

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10255	AACTE SID:	475
Institution:	Brigham Young University		
Unit:	Educator Preparation Program		

Section 1. EPP Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

424

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

36

Total number of program completers 460

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <http://epp.byu.edu/reports.php>

Description of data accessible via link:

CAEP Accreditation Documents, TEAC Accreditation Documents, TEAC/CAEP Annual Reports, BYU EPP Teacher Preparation Annual Reports, School Leadership Annual Reports, USBE Annual Reports, Title II Reports

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Brigham Young University continues to review and improve its annual reporting system. The feedback from both the 2018 and 2019 CAEP Annual Reports stated that the display of data for the CAEP Annual Reporting measures is not an example of best practice. The data is available on the website, but it takes multiple clicks to get to the information, and the reports are "not clearly or prominently displayed or accessible immediately." Also, the 2018 feedback report indicated that though the measures are displayed, they are not tagged to CAEP Standards.

In response to this feedback, the BYU-EPP is again in the process of re-designing the EPP website. The website is now designed so that the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures has its own tab. As the EPP prepares for its 2021 site visit, it will gather documentation and evidence to support the standards and will include that evidence under this tab. Previous reports which contain evidence of the annual reporting measures will continue to be available on the website. These reports can be found under the tabs labeled: CAEP Annual Reports, USBE Annual Reports, EPP Continuous Improvement Reports, CAEP Accreditation, and TEAC Accreditation.

Several of the programs at BYU are reporting a slight decrease in acceptance and retention of candidates entering education

programs. As a result of this trend, individual programs are focusing more on recruitment and retention strategies, as well as participating in EPP-wide recruitment and retention events. This trend is similar to a number of state schools in Utah. BYU's enrollment cohorts as a private institution and its susceptibility to the variances in students serving religious missions make this trend harder to anticipate at BYU. As a result, the EPP will continue to work on improving and implementing strong recruiting and retention strategies.

The School Leadership program, with input and encouragement from the BYU-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP) governing board, decided to discontinue the Leadership Preparation Program (LPP) as a result of low enrollment. The LPP track was one of three tracks in the School Leadership program that led to licensure as a school administrator. The LPP was a full-time, 18-month program. Candidates were opting to enroll in the other two tracks which were part-time and allowed the candidate to continue working while completing the necessary requirements to be licensed. The School Leadership program was engaged in a redesign of its program during the 2019-2020 academic year.

Analysis of each of the annual reporting measures, at both the advanced and initial levels, are documented in the following reports: CAEP Annual Reports, USBE Annual Reports, EPP Continuous Improvement Reports, and the 2018 Advanced Program CAEP Accreditation Documents. Benchmark data is also provided in these reports. The reports are presented in both EPP-wide and program-specific formats. These reports are widely shared with various stakeholders through the EPP website, with partners at Partnership Advisory Councils, with the Deans in the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE), and with faculty and staff through the Initial Programs Council (IPC) and the Advanced Programs Council (APC).

Programs frequently review their data informally as well as formally. All programs have a formal yearly or bi-yearly day where faculty review and discuss program data looking for trends and areas of improvement.

Following is an example of the adjustments one program made as a result of formal and informal analysis of data. Based both on the reports mentioned above and informal measures, the Spanish program recognized the need to improve candidates' ability in three areas 1) assessing learning, 2) differentiating instruction, and 3) managing the classroom. These are all skills that tend to be difficult to learn if they are not contextualized in actual classroom practice.

A major initiative to help candidates improve in these three areas was the creation of a partnership with a local secondary school. As part of one of the teaching methods courses in the major, a professor from the Spanish faculty and students in the Spanish program teach several sections of Spanish at this local school. Spanish majors each plan lessons and teach multiple times in this classroom throughout the semester. Doing so allows them to gain valuable first-hand experience and receive more meaningful feedback from the Spanish faculty. This project also provides context and experience for the Spanish faculty in understanding public school classrooms, bridging the university-public school divide.

