

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10255	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	475
<b>Institution:</b>	Brigham Young University		
<b>Unit:</b>	Educator Preparation Program		

## Section 1. AIMS 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"/>

## 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure <sup>1</sup>	562
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.) <sup>2</sup>	61

**Total number of program completers** 623

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 2017-2018 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:** 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

The Brigham Young University Educator Preparation Program (BYU-EPP) has reviewed and improved their annual reporting over the past three years. Due to legacy requirements, Brigham Young University (BYU) made their annual reporting public by posting their reports on their website. No explanation or additional information was provided with the reports.

During 2017–2018, the BYU-EPP prepared for an Interim CAEP Advanced Programs Accreditation visit scheduled for December 2018. Through the accreditation process and in writing the Self-Study Report for their advanced programs, the BYU-EPP recognized that their display of annual reporting measures for both advanced and initial programs is not clearly or prominently displayed, immediately accessible (it took multiple clicks to access the information), or self-explanatory. As result of these findings, the BYU-EPP changed their reporting format for the 2017–2018 report to make their reports easier to read, interpret, and explain. These reports can be found in the Teacher Preparation Annual Reports file under Reports on the Documents tab of the BYU-EPP website.

In order to make Annual Reporting Measures more transparent, the BYU-EPP will add new sections to their website. There will be a section displaying the eight annual reporting measures for initial programs as well as a section reporting the six annual reporting measures for advanced programs. CAEP standards will be tagged for each of these measures.

As the BYU-EPP reviewed their annual reporting measures, they recognized that all data reported on the website was candidate data and did not include any completer data. During 2017–2018, the BYU-EPP piloted candidate, completer, and employer surveys. All ten higher education institutions in the state of Utah collaborated to create these surveys. The survey results from the pilot will be added to our Teacher Preparation 2018–2019 Annual Report.

The BYU-EPP and Utah Valley University (UVU) collaborated with partnership districts to design a reporting mechanism that demonstrates the impact of its completers on P–12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. This data will be added to future annual reports.

## 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.**

During 2017–2018, the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU-EPP) did not make as much progress on their plans to address the weaknesses cited in their AFI. The BYU-EPP, particularly the EPP office and the advanced programs, were highly focused on preparing an SSR and supporting evidence for an interim advanced programs review. Preparing for this interim review slowed the BYU-EPP's progress and shifted their attention. Though the BYU-EPP didn't make as much progress as they would've hoped, they continued to work on their AFI by focusing on two areas. The first was the ongoing effort to identify policies and procedures that need to be updated and/or created and the second was the continued improvement of their assessment and data systems, mYlink.

The EPP office, comprised of the BYU-EPP director, associate director, and EPP support team, has worked with the EPP executive committee, comprised of the AAVP, EPP director, Education dean, and Life Sciences associate dean; the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE), comprised of the EPP executive committee, the director of the Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES), and the seven EPP college associate deans; the BYU-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP) Governing Board, comprised of the Education dean, superintendents from the five BYU-PSP school districts, and director of CITES; and the Initial Programs Council, comprised of the EPP director, EPP associate director, 26 faculty representatives from the 20 initial teacher preparation programs, and the supervisor of the education advisement center and field services office to identify and update policies and procedures needed to maintain their QAS.

During the last year, the BYU-EPP addressed the following policy, procedural, and curriculum issues:

1. The Teacher Preparation Program (TPP), comprised of ECE, ELED, SCED, and SPED education majors, adopted a performance criterion of 80% on all EPP-wide assignments, assessments, and evaluations. (Standards 1,3,5)
2. To have parity across the TPP, the SCED 353: SCED Multicultural Education course was increased from 2-credits to 3-credits. In addition to establishing parity across programs, the EPP found from a multiyear study of their clinical experience assessments data (UPTOP and BYU TWS) that candidates are scoring lowest on items measuring candidate knowledge and skills working with diverse populations. These findings informed the need to increase the SCED 353 credit hours. (Standards 1, 3)
3. The TPP started the work to adopt a disposition assessment and develop a clinical educator assessment. This work has been guided by the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created Assessments. (Standards 2, 3)
4. The BYU-EPP has not had a comprehensive recruitment effort. Starting with the 2017–2018 academic year, the EPP office formed a recruitment and retention committee and held four EPP-wide recruitment and retention events. These events represent the first efforts of the EPP to develop an EPP-wide recruitment and retention plan. (Standard 3)
5. The BYU-EPP enjoys a 30 plus year public school partnership with the five surrounding school districts. In recent years, clinical placements have expanded beyond the five partnership districts. UCOTE and the BYU-PSP Governing Board spent several months reviewing the issue and supporting data in an attempt to develop a policy that restricted clinical placements to the BYU-PSP. After reviewing the data and considering the needs of all BYU-EPP programs the policy was tabled.
6. Approximately 10 years ago, the BYU-EPP established four education without licensure majors (ECE, ELED, SCED, SPED) for candidates that needed to be counseled out of a program or that failed student teaching. Over time, these majors were being abused, and more than 20 candidates a semester were applying for the education without licensure majors to avoid student teaching or to graduate early. UCOTE discussed the majors and tightened up the criteria for using the majors. The council decided that the majors are only for candidates that attempt student teaching and fail. (Standards 2, 3, 5)
7. The BYU-EPP is led by the EPP Executive Committee, which was comprised of an AAVP, EPP director, and Education dean. Over half of the BYU-EPP lies outside of the school of education, so the executive committee was expanded to include an associate dean from one of the other six EPP colleges that house the secondary education programs. (Standard 5)

