AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	School of Education/WGU
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	June 30, 2026

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

Western Governors University (WGU) was founded in 1997 by 19 U.S. governors as a solution to a growing need for a college-educated workforce—a need that was not being met by traditional higher education. WGU is the realization of the vision for higher education that emerged among the governors of the Western Governors Association (hence our name); however, WGU is a **private, non-profit institution**. Our independence allows WGU to keep its focus on students, following the governors' foundational vision. WGU was designed to serve "non-traditional" students who need a nimbler and more flexible educational model. From day one, WGU's online, competency-based model has opened higher education pathways for students who previously lacked access due to location or other barriers. Through student-centered design and tech-enabled innovation, WGU continues to meet students where they are, delivering educational opportunity and economic mobility at scale. Since 1997, WGU has awarded over 450,000 degrees to nearly 400,000 alumni.

WGU's School of Education (WSE) was founded in 2003 as the Teachers College with a grant from the United States Department of Education. Teachers College was renamed the School of Education in 2022 and houses all education-related programs, including licensure and non-licensure. WSE confers the largest number of education degrees in the nation. WSE serves approximately 44,000 students in all programs across the United States. Approximately 29,000 candidates are enrolled in licensure programs.

The School of Education began a reimagining of all initial licensure programs at the BA, BS, and MAT levels in November 2022. Upon completion of all curriculum development activities and subsequent preparations for program release, including pre-release change management efforts and training on new program components, the updated initial licensure programs were released between November 2024 and April 2025. After release, systematic program migrations were planned to ensure that all candidates can benefit from improved programs. Additional endorsement programs were opened for new student enrollments on September 1, 2025.

The Reimagination Project embraced a shift in thinking about the way we prepare teachers, leading the way for the nation in professional educator preparation. With a foundation in the science of learning that undergirds the entire program, it includes:
- A spiraled curriculum rooted in learning science;
- "Right-sized" reading content grounded in the science of reading;
- Revised assessment design (formative and summative);
- Increased teaching experience through interactive activities, including simulations and multimodal experiences integrated into core activities;
- The incorporation of AI as an ethical teaching-and-learning tool; and
- More flexible clinical pathways and work-based learning, including apprenticeships, so candidates can remain employed during student teaching.

The effort strives to maximize completion rates to close equity and attainment gaps and future-proof our educator preparation portfolio by building programs to support professional educator pathways at scale with models that empower educators and enrich communities.

Programs accredited by AAQEP in 2019:
BA, Elementary Education
MAT, Elementary Education
BA, Special Education (K-12), dual licensure with special education and elementary education.
BA, Special Education-Mild to Moderate
MAT, English Education (Secondary)
BS, Mathematics Education (Middle Grades)
MAT, Mathematics Education (Middle Grades)

BS, Mathematics Education (Secondary)
MAT, Mathematics Education (Secondary Education)
BS, Science Education (Middle Grades)
BS, Science Education (Secondary Chemistry)
BS, Science Education (Secondary Physics)
BS, Science Education (Secondary Earth Sciences)
BS, Science Education (Secondary Biological Sciences)
MAT, Science Education (Secondary), includes Chemistry, Biological Sciences, Earth Sciences, and Physics

Program added to review:
MAT, Special Education K-12 (added on May 1, 2021)

Programs added to review (added accreditation scope August 1, 2025):
MAT, Secondary Social Studies
MS, Educational Leadership
MA, English Language Learning
Endorsement, English Language Learning
Endorsement, Middle Grades Mathematics
Endorsement, Secondary Biology
Endorsement, Secondary Chemistry
Endorsement, Secondary Earth Sciences
Endorsement, Secondary Physics
Endorsement, Early Childhood Education

Program removed from review:
PB, Elementary Education (retired in 2020)

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	**Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential** granted by the state	**Number of Candidates Enrolled** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Elementary Education, BA	Elementary Education	1,892	1,660
Elementary Education, MAT	Elementary Education	1,421	1,368
Elementary Education, BA	Elementary Education	1,892	1,660
Special Education (K-12), BA *Note: dual licensure special education and elementary education*	Elementary Education and Mild to Moderate Special Education	554	535
Special Education Mild to Moderate, BA	Mild to Moderate Special Education	194	164
Special Education K-12, MAT	Special Education K-12: Mild/ Moderate	582	514
English Education (Secondary), MAT	English Endorsement	242	282
	Mathematics Middle Grades	84	85
Mathematics Education (Secondary), BS	Mathematics Secondary	74	70
Mathematics Education, MAT (Middle Grades)	Mathematics Middle Grades	24	34
Mathematics Education (Secondary), MAT	Mathematics Secondary	72	91

Science Education (Middle Grades), BS	Science Middle Grades	20	20
Science Education (Secondary Chemistry), BS	Chemistry Secