2017 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10255	**AACTE SID:**	475
Institution:	Brigham Young University		
EPP:	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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

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 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure	933
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.)	0
Total number of program completers	933

*****2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.*

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.
Clinical Experience Evaluations, Teacher Work Sample Scores, GPA, and Praxis Content Test Scores:
http://epp.byu.edu/reports.php

Section 6. 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.

Weakness 2.3 Influential quality control system

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

To address our AFI from our last accreditation visit, the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU EPP) went through a reorganization process and hired a director and associate director to lead the seven colleges that prepare educators at BYU. The BYU EPP directorate has worked with the EPP executive committee, the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE), and the Initial Programs Council (IPC), to identify policies and procedures that need to be updated and/or made more explicit. During the last year, UCOTE and IPC addressed such policy, procedural, and curriculum issues as the EPP professional core, formation of the data systems council, student teaching in the minor, technology instruction, multicultural education instruction, fingerprint and background checks for clinical evaluators, maintenance of EPP course syllabi, performance criteria on the UPTOP, Utah Teacher Education Student Survey (UTESS), aligning the BYU TWS with CAEP requirements, assessment due dates, and minor student teaching supervision. Working together, these councils are making our policies and procedures more transparent and visible to our faculty, staff, and students. To specifically address the "unevenness in documentation," the EPP directorate has undertaken the development of an EPP handbook to make policies and procedures more explicit across the unit. They have also begun work on an EPP website to provide greater access and transparency to policies and procedures. The EPP office has hired a 20 hour a week student web developer, to help make the new website a reality. The handbook and website will address the unevenness in documentation across the EPP since there will be a single source of information. To improve data collection "across measures and across program options," the EPP directorate has developed weekly assessment and data reports managed and distributed by the EPP support team. The impact of this report is evident in that 100% of the spring 2016 and fall 2016 assessment data were collected or accounted for. This makes three semesters in a row, in which all data was collected or accounted for. This is a marked improvement. Prior to the weekly report, the EPP typically collected between 85-95% of a given semester's data. The BYU EPP has been developing its own in-house assessment and data system called mYlink. The EPP directorate 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, BYU central administration has acknowledged the importance of the mYlink system to the success of the EPP. The academic vice president and university CIO have moved the development and maintenance of the mYlink system out of the McKay School of Education and into the university's central Office of Information Technology (OIT). In doing so, the vice president and CIO have committed the funds and resources necessary for the mYlink system to be on par with other university enterprise solutions. This means that the mYlink system now has two full-time engineers, a product manager, and a team of five student developers dedicated to its success along with OIT's customer support services comprised of four full-time managers and 90 student analysts that provide 24/7 customer support. Prior to this investment by central administration, the mYlink system was being maintained and developed by half a full-time engineer and a team of three student developers. This is a huge investment by our central administration to help address our AFI.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Inquiry Brief. *Update Appendix E to confirm the categories of evidence the faculty members rely on and have available to support their claims that candidates know their subjects, know pedagogy, and can teach in an effective and caring manner. The update should also note any new categories of evidence the faculty plans to collect.*

A. Items under each category of Appendix E are examples. Programs may have more or different evidence.

Type of Evidence	Available and in the Brief [1]		Not available and not in the Brief		Reason
	Relied on	Not Relied on	For future use	Not for future use	for your selection
Grades					
Candidate grades and grade point averages	◉	○	○	○	Total GPA at admissions, student teaching application, and graduation
Scores on standardized tests					
Candidate scores on standardized license or board examinations	◉	○	○	○	PRAXIS II showing content knowledge.

Candidate scores on undergraduate and/or graduate admission tests of subject matter knowledge and aptitude

ACT, SAT, and/or Praxis CORE are evaluated at time of admissions.

Standardized scores and gains of the completers' own students

Value added studies indicate that it is almost impossible to attribute student learning to one teacher in one year. There are too many variables that influence student test scores.

Ratings

Ratings of portfolios of academic and clinical accomplishments

Teacher Work Sample (TWS) that is aligned with the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS).

Third-party rating of program's students

Candidates are evaluated using the CPAS by a mentor teacher or school facilitator who is an employee of the school district in which they have their student teaching or internship experience.

Ratings of in-service, clinical, and PDS teaching

Employer Survey – collected every 3 years

Ratings, by cooperating teacher and college / university supervisors, of practice teachers' work samples

Teacher Work Sample (TWS) that is aligned with the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS).

