



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2022

Provider/Program Name:	Houghton University Teacher Education Program
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	June 30, 2028

### **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.

The Houghton University Teacher Education Program (HUTEP) is rooted in the conviction that education at every level must not only inform the mind, but also enrich the spirit and develop the character of all who participate. The HUTEP further believes that, to serve effectively as teaching in the changing world of the 21st century, our graduates must enter the profession solidly prepared in academic content, intellectual abilities, and pedagogical knowledge. Additionally, graduates must demonstrate personal responsibility and professional dispositions that will ensure a positive educational experience for all learners. Since no amount of preparation can anticipate all teaching contexts or subsequent developments in the field, our graduates must also be ready to continue learning as they teach. The mission of HUTEP, derived from these convictions, is to equip teachers for transformative learning and service.

There are four undergraduate strands for teacher preparation at Houghton: Adolescence Education, Inclusive Adolescence Education, Inclusive Childhood Education, and Music Education. There are regular and diverse clinical field experiences across all strands of the undergraduate programs. While most of these experiences occur in rural schools, all candidates have a two-week intensive experience where they are immersed in inner city Buffalo Schools for the EDUC 240: Teaching in Urban America course. In addition to the four undergraduate strands, the HUTEF offers a Master’s program in literacy. Paralleling our undergraduate program, the M.S.Ed. - Literacy program seeks to equip certified K-12 educators to foster positive literacy-rich experiences with diverse backgrounds and abilities. The program leads to an additional professional certification as a literacy specialist. The HUTEF is composed of all members of the education department and led by the chair of the education department which meets weekly to make program policy decisions.

All candidates complete practica/clinical experiences and student teaching/internships and complete a senior or graduate level portfolio. Annually, the HUTEF graduates approximately 30 graduates per year and completers are highly sought after by local and state school districts.

**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://www.houghton.edu/about/accreditation/>

**2. 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**

<b>Degree or Certificate</b> granted by the institution or organization	<b>State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b> enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/2022)	<b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/2022)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			

<i>Bachelor of Arts- Adolescence Education (ADE)</i>	<i>Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 7-12)</i>	1	1
	<i>Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 7-12)</i>	0	0
	<i>Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)</i>	7	1
	<i>Initial Certification: Math (Grades 7-12)</i>	7	2
	<i>Initial Certification: Physics (Grades 7-12)</i>	0	0
	<i>Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 7-12)</i>	15	4
<i>Bachelor of Arts- Inclusive Adolescence Education (IADE)</i>	<i>Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>	2	0
	<i>Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>	0	0
	<i>Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>	5	1
	<i>Initial Certification: Math (Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>	0	0
	<i>Initial Certification: Physics (Grades 7-12)</i>	0	0

	<i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>		
	<i>Initial Certification: SwD Generalist (Grades 7-12)</i>	1	0
<i>Bachelor of Science- Inclusive Childhood Education (ICE)</i>	<i>Initial Certification: Childhood Education (Grades 1-6)</i> <i>Initial Certification: SwD (Grades 1-6)</i>	66	14
<i>Bachelor of Music- Music Education (MED)</i>	<i>Initial Certification: Music (Grades PK-12)</i>	14	5
<i>Master of Science in Education- Literacy (MSED - Literacy)</i>	<i>Initial Certification: Literacy (Birth-Grade 6)</i> <i>Professional Certification: Literacy (Birth-Grade 6)</i>	5	1
	<i>Initial Certification: Literacy (Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Professional Certification: Literacy (Grades 7-12)</i>	1	1
	<i>Initial Certification: Literacy (Birth-Grade 6 and Grades 7-12)</i> <i>Professional Certification: Literacy (Birth-Grade 6 and Grades 7-12)</i>	1	1
<b><i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i></b>			
Total for additional programs		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		125	31
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		125	31

### **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.)

No programs have been added or discontinued within the past year.

### 3. Program Performance Indicators

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

**Table 2. Program Performance Indicators**

<p>A. <b>Total enrollment</b> 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.</p>
<p>125</p>
<p>B. <b>Total number of unique completers</b> (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.</p>
<p>31</p>
<p>C. <b>Number of recommendations</b> for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>
<p>47 recommendations were earned. 15 candidates earned a single recommendation, 14 Inclusive Childhood majors earned both Childhood Grade 1-6 and SwD Grade 1-6 recommendations, 1 Inclusive Adolescence major earned both English 7-12 and SwD 7-12 recommendations and 1 MSED candidate earned a recommendation for both Birth-Grade 6 and Grade 7-Grade 12 Literacy.</p>
<p>D. <b>Cohort completion rates</b> for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program’s expected timeframe <b>and</b> in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Inclusive Childhood Education</p>

End of Academic Year	Graduation Cohort	Graduated in 100% time (4 years)	Graduated in 150% time (6 years)	Graduated in 200% time (8 years)	Graduation Rate % (4 years)	Graduation Rate % (6 years)	Graduation Rate % (8 years)
2022	14	13	1	0	93%	7%	
2021	16	16	0	0	100%		
2020	10	6	4	0	60%	40%	
2019	19	18	1	0	95%	5%	
2018	14	12	2	0	86%	14%	
2017	10	9	1	0	90%	10%	
2016	13	12	1	0	92%	8%	
2015	20	20	0	0	100%		
<p>Where completers took more than four years to graduate, almost all declared the major late in their sophomore year. Course sequencing forced a year of preparation before beginning upper-level courses, then a ninth semester for student teaching.</p>							
<p><b>Adolescence Education</b></p>							

End of Academic Year	Graduation Cohort	Graduated in 100% time (4 years)	Graduated in 150% time (6 years)	Graduated in 200% time (8 years)	Graduation Rate % (4 years)	Graduation Rate % (6 years)	Graduation Rate % (8 years)
2022	7	6	1	0	86%	14%	
2021	11	11	0	0	100%		
2020	3	3	0	0	100%		
2019	2	2	0	0	100%		
2018	4	3	0	1	75%		25%
2017	3	1	2	0	33%	67%	
2016	5	5	0	0	100%		
2015	12	10	2	0	83%	17%	
<p>One international student in the 2018 cohort stopped out for a period to fulfill his national service.  Two students in the 2017 cohort stopped out for a period due to medical reasons.</p>							
<p><b>Inclusive Adolescence Education</b></p>							

End of Academic Year	Graduation Cohort	Graduated in 100% time (4 years)	Graduated in 150% time (6 years)	Graduated in 200% time (8 years)	Graduation Rate % (4 years)	Graduation Rate % (6 years)	Graduation Rate % (8 years)
2022	1	1	0	0	100%		
2021	0						
2020	2	2	0	0	100%		
2019	2	2	0	0	100%		
2018	0						
2017*	1	0	1	0		100%	
<b>Music Education</b>							
End of Academic Year	Graduation Cohort	Graduated in 100% time (4 years)	Graduated in 150% time (6 years)	Graduated in 200% time (8 years)	Graduation Rate % (4 years)	Graduation Rate % (6 years)	Graduation Rate % (8 years)
2022	5	4	1	0	80%	20%	



2021	10	9	1	0	90%	10%	
2020	6	5	1	0	83%	17%	
2019	3	3	0	0			
2018	9	9	0	0	100%		
2017	4	3	1	0	75%	25%	
2016	7	6	1	0			
2015	10	10	0	0	100%		

One student in the 2017 cohort chose to complete a double major- Music Education AND Mathematics, which required extra time.

#### Graduate Literacy Education

End of Academic Year	Graduation Cohort	Graduated in 100% time (2 years)	Graduated in 150% time (3 years)	Graduated in 200% time (4 years)	Graduation Rate % (2 years)	Graduation Rate % (3 years)	Graduation Rate % (4 years)
2022	3	0	3*	0		100%*	

\*Our first graduates in this program were in AY 2021-22. The program at that time was built to be completed in three or four years, depending on the pace the individual was willing to follow. Beginning in F2022, based on feedback from our students and prospective students, we restructured the program courses to be offered in 8-week sessions, reducing our program's expected timeframe from 3-4 years to 2 years.

**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%.

Test Number	Test Name	Number Passed	Number Taken	Pass Rate
060	Students with Disabilities	10	12	83%
065	Literacy	1	1	100%
090	Elementary Assessment of Teaching Skills	11	11	100%
091	Secondary Assessment of Teaching Skills	7	7	100%
115	Social Studies	3	3	100%
160	Biology	1	1	100%
165	Music	3	3	100%
201	Educating All Students	31	33	94%
221	Multi-Subject Part One	14	17	82%
222	Multi-Subject Part Two	14	17	82%
245	Multi-Subject Part Three	18	18	100%

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

As outlined above, our pass rate for every NYSED examination was above 80%. We continue to monitor changes to standards and state assessments and incorporate that content throughout our program requirements. Additionally, from our AY2021-22 Completers' portfolio data, we noted that our MED strand continued to score lower than the other strands. Our MED students are now engaged in more formal practicum experiences alongside more explicit discussion of these claims prior to their student teaching semester. Finally, we noted that responses across strands were lower to the 3b prompt in the fall semester. The following semester, we directed the discussion of this claim with more focused scaffolding with improved results.

4= Exemplary 3= Proficient 2= Acceptable 1= Insufficient	Fall 2021					Spring 2022				
	ADE n=7	IADE n=1	ICE n=8	MED n=4	All n=20	ADE n=3	IADE n=0	ICE n=6	MED n=2	All n=11
Claim 1	3.3 0.7	3.3 n/a	3.2 0.7	3.2 1.1	3.3 0.8	3.9 0.2		3.5 0.8	3.2 0.2	3.5 0.6
Claim 2	3.3 0.5	2.7 n/a	3.4 0.5	3.2 0.5	3.1 0.6	3.2 0.4		3.1 0.4	2.8 0.5	3.1 0.4
Claim 3a	3.0 1.4	4.0 n/a	3.1 0.8	2.5 1.1	2.8 1.2	3.0 0.0		3.7 0.5	2.5 0.5	3.3 0.6
Claim 3b	2.9 1.2	2.0 n/a	3.3 0.8	2.8 1.1	2.9 1.1	3.7 0.5		2.8 0.9	3.0 1.0	3.1 0.9
Claim 3c	2.9 1.4	3.0 n/a	3.3 0.8	2.5 1.1	3.0 1.2	3.0 0.0		3.5 0.5	3.0 1.0	3.3 0.6
Claim 4	3.1 0.7	2.0 n/a	3.4 0.7	2.8 0.9	3.1 0.7	3.8 0.3		3.6 0.3	2.5 0.2	3.5 0.5
Claim 5	3.2 0.6	3.0 n/a	3.3 0.6	3.3 0.6	3.3 0.6	4.0 0.0		3.7 0.4	3.2 0.2	3.7 0.4
Evidence P-12 St. Learning	3.0 0.5	2.6 n/a	3.3 0.5	2.8 0.8	3.0 0.6	3.5 0.2		3.5 0.3	2.5 0.5	3.3 0.5

Our annual graduate survey did not have enough responses to analyze quantitatively. However, guiding our qualitative analysis with the guiding question, “**What constructive feedback can you offer for improving the HUTEF?**” some actionable themes emerged. While much of the narrative responses revolved around better preparation for the EdTPA, including recommendations to replace our Senior Portfolio with the EdTPA which is now a moot point, there were other narrative responses that illuminated areas for potential growth and we’ve taken action to address them. See the brief table below:

Area for Potential Growth	HUTEP Responsive Action	Result
Better preparation for interviews	<p><b>Spring 2022-</b> EDUC Faculty and Vocation Office collaborated for an evening presentation and discussion.</p> <p><b>12.01.22</b> Discussion with Advisory Board  - Agreed to host a half-day Interview Preparation Day</p>	<p>It was poorly attended, so we decided that this year we would bring back our Interview Preparation Day [including a panel of local administrators and teachers, mock-interviews, and resume workshop].</p> <p>Advisory Board Agreed and several members volunteered to serve during the Interview Preparation Day event Spring 2023</p>
Increased attention to classroom management strategies	<p>We have added a year-long, 1.5 days/week practicum for Adolescence students so it now mirrors the elementary program. As classrooms return to more normal patterns from the pandemic, our students will have increased opportunities to practice classroom management strategies and receive feedback from both classroom and university mentors.</p>	

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

Our annual employer survey did not have enough responses to analyze. Our associate dean and a faculty member attended a forum with local principals, all of whom employ program alumni, to gather feedback on program strengths and weaknesses. While our program was generally considered strong, we were advised to spend more time on interview skills, classroom management, family & community collaboration, and phonics instruction. This was discussed in our department meeting. While our literacy course sequence explicitly immerses our ICE candidates in phonics instruction and assessment practices, we agreed that the other items are areas in which we could expand or go deeper. As mentioned above, we are organizing an Interview Preparation Day to begin as an annual event that both juniors and seniors can register for. We have also incorporated more explicit attention and assignments related to classroom management. Engaging our students in authentic family and community collaboration remains challenging and depends on our partnering schools and mentors.

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.

Houghton surveys all students at graduation and six months post-graduation, seeking information on employment and graduate school enrollment. The Teacher Education Program conducts an annual survey of graduates two years and five years after graduation. In our most recent survey, over 80% of respondents reported employment in education and 95% reported either current graduate studies or a graduate degree.

#### 4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Junior Practicum Evaluation	During the junior practicum clinical field experience, an evaluation form is utilized, which is based tightly on Danielson's framework. This alignment was due in large part to New York's alignment of the actual teacher observation instrument with Danielson. The practicum evaluation is a truncated form of the full form used for student teaching. There are numerous criteria observed which relate to AAQEP standard one. A likert scale is used with a 4 indicating exceptional, 3 is proficient, 2 is developing and 1 is minimally evident. Candidates must perform at the developing level or higher on ALL criteria to move to student teaching.	31/33 juniors met all criteria and were approved to advance; 1 student did not meet the criteria and was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later) and were approved and advanced, one semester later; 1 student did not meet the criteria and left the program.

<p>Student Teacher Evaluation / Graduate Internship Evaluations</p>	<p>During student teaching and the graduate level clinical field experiences, evaluation forms are used (based tightly on Danielson’s framework). This alignment was due in large part to New York’s alignment of the actual teacher evaluation instrument with Danielson. There are numerous criteria observed which relate to AAQEP standard one. A likert scale is used with a 4 indicating exceptional, 3 is proficient, 2 is developing and 1 is minimally evident. Candidates must earn exceptional or proficient scores in almost every criteria; scores of developing must be rare.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1329 215 1520 277">Strand</th> <th data-bbox="1520 215 1703 277">Number</th> <th data-bbox="1703 215 1885 277">Results</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 277 1520 743">ADE</td> <td data-bbox="1520 277 1703 743">8</td> <td data-bbox="1703 277 1885 743">1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 743 1520 805">IADE</td> <td data-bbox="1520 743 1703 805">1</td> <td data-bbox="1703 743 1885 805">100% met</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 805 1520 902">ICE</td> <td data-bbox="1520 805 1703 902">14</td> <td data-bbox="1703 805 1885 902">100% met criteria</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 902 1520 1235">MED</td> <td data-bbox="1520 902 1703 1235">6</td> <td data-bbox="1703 902 1885 1235">1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 1235 1520 1297">Literacy</td> <td data-bbox="1520 1235 1703 1297">3</td> <td data-bbox="1703 1235 1885 1297">100% met</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Strand	Number	Results	ADE	8	1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)	IADE	1	100% met	ICE	14	100% met criteria	MED	6	1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation	Literacy	3	100% met
Strand	Number	Results																				
ADE	8	1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)																				
IADE	1	100% met																				
ICE	14	100% met criteria																				
MED	6	1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation																				
Literacy	3	100% met																				

