



AAQEP Annual Report for 2022

Provider/Program Name:	Utah State University, Teacher Education, initial licensure
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term	Spring 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 included 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 Rehabilitation Counseling (SPERC) 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 are majors in other departments (22 other departments) housed in other colleges (except for 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 their practicum and clinical experiences and student teaching 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

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

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

Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2021-2022

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of recommendations for licensure in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22) *includes minors and dual majors
Deaf Education, M.Ed.	Deaf Education (Birth - Age 22)	18	12	16
Elementary Education, BS, BA	Elementary (K-6 or 8)	351	151	148
Early Childhood Education, BS, BA	Early Childhood (K-3)	32	28	26
Elementary Education & Deaf Education (Composite), BS, BA	Deaf Education (Birth-22) & Elementary Education (K-6)	0	2	N/A (they license at the end of the master's degree)
Early Childhood Education & Special Education, BS, BA	Early Childhood (K-3) & Special Education (K-12)	2	1	1
Elementary Education & Special Education (Composite), BA, BS	Elementary (K-6 or 8) & Special Education (K-12)	1	1	1
Special Education, BA, BS	Special Education (K-12)	178	81	85*
Agricultural Education, BS	Agriculture Science (6-12) (CTE/General)	61	13	12
Business Education, BS	Business & Marketing (6-12)(CTE/General)	55	4	3
Family and Consumer Sciences, BS	Family & Consumer Sciences (6-12)	91	15	11
Technology and Engineering Ed, BS	Technology & Engineering (6-12)	27	4	4
Art Ed, BFA	Visual Arts (6-12 or K-12)	13	3	3

Theatre Education, BFA	Theatre (6-12 or K-12)	24	4	4
Music Ed (Band/Choral/ Orch/Guitar Emphasis), BM	Music (6-12 or K-12)	51	12	12
English Teaching, BA, BS	English (6-12)	149	19	24*
History Teaching, BA, BS	History (6-12)	75	9	10*
Chinese Teaching Minor	World Language-Chinese (6-12)	1	0	0
Spanish Teaching, BA	World Language-Spanish (6-12)	25	5	5*
French Teaching, BA	World Language-French (6-12)	4	2	2
German Teaching, BA	World Language-German (6-12)	1	0	0
Biological Sciences Composite, BS	Biology (6-12)	37	3	4*
Chemistry Teaching, BS	Chemistry (6-12)	18	1	9*
Physical Sciences Composite, BS	Physical Sciences Composite (6-12)	4	4	3
Physics, BS	Physics (6-12)	13	0	4*
Earth Sciences Composite, BS	Earth Science (6-12)	10	2	6*
Geography Teaching Minor	Geography (6-12)	3	1	1
Math Ed & Math/Stats Composite, BS	Secondary Math (6-12)	142	14	13
Social Studies Composite, BS	Social Studies Composite (6-12)	27	10	7
Political Science Teaching Minor	Political Science (6-12)	10	2	2
Psychology Teaching Minor	Psychology (6-12)	14	5	5
Sociology Teaching Minor	Sociology (6-12)	4	2	2
Kinesiology-Physical Education teaching, BS	Physical Education (K-12)	65	11	11

School Library Media Minor	Library Media (K-12)	6	2	1
School Leadership License	School Leadership License Area of Concentration	20	14	14
School Counseling	School Counselor	115	83	83
Communicative Disorders and Deaf Ed MS, MA with specialization in speech language pathology	Speech Language Pathology	25	19	19
Total of all program candidates and completers		1,672	539	632

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.)

The Elementary Education & Deaf Education (Composite), BS, BA has been discontinued. No new students are being admitted.

2. Program Performance Indicators

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

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. 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.
1,672
B. 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.
539

C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.

632

D. **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.

See https://cehs.usu.edu/files/accreditation/2022/8-yearCompletionData_2022.xlsx

E. **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%.

Currently, the Utah State Board of Education does not require any Praxis content tests for any initial licensure programs in teacher education. They are phasing in a requirement for the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). Currently, teacher candidates must complete the assessment but are not required to achieve any particular score. Beginning in August 2023, teacher candidates will be required to score a 36 to be recommended for a professional license. In addition, early childhood, elementary, and special education students must take the Pearson Foundations of Reading test to be recommended for licensure, but a cut score has not yet been determined.

Here is a summary of the PPAT scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022.

N	% pass at 36 cut score	Median	Mean	SD	Average Performance Range	Highest Observed Score	Lowest Observed Score
361	68.14%	40.00	37.40	8.71	33 - 44	56	0

In Fall 2022, scores improved somewhat.