The Spanish program also administers a program-specific survey to teacher candidates and mentor teachers at the conclusion of each semester. It is designed to help the Spanish program identify program and teacher candidate strengths and weaknesses, as well as potential innovations and collaborations that might strengthen candidate impact.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

TEAC: Weakness

2.3 Influential quality control system

There is unevenness in documentation and missing data across measures and across program options.

In response to TEAC Weakness 2.3, the Brigham Young University Educator Preparation Program (BYU-EPP) abandoned LiveText and began developing its own in-house assessment and data system called mYlink. The EPP office believed that the development of mYlink would provide the BYU-EPP with a system that would put in place mechanisms to ensure that all admissions, assessments, and student application data were collected and reported.

The mYlink system was first developed in the McKay School of Education by their Data/Website Development team. In 2016, it was determined the mYlink project had outgrown the capability of the McKay School team. In January of 2017, mYlink was moved under the direction of the university's Office of Information Technology (OIT). OIT and the EPP office then worked together to maintain and enhance the mYlink system.

In January 2018, OIT and the EPP office determined the old mYlink system to be outdated and bug-ridden. An annual resource planning request was made to secure additional funds to build a new version of mYlink. The new system is to be more user-friendly, have fewer bugs, and allow for better use of data to inform decision-making and continuous improvement of programs. It will support the effort to improve data collection across measures and across program options.

In June 2019, OIT and the EPP Associate Director participated in a three-day Mendix Project Enablement training, where they worked in cooperation with the Mendix team to learn the Mendix platform and begin the redesign of mYlink. It was determined that the new project would be called the Educator system. Meetings were scheduled at least once or twice a week with additional meetings during the week as needed. Service Now Agile was used to create stories and plan the work to be done in 2-week sprints.

A timeline was established for the building, implementation, and launch of Educator:

- 1) Identify the components of the Educator system and create stories.
- 2) Work with the OIT User Experience Team (UX) to design the screens. Base UX design of screens on user feedback from various stakeholders across campus and across partnership districts.
- 3) Every other week attend Sprint review, retrospective, Sprint planning, and backlog meetings, which include OIT, the EPP Office, and the director of the Education Advisement Office (EAC). Attend other design meetings as needed.
- 4) Design and build out Transition 0 (Account), which includes the landing page and user ability to create an Educator account by October 2019. Design User guides for training.
- 5) Design and build out Transition 1 (Admissions). Candidates will apply to an education major or minor in this transition. It includes candidate personal information and EPP required tasks. Programs will have the option to add program-specific tasks as well. The student side of admissions is to be operational on December 16, 2019. The faculty and staff side of admissions, where the Program Coordinator approves and accepts students that meet CAEP, USEBE, and BYU-EPP admissions requirements into the program, is to be operational mid-May of 2020. Design User guides for training.
- 6) Design and build out Transition 2 (Pre-Clinical). EPP-required assessments for practicum experiences will be completed, scored, and collected. Praxis scores, fingerprinting and background clearance, and career placement activities will be stored. Students will apply for student teaching or internships in this transition. It is to be operational by the end of June 2020. Design User guides for training.
- 7) Design and build out Transition 3 (Clinical). Program Coordinator and BYU Field Services will approve and accept students into student teaching or internships. They will work to co-construct candidate field placements with partnership districts and to assign mentor teachers. EPP-required assessments for final clinical experiences will be completed, scored, and collected. Transition 3 is to be operational by the end of July 2020. Design User guides for training.
- 8) Design and build out Transition 4 (Alumni). Employer and Candidate Satisfaction Surveys will be sent out, collected, and stored. District student impact data and teacher effectiveness will be stored here as well. Transition 4 is to be operational by the end of August 2020. Design User guides for training.
- 9) Build out Advanced Programs in Mendix following a similar pattern as listed above, to be operational by December 31, 2020. Design User guides for training.