Rates

Rates of completion of courses and program

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Completers' career retention rates

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Completers' job placement rates

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Rates of completers' professional advanced study

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Rates of completers' leadership roles

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Rates of graduates' professional service activities

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Case studies and alumni competence

Evaluations of completers by their own pupils

We do not currently have plans to track this.

Completer self-assessment of their accomplishments

We do not currently have plans to track this

Third-party professional recognition of completers (e.g., NBPTS)

We do not currently have plans to track this

Employers' evaluations of the program's completers

Employer Survey – collected every 3 years

Completers' authoring of textbooks, curriculum materials, etc.

This is extremely difficult to track. We do not currently have plans to track this.

Case studies of completers' own students' learning and accomplishment

We do not currently have plans to track this

[1]: Assessment results related to TEAC *Quality Principle I* that the program faculty uses elsewhere must be included in the *Brief*. Evidence that is reported to the institution or state licensing authorities, or alluded to in publications, Web sites, catalogs, and the like must be included in the *Brief*. Therefore, Title II results, grades (if they are used for graduation, transfer, and admission), admission test results (if they are used), and hiring rates (if they are reported elsewhere) would all be included in the *Brief*.

B. Provide an update of the program's data spreadsheet(s) or data tables related to the program's claims.

2015-2016 Annual Report.xlsx

2015-2016 Annual Report.pdf

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 2017 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, going forward 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 derided from accreditation documents.

2017 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10255	**AACTE SID:**	475
Institution:	Brigham Young University		
EPP:	School Leadership 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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

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 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure	0
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.)	31
Total number of program completers	31

*****2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.*

No, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is not currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.
2014-2016 completer data, including Admissions data, Administrative Praxis scores & Recommendation for Admin Licensure: http://education.byu.edu/edlf/school_leadership_program/vision_and_mission.html

Section 6. 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.

Weakness 2.1 Rationale for assessments

The program's assessment system is not yet fully developed.

1. Development of Program Assessment System The program assessment system had two challenges. First, the local assessments and rubrics were not fully developed and, second, no plan existed for evaluating the validity and reliability of local assessments. A. Development of Local Assessments & Rubrics: We adjusted the program learning outcomes and assessments to align with CAEP standards (transitioning from TEAC) and the Utah Educational Leadership Standards (which are based on ISLLC 2008). We identified the local assessments that needed revision or development. We are transitioning away from a previous assessment (SLATE) and have instead selected seven key program assessments to more efficiently administer assessments and collect the data. We are clarifying the annual timelines for assessments and data gathering. We meet at least twice a year with our School Leadership Advisory Council, consisting of school leaders (both district representatives, acting principals and alumni) and current students, and seek and use their feedback in the development and revision of local assessments. We have also developed an Excel-based data management system for student and program assessment data. We are now adjusting our local assessments to align with the 2015 ISLLC standards and ELCC program review. We have developed, piloted and are using a Dispositions Survey (CAEP #1, #3). We are developing and revising local assessments and rubrics based on stakeholder and faculty feedback. This past year, we have revised the several local assessment, including: admission campus screening, internship activity reflection papers, mentor principal evaluations. We are currently working to revise the Internship Leadership Project and align the mentor principal evaluations and the principal recommendations with the dispositions survey. We are working with the Utah Valley University and partnership districts across the Wasatch Front to collect state data on principal effectiveness. In addition, we have been evaluating several data management software strategies for cost and functionality. B. Validity Plan: We are evaluating the rubrics for our proposed key assessments, based on the CAEP Rubric for Rubrics, refining, redesigning, and piloting them as needed. We have piloted both the Disposition Survey and an ISLLC-based survey, conducted a validity analyses using EFA and reliability (alphas) and revised to improve their validity. In addition, our EPP directors attended the 2016 Fall CAEPCon, and will be attending 2017 Spring CAEPCon, and attended sessions on validity and reliability of assessments.

Weakness 2.3 Influential quality control system

The Executive School Leadership Program (part time) track appears to lack parity with the Leadership Preparation Program (full time) track.