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

<b>Provider-Selected Measures</b>	<b>Explanation of Performance Expectation</b>	<b>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</b>
-----------------------------------	---	--

Senior Portfolio / Graduate Portfolio	<p>The senior portfolio is a compilation of essays which present the students understandings and practices (with appropriate hyperlinked artifacts) of each of five goals for program completers: 1) Demonstrate a breadth and depth of subject matter knowledge and facility with the intellectual tools of the liberal arts, 2) Articulate and implement a personal philosophy of education based on their knowledge of students' cognitive, psychosocial, and moral development as well as the cultural and philosophical foundations of education, all of which inform and give coherence to their teaching, 3) Integrate the knowledge and intellectual tools of the liberal arts with pedagogical knowledge to create instruction and assessment practices that acknowledge, address and value the varied learning needs of diverse students in nurturing and culturally-responsive learning environments, 4) Work in partnership with students, educational professionals, parents, and community members to foster students' learning and development, and 5) Develop and critique educational thought and practice in light of Christian faith in a way that communicates the commitment and ability to grow as life-long learners who contribute thoughtfully to the profession while demonstrating integrity in their personal and professional behavior. A likert scale is used with a 4 indicating exceptional, 3 is proficient, 2 is</p>	<p>29/31 student teachers received scores of 2 or above on all portfolio essays, 1 candidate had to resubmit 2 essays and 1 candidate was not successful.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1335 383 1879 1367"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strand</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Results</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ADE</td> <td>8</td> <td>100% met</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IADE</td> <td>1</td> <td>100% met</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ICE</td> <td>14</td> <td>1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MED</td> <td>6</td> <td>1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Strand	Number	Results	ADE	8	100% met	IADE	1	100% met	ICE	14	1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)	MED	6	1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation
Strand	Number	Results															
ADE	8	100% met															
IADE	1	100% met															
ICE	14	1 candidate was given an Incomplete and given an additional placement (in which they met criteria one semester later)															
MED	6	1 candidate did not meet criteria and graduated without a program recommendation															



	developing and 1 is minimally evident. If candidates score below a 2 on an essay, they must resubmit the applicable portion of the essay.	Literacy	3	100% met
Disposition Assessment	Professional Dispositions are monitored throughout each candidate's undergraduate experience. Candidates formally assess their own professional dispositions at the entry to the program. During the junior year, candidates again self-assess after they have interned in a K-12 setting while college faculty assess them during this time as well. Discussion of dispositions are also discussed during weekly department meetings. If students need to improve, then a professional growth plan is created by faculty and the student.	All candidates have met or exceeded dispositional standards prior to their student teaching experience.		
Survey of Alumni & Employers	These surveys examine program effectiveness in determining candidates content and pedagogical knowledge by surveying 2 years and 5 years after graduation	The number of responses was too low to allow quantitative analysis. While graduates generally reported feeling well-prepared with regard to content and pedagogical knowledge, MED completers continue to rate themselves lower than other strands. Field experiences and assessment for MED students are being increased to address this		

## 5. 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.

**Challenges:**

As schools began to return to normal schedules and practices, we noted that our senior student teachers appeared less confident because of their disrupted practicum experiences. Additionally, we noted that our ADE, IADE, and MED candidates were finding the transition to student teaching more challenging than their ICE peers.

**Responsive Actions/Accomplishments:**

Therefore, beginning this year we require all of our programmatic juniors to enroll in our extended and mentored junior practicum that is connected thoughtfully with their junior-block methods courses. This change impacts our ADE, IADE, and MED strands, increasing their contact hours with opportunities to plan, teach, and assess students, applying their methods' content. We have already seen increased engagement and confidence with their practical applications of the content in this year's practicum experiences and reflections. Additionally, in response to feedback we received from our classroom mentors, we have improved the rigor of the practicum placement in the spring semester where all observed lessons will involve planning, facilitating, and assessing all of the students in a whole class setting.