah State University has adopted the ETS product, PPAT, for this purpose. The cut score will be 36 beginning in Fall 2021.

The state of Utah passed legislation requiring an early literacy test for early childhood, elementary, and special education teacher candidates. This legislation is tied to funding for the test, and the funding was rescinded due to COVID-19 budget cuts. We anticipate that this test will be funded in the next round of legislation. The USBE will be adopting the Pearson Foundations of Reading test for this purpose.

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Sylvia Read, Associate Dean	Sylvia Read, Associate Dean

Date sent to AAQEP:

12/17/20