The BYU-EPP has been developing its own in-house assessment and data system called mYlink. The EPP office believes that the ongoing development of mYlink will provide the BYU-EPP with a system that will put in place mechanisms to ensure that all admissions, assessments, and student application data are collected and reported. During this last year, the BYU-EPP and university's Office of Information Technology (OIT) worked together to maintain and enhance mYlink. OIT and the EPP office have determined the old mYlink system is outdated, thus an annual resource planning request was made to secure additional funds to build a new version of mYlink. The new system will be more user friendly and allow the better use of data to inform decision making and continuous improvement of programs. The new mYlink system will support the efforts started the previous year to improve data collection "across measures and across program options." In 2016, the EPP office developed weekly assessment and data reports that informed programs on what assessments have or have not been completed. This initiative has been very successful as is evident in that 100% of the 2016–2018 assessment data were collected or accounted for. It is anticipated that the new mYlink 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?

Brigham Young University (BYU) and the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU-EPP) require faculty members and administrators to complete an annual Closing the Loop report. During this process, the BYU-EPP gathers feedback from various stakeholder groups (candidates, completers, faculty, staff, mentor teachers, partnership schools, and districts [BYU-PSP]). Each program reviews their learning outcomes and corresponding assessments, and they analyze data from various reports and standards (EPP annual report, Utah State Board of Education [USBE] annual report, Utah Effective Teaching Standards [UETS], CAEP Standards, and program specific national standards) to identify areas of strength and weakness. Based on feedback, reviews, and analysis, programs set yearly targets and goals with procedures in place to achieve those goals.

The following examples show the changes, innovations, and goals that were implemented at BYU as a result of the above process during 2017–18:

- Early Childhood Education implemented the following changes:
  1. Improved teacher candidates' understanding of how to more effectively implement developmentally appropriate practices by adding a practice component to the early childhood lesson plan design. Students purposefully planned ways to attend to NAEYC's 12 Guiding Principles of Developmentally Appropriate Practice.
  2. Continued to work to improve teacher candidates' understanding of learner differences by helping students make connections between their multicultural and educational psychology courses and their lesson planning. In addition, a more detailed accommodations section was added to the ECE lesson plan design.
  3. Improved teacher candidates' ability to implement lessons incorporating the integration of cross-disciplinary skills by working with ECE methods instructors and clinical faculty to construct a common vocabulary related integration and by adding an assignment that provides opportunities for teacher candidates to practice writing and implementing cross-disciplinary integration lesson plans.
- In accordance with BYU and BYU-EPP expectations, Dance Education (DE) documents and assesses Program Learning Outcomes via an alignment table. At the BYU-EPP level, DE is involved with the Initial Programs Council (IPC). The IPC works together to ensure CAEP Standards are met. DE continually refines curriculum, sequencing, and content. DE has focused on multicultural education and diversity and implemented a required one-credit elective dance class of underrepresented cultures and people. DE is committed to student and mentor teacher recruitment and retention. In reviewing CAEP Standards, DE has increased efforts in recruitment and retention by increasing allocated Experiential Learning Funds for Dance Education K–12 major retainment and offering mentor teachers free admission to BYU events.
- Based on feedback from various stakeholders, Elementary Education (ELED) made the following changes:
  1. Received feedback on the program from student representatives, which made ELED aware of some unplanned redundancy in

the program. Students noted that it is difficult to take additional courses during practicum semesters since students are required to be in the classroom six hours per day for four full weeks. Generally, ELED students do very well on their evaluations, and the BYU-PSP repeatedly provides feedback on their satisfaction with ELED teachers.

Currently, there are fewer students choosing to major in ELED. The ELED major requires more credit hours than most of the other majors on campus. Based on feedback from candidates, completers, and the BYU-PSP, ELED created a committee to explore ways of improving the ELED program and making it more appealing with the following goals:

- Maintain (or improve) the quality of the program;
- Reduce credit hours;
- Improve connections between theory and practice;
- Provide students with more flexibility and choice;
- Make the five BYU-PSP Commitments explicit across the program; and
- Increase the number of interns (which will help finance the facilitators in the schools).