2. Program Track Parity Challenge: Ensure and clearly communicate program track parity We continue to provide parity across all tracks in all required program components as all academic and internship requirements are the same. Students in both tracks receive the same academic mentoring and the same internship supervision in the field. Our placement data is indicating equitable placement outcomes across all tracks. All tracks require an administrative internship that meets the state-required 450 hours. We provide all students (all tracks) the option of pursuing more than the required 450 internship hours. For example, they may choose the option of an extensive internship (LPP internship--not required) which can provide additional hours of internship. Students make their own decisions regarding the number of additional internship hours to pursue depending on what their schedules and situations allow. Students cannot be teaching full time if they choose to pursue an extensive internship. Students who pursue the option for an extensive internship will have additional internship experience, similar to student teachers who opt for a full-year student internship over student teaching. In addition, we have combined the admissions campus screening, program orientation, opening social, mentor training for all tracks. In addition, we have two closing socials per year (based on graduation date rather than track).

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Inquiry Brief. *Update Appendix E to confirm the categories of evidence the faculty members rely on and have available to support their claims that candidates know their subjects, know pedagogy, and can teach in an effective and caring manner. The update should also note any new categories of evidence the faculty plans to collect.*

A. Items under each category of Appendix E are examples. Programs may have more or different evidence.

Type of Evidence	Available and in the Brief [1]		Not available and not in the Brief		Reason
	Relied on	Not Relied on	For future use	Not for future use	for your selection
Grades					

Candidate grades and grade point averages

Entry GPA (CAEP A1); Exit GPA (CAEP A3); Course assignment grades inform SLATE (CAEP A1)

Scores on standardized tests

Candidate scores on standardized license or board examinations

Admin Praxis (CAEP A3)

Candidate scores on undergraduate and/or graduate admission tests of subject matter knowledge and aptitude

Grad exams (i.e. GRE, MAT, GMAT, LSAT) (CAEP A3)

Standardized scores and gains of the completers' own students

School leaders do not have their own classroom. These data are not applicable to the program.

Ratings

Ratings of portfolios of academic and clinical accomplishments

Admin. Internship (CAEP 2A): Internship Leadership Project (ILP) Score, Comps Reflection Paper, SLATE Report, Graduate Student Evaluations, Admin Licensure Recommendation , Pre-Post ISLLC Survey

Third-party rating of program's students

Admission (CAEP 3A): Principal Recommendation, Campus Screening, Leadership Experience, Years Teaching & BYU Badges (background check)

Ratings of in-service, clinical, and PDS teaching

Internship Activity Reflections (9) (CAEP A1, A2, A3)

Ratings, by cooperating teacher and college / university supervisors, of practice teachers' work samples

Mentor Principal Evaluations (CAEP A1, A2)

Rates

Rates of completion of courses and program

All students in the 2017 annual report have completed all courses and graduated; low variation; not used

Completers' career retention rates

All students in the 2017 annual report graduated 2015- 2016; too early for this rate

Completers' job placement rates

We evaluate job placement at 3rd year. (CAEP A3). All students in the 2017 annual report only graduated 2015- 2016; too early for this rate

Rates of completers' professional advanced study

Not applicable

Rates of completers' leadership roles

We are designing data collection for first year job placement positions (CAEP A3)

Rates of graduates' professional service activities

Not tracking this data

Case studies and alumni competence

Evaluations of completers by their own pupils	○	○	○	◉	Not applicable
Completer self-assessment of their accomplishments	○	○	◉	○	Piloting Dispositions survey (CAEP A3)
Third-party professional recognition of completers (e.g., NBPTS)	○	○	○	◉	Not tracking this data
Employers' evaluations of the program's completers	○	○	◉	○	We are working with the Utah Valley University and partnership districts across the Wasatch Front to collect state data on principal effectiveness. (CAEP A4)
Completers' authoring of textbooks, curriculum materials, etc.	○	○	○	◉	Not tracking this data
Case studies of completers' own students' learning and accomplishment	○	○	○	◉	Not tracking this data

[1]: Assessment results related to TEAC *Quality Principle I* that the program faculty uses elsewhere must be included in the *Brief*. Evidence that is reported to the institution or state licensing authorities, or alluded to in publications, Web sites, catalogs, and the like must be included in the *Brief*. Therefore, Title II results, grades (if they are used for graduation, transfer, and admission), admission test results (if they are used), and hiring rates (if they are reported elsewhere) would all be included in the *Brief*.

B. Provide an update of the program's data spreadsheet(s) or data tables related to the program's claims.

2017 SL Candidate Data

2017 SL Data Tables

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 2017 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Julie Hite

Position: School Leadership Accreditation Coordinator

Phone: 801-422-5039

E-mail: jullie_hite@byu.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward 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 derided from accreditation documents.