In 2016, the EPP office developed weekly assessment and data reports (Completion Accounting) that informed programs which assessments have or have not been completed by individual students. This initiative has been very successful; 100% of the 2016–2019 assessment data has been collected or accounted for. It is anticipated that the Educator system will continue this trend and provide real-time, enhanced reports to programs.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

A validity study was conducted by Brigham Young University (BYU) in cooperation with other universities across the state. On June 12-13, 2019, the Utah Teacher Education, Assessment, and Accreditation Council (UTEAAC) organized the 2019 Utah Assessment & Accountability Summit which was sponsored by Brigham Young University. The summit consisted of teachers, principals, district administrators, university faculty and administrators, and Utah State Board of Education (USB) representatives. Alpine School District, Jordan School District, Provo City School District, Nebo School District, Wasatch School District, Utah State University, University of Utah, Southern Utah University, Weber State University, Westminster College, Utah Valley University, Brigham Young University, and USB were in attendance for a total of 82 expert participants across the two day the summit.

The objectives of the summit were to:

- Establish content validity for three UTEAAC developed assessments:
 - ☐ Utah Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment & Evaluation System (PAES)
 - ☐ Utah Teacher Education Student Survey (UTESS)
 - ☐ Utah Teacher Education Employer Survey (UTEES)
- Revise UTEAAC developed assessments
- Share best practices in assessment and accountability

At the summit, the Lawshe method was used to establish content validity on each of the above assessments. A PowerPoint was presented to educate participants on the Lawshe method, how the process would be conducted, and how validity would be determined

Participants were asked when responding to each item of the evaluation, to consider what they felt a typical graduate of their program or a first-year teacher in their school district needed to know and to mark the item using the following ratings:

Is the skill (or knowledge) measured by this item

§ Essential

§ Useful but not essential, or

§ Not necessary

to the performance of the job?

Each assessment was presented separately. Participants individually scored the items electronically.

When participants had completed scoring the assessment, small group discussion occurred. Small groups were asked to consider what constructs from the content universe or domain were missing from the PAES/UTESS/UTEES. Using their knowledge and experience as a subject matter expert, the Utah Effective Teaching Standards, a copy of the assessments, and the PAES rubric they discussed and recorded the constructs that may need to be added to the PAES/UTESS/UTEES. Participants were given a T chart to fill in as they went through each item of the assessments. They were asked to list on the T chart any missing constructs and the rationale.

Survey results showing the CVR & CVI (see the attached document), were presented to the whole group and a discussion concerning making changes to the assessment ensued. Items of discussion were voted on as to whether or not the item should be retained, rejected, or revised. Items 6.2, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, 9.1 contained in the PAES assessment were discussed and voted on. All items were retained with revisions. UTESS/UTEES items 3, 4, 7, 16, 17, 21, 23 were revised and items 18 and 27 were unanimously voted to keep as is.

The following practices were continued or adopted based on the groups input:

- Keep the alignment of the PAES with the USB guidelines for Inservice teacher evaluation
- Change the passing score to an overall score of 80% of all components of the PAES instead of requiring 80% in each of the three sections - The Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility
- Require an 80% performance level with no zeros and yeses on 10.1 and 10.2 for the summative final clinical experience
- Keep the in-service effective level on the rubric but do not allow it to be marked
- Require a minimum of 4 formative evaluations with written feedback

Based on the outcomes of the summit, Brigham Young University was able to obtain content validity on all EPP created assessments at the initial level. The Lawshe method will be used to obtain validity on the advanced level program EPP created assessments during the 2019-2020 academic year.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.



UTEAAC_Lawshe_Experience_ResultsCVR__CVI_Calcs.xlsx

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.

☒ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Terri Summers

Position: Associate Director

Phone: 801-419-2187

E-mail: terri_summers@byu.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses,

and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

 **Acknowledge**