N	% pass at 36 cut score	Median	Mean	SD	Average Performance Range	Highest Observed Score	Lowest Observed Score
172	72.67%	41.00	38.81	8.11	34 - 45	54	4

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

The Utah State Board of Education **Engagement Survey** began disaggregating data by EPP. The survey asked early career educators several questions that were linked to their EPP:

“Typically this year, how well prepared have you felt to deliver the academic content associated with your assignment at school.” Results for USU grads: 27.8% answered extremely well prepared, 48.7% moderately prepared, 17.7% somewhat prepared, fewer than 3% not at all prepared, and 4% answered not applicable.

“Typically this year, how prepared have you felt to manage classroom procedures and protocols associated with your assignment at this school?” disaggregated by whether and where the educator completed a preparation program. Results for USU grads: 23.1% answered extremely well prepared, 51.3% moderately prepared, 18.4% somewhat prepared, less than 3% not at all prepared, and 4.3% answered not applicable.

“Typically this year, how prepared have you felt to manage student behavior associated with your assignment at this school?” disaggregated by whether and where the educator completed a preparation program. Results for USU grads: 15.2% answered extremely well prepared, 37.9% moderately prepared, 38.6% somewhat prepared, 5.8% not at all prepared, and less than 3% answered not applicable.

“Typically this year, how prepared have you felt to manage interactions with parents as required by your assignment at this school?” disaggregated by whether and where the educator completed a preparation program. Results for USU grads: 19.3% answered extremely well prepared, 48.7% moderately prepared, less than 3% somewhat prepared, 4.4% not at all prepared, and 25.1% answered not applicable.

“Typically this year, how prepared have you felt to work with other professionals at this school?” disaggregated by whether and where the educator completed a preparation program. Results for USU grads: 44.4% answered extremely well prepared, 44.7% moderately prepared, 9.8% somewhat prepared, and less than 3% answered not at all prepared.

This is the first iteration of this survey that has been disaggregated by whether and where an educator completed a preparation program, so we do not have a sense of whether our students are feeling more, or less, prepared than in previous years. In comparison with other EPPs, Utah State University does not stand out as either superior or inferior. The greatest percentage of USU students who felt “not at all prepared” was in response to the question “Typically this year, how prepared have you felt to manage student behavior associated with your assignment at this school?” It’s important to note that there are many other factors that could contribute to a respondent’s answer other than their formal preparation. For example, we know that when dealing with student behavior, some of our graduates have told us that they do not feel adequately supported by the school administration where they work. In other words, just because a question uses the word “prepared” does not mean the answer is directly attributable to their preparation program. Nevertheless, we have asked USBE staff if they can further disaggregate by license type (i.e., early childhood, elementary, special education, and secondary education) so that we could better use the data for program improvement.

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

Employer survey results from 2022 provide evidence that employers of completers rated them as adequately, well, or very well prepared on every item measured. The lowest rated item was “Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners”.

Based on your interactions and observations of the USU first year teacher in your building, how well can he/she do the following?	Mean	SD	N
Provide instruction that uses language acquisition strategies to meet the needs of English learners.	2.77	1.01	65

H. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers’ ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

We are able to check the licensing database (CACTUS) managed by the Utah State Board of Education for who among our graduates is employed in the state. We also survey students who are not in that database. Survey responses along with the data from CACTUS indicates that 97% of graduates who have sought employment are employed in education.

3. 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
PPAT, Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 Mean score 37.40 (N = 361) The PPAT is a performance assessment Specific alignment with AAQEP standards and aspects can be seen here: https://www.ets.org/content/dam/ets-org/pdfs/ppat/ppat-aaqep-alignment.pdf	The expectation is that students will score at least a 36 on the overall PPAT; however, the cut score of 36 is not consequential for licensure until Fall 2023.	This is an area for focused improvement. Because the cut score of 36 is not consequential until Fall 2023, this year we are focusing on improvement coursework alignment with PPAT vocabulary and communicating to students that they must score a 36