The eight-member ELED advisory committee began by studying and discussing articles about field experiences. The committee met twice a month and discussed the characteristics of good field experiences. During this time, the committee and other faculty members gathered data about what would be considered an ideal field experience for students, and they shared their ideas at a Clinical Fellows Symposium sponsored by the Association of Teacher Educators and the National Association for Professional Development Schools. Clinical Fellows from other universities gave feedback on ELED's proposed changes to their practicum.

ELED carefully analyzed program coursework and made recommendations that would result in 12 fewer credits. ELED currently has the support of the faculty, the BYU-PSP Governing Board, and ELED advisory committee to make the recommended course changes. After gaining support from the BYU-PSP for proposed course changes, ELED will work to change the program requirements and university catalog.

- Technology and Engineering Studies implemented the following innovations:

Beginning fall semester 2017, the Technology and Engineering Education (TEE) program became Technology and Engineering Studies (TES). The TEE program was restructured to include two degrees: TES Teaching and TES Technical. In the new TES program, the teaching emphasis continues to prepare students to receive secondary education teaching licensure from USBE. The new technical emphasis prepares students for employment in technology and engineering related fields outside of education. There were three primary reasons for making the change:

1. One of the best recruitment strategies for the TEE program was to recruit students from BYU technology, engineering, or computer science programs who were either dissatisfied with their current major, had not been accepted into the major, or who had an innate desire to teach. These students typically came to TEE with an excellent background in math, science, and technical content, and many had a good aptitude for teaching. Unfortunately, because of the difficult courses (calculus, advanced physics, statistics, thermal dynamics, etc.) required in these majors, students often had GPAs that ranged from 2.5 to 3.0. When Utah State Board of Education decided in 2014 to only allow students with a 3.0 or higher GPA to enter teacher education programs, the unintended consequences of this decision was to not only eliminate a good source of TEE majors but to also eliminate many students with a technical background as potential graduates to teach the STEM subjects that schools are desperately seeking.
2. Periodically, there were students within the TEE program that had great technical skills and good academic abilities but for various reasons (emotional, physical, etc.) were not good candidates to become classroom teachers. The new TES major allows students with technical and engineering backgrounds to transfer their technical coursework into the technical emphasis component of the TES major and continue toward graduation without having to start a new degree program. Additionally, students that have a desire to obtain teacher licensure, but who do not initially meet the current 3.0 GPA requirement, can enter the TES program, and once their GPA meets the 3.0 requirement, transfer into the teaching emphasis of the TES major and work toward teacher licensure. Students wanting to enter the TES teaching emphasis with a GPA below 3.0 are required to take TES core and depth classes until their GPA meets the 3.0 requirement, at which point they can enter the Teaching emphasis.
3. It was anticipated that the dual emphasis system of the new TES major would allow us to recruit from a broader range of students (Technical and Teaching) and thus increase the overall student enrollment in our program.

In an effort to give all TES students some experience in a classroom setting, students seeking a teaching or a technical emphasis are all required to take TES 276, which is the standard gateway course for students to enter the TES Teaching path. If students do not demonstrate an aptitude for or interest in teaching, they are advised to pursue the technical emphasis of the TES major.

## Results

After one academic year, it appears the change from TEE to TES will accomplish the program's desired goals. However, it will probably take two or three additional years before there is sufficient data to assess the effectiveness and impact of the change. This will be measured by analyzing student performance in TES core classes, TES teaching pedagogy classes, and student enrollment in the TES Teaching emphasis.

To track progress and results, all teacher candidates are evaluated on multiple common assessments established by the EPP. These assessments include evaluations of academic performance, teacher dispositions, technology skills, and clinical practice. All of these assessments are tied to program goals, CAEP standards, and UETS. The following are EPP-wide assessments:

1. Utah Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment & Evaluation System (PAES)
2. Renaissance Teacher Work Sample (RTWS)
3. PRAXIS Content Assessment
4. Technology Skills Assessment (TSA)
5. UT Teacher Education Student Survey (UTESS)
6. UT Teacher Education Employer Survey (UTEES)



## 7. Program GPA

Data for these assessments is collected in mYlink, which facilitates the creation, sharing, saving, and storing of information, assignments, assessments, and other artifacts to be used as evidence of candidate and completer performance. These assessments were in alignment with TEACC requirements but do not meet the CAEP Sufficiency level. We will be establishing validity and reliability on all EPP-created assessments by 2021.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards  
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge  
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships  
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences  
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool  
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability  
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress  
4.3 Employer satisfaction  
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used  
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation  
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation  
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences  
x.1 Diversity  
x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Terri Summers

Position: Associate EPP Director

Phone: 801-422-0115

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 completion 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**