								overall; if they do not, they will resubmit at least one step of one task for internal re-scoring by program faculty.
Student teaching evaluations for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022							An average score of 2.4 (80%) is the expectation.	In the aggregate, students are meeting the expectation. Students who are performing according to program expectations are counseled out at various points in the program.
	Fall 2021 ELED		Fall 2021 SCED		Fall 2021 SPED			
	Mentor Teacher N=52	University Supervisor N=59	Mentor Teacher N=45	University Supervisor N=46	Mentor Teacher N=23	University Supervisor N=33		
0-3 scale	2.88	2.96	2.81	2.91	2.87	2.89		
	Spring 2022 ELED		Spring 2022 SCED		Spring 2022 SPED			
	Mentor Teacher N=84	University Supervisor N=94	Mentor Teacher N=67	University Supervisor N=81	Mentor Teacher N=18	University Supervisor N=53		
0-3 scale	2.81	2.91	2.77	2.90	2.89	2.89		
Dispositions at the end of student teaching							An average score of 4 is the expectation.	In the aggregate, students are meeting the expectation. Students who are not exhibiting appropriate dispositions are counseled out at various points in the program.
	Fall 2021 ELED		Fall 2021 SCED		Fall 2021 SPED			
	Mentor Teacher N=52	University Supervisor N=59	Mentor Teacher N=45	University Supervisor N=46	Mentor Teacher N=23	University Supervisor N=33		
1-5 scale	4.82	4.68	4.55	4.70	4.62	4.11		
	Spring 2022 ELED		Spring 2022 SCED		Spring 2022 SPED			
	Mentor Teacher N=84	University Supervisor N=94	Mentor Teacher N=67	University Supervisor N=81	Mentor Teacher N=18	University Supervisor N=53		
1-5 scale	4.65	4.52	4.49	4.70	4.8	4.78		

				Note, the mentor teacher and university supervisor N for Spring 2022 for special education do not match because some of the student teachers (in the alternative SPED route) have an instructional coach (not a mentor teacher) who also serves as their supervisor. These student teachers are the instructor of record and employed by the school.	
Employer survey results from Spring 2022, specific to Standard 1:				Because the scale is 0-4, a 3 is the minimum expectation.	In the aggregate, completers are meeting the expectation. Of note, completers' ability to design assessments had an average rating of 3.0. Because of the programs' emphasis on the PPAT, we expect that this will improve.
Based on your interactions and observations of the USU first year teacher in your building, how well can he/she do the following?	Mean	SD	N		
Convey accurate information and concepts based on the content knowledge of your discipline(s).	3.29	0.76	65		
Design assessments (e.g., pre, formative, summative) that match learning objectives.	3.00	0.85	65		
Collaborate with your students to establish a respectful learning environment.	3.23	0.90	65		
Use your students' assessment/performance results to guide your instruction.	3.14	0.90	65		

Use a variety of classroom management strategies to create and maintain a positive learning environment.	3.14	0.92	65		
--	------	------	----	--	--

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
Items from employer survey of Spring 2022, specific to standard 2				Because the scale is 0-4, a 3 is the minimum expectation.	Completers' ability to support students' growth in international and global perspectives is still a challenging outcome to address. We are uncertain if the respondents to the survey understand what they are being asked to evaluate.
Based on your interactions and observations of the USU first year teacher in your building, how well can he/she do the following?	Mean	SD	N		
Collaborate with colleagues to plan and evaluate instruction.	3.34	0.83	65		
Collaborate with families, colleagues, and other professionals to support student growth.	3.23	0.79	65		
Provide instruction that addresses students' cultural differences.	3.02	0.87	65		
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	2.74	1.11	65		
Engage in professional learning to strengthen your instructional practice.	3.31	0.81	65		

Actively reflect on the effectiveness of my instruction to identify areas of strength and challenges.	3.06	0.92	65		
Items from alumni survey					
PPAT, Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 Mean score 37.40 (N = 361) The PPAT is a performance assessment Specific alignment with AAQEP standards and aspects can be seen here: https://www.ets.org/content/dam/ets-org/pdfs/ppat/ppat-aaqep-alignment.pdf				The expectation is that students will score at least a 36 on the overall PPAT; however, the cut score of 36 is not consequential for licensure until Fall 2023.	This is an area for focused improvement. Because the cut score of 36 is not consequential until Fall 2023, this year we are focusing on improvement coursework alignment with PPAT vocabulary and communicating to students that they must score a 36 overall; if they do not, they will resubmit at least one step of one task for internal re-scoring by program faculty.

4. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

The main challenge over the past year has been incorporating the Praxis Pedagogical Assessment for Teachers into the programs as a requirement for licensure, but without a consequential cut score. All programs have worked to incorporate the competencies and vocabulary of the PPAT into their coursework.

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.

5. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard. Note that providers may focus their work on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

	Standard 1
Goals for the 2022-23 year	Increased focus on using data to inform instruction in EC/ELED and secondary education (1d). This is an area that programs are working to improve so that when the cut score for the PPAT becomes consequential, there will be a higher passing rate. Passing rate is higher for special education majors than for early childhood, elementary, and secondary education majors.
Actions	Increased focus on using data to inform instruction in SCED 5210: Learning Theory, Curriculum, and Assessment (secondary education) ELED 4150: Assessment and Differentiation Across the Curriculum (early childhood and elementary education) ELED 4040: Reading Assessment and Intervention (early childhood and elementary education) ELED 4062: Teaching Elementary School Mathematics II (early childhood and elementary education)
Expected outcomes	We expect a higher overall pass rate of 90% or higher.
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 2
Goals for the 2022-23 year	A project that will happen during 2022-23 is the revision of the student teaching instrument to align with a revised version of the Utah Effective Teaching Standards and the Utah model for teacher evaluation. The new model for teacher evaluation will incorporate heavy use of goal setting. The new student teaching evaluation instrument will likely also include a goal setting component (2e).
Actions	
Expected outcomes	

Reflections or comments	
	Standard 3
Goals for the 2022-23 year	<p>Elementary Education: Competency mapping for elementary education. 3a.</p> <p>Secondary Education: teaching majors/minors are being submitted (in a piecemeal fashion) for approval to USBE. 3a.</p> <p>Special Education: USHE (Utah System of Higher Education) mandated that all courses 3000 level or higher be taught in the junior and senior years. Special Education decided to take this one step further and re-evaluated all of their courses to make sure they still align to state and special education standards. They also evaluated if the courses were configured in a scaffolded manner. The department met with all major stakeholders to receive feedback on the proposed changes. The revised program will begin fall of 2023. The goal for the 2022-2023 year is to get these courses into the university system and to develop and revise the courses to align to current standards. 3a.</p>
Actions	<p>Elementary Education: Get clarity from USBE regarding elementary competencies and how we should document alignment of preparation program with the competencies.</p> <p>Secondary Education: Continue to submit secondary teaching majors and minors to USBE for approval as endorsement areas. Work with USBE to establish a protocol.</p> <p>Special Education: During the fall of 2022 the revised courses will go through the USU approval process. During the 2022-2023 school year, the faculty will develop the new courses and revised courses. One major change to the program will be the practicum for the mild/moderate emphasis. Currently the first field experience is English language arts (ELA) at the elementary level and the second field experience is math at the secondary level. In the revised program they will have a chance to teach both ELA and math at both levels. Some of the changes to practicum are currently being field tested. The faculty will evaluate the changes at the end of the semester using student, cooperating teacher, university supervisor and district feedback. The department is also working with the 2-year institutions to develop transfer guides.</p>
Expected outcomes	<p>Elementary Education: The USBE has indicated that they will have a streamlined document and a protocol for demonstrating alignment “soon.”</p> <p>Secondary Education: We will have all secondary majors and minors approved by USBE by August 2023.</p>

	Special Education: Moving the special education courses to the final 4 semesters will make transferring from 2-year institutions seamless. The revised program will better prepare special education teachers for the current workforce as measured by principal and district feedback.
Reflections or comments	The USBE does not have a structured process for program approval. We have been told by staff at USBE that USU is the only EPP working on program approval. The “old” programs in secondary education expire in Summer 2023.
	Standard 4
Goals for the 2022-23 year	USU continues to focus on increasing enrollment to meet the educator workforce needs of the state.
Actions	
Expected outcomes	
Reflections or comments	

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 (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted). Note that where a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

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.

- A major challenge in the coming years will be establishing alignment of early childhood and elementary education majors with USBE’s newly written Elementary Content Competencies for Educator Preparation Programs.

- Another major challenge is ensuring that our teacher candidates pass the PPAT and, if they don't pass, have a method for retaking the assessment with appropriate support, including a placement in which to complete the PPAT.
- Finally, the Pearson Foundations of Reading test will be influencing early childhood, elementary, and special education programs as the state moves to establish their focus on competency for teaching reading based on the "science of reading" as a requirement for licensure.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

- Performance assessment required for professional licensure recommendation. Cut score of 36 (for PPAT) will be consequential in August 2023.
- Pearson Foundations of Reading test required of all early childhood, elementary, and special education teacher candidates prior to recommendation for professional licensure. No cut score has been determined, but all must attempt.
- Competency based program requirements for elementary education and secondary education have been established by the state. Currently, the secondary majors at USU are being reviewed by USBE, one at a time, in order to establish program approval.
- The elementary program competencies will be phased in over the next few years. Currently, programs are approved as is.

10. Sign Off

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

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/19/22
---------------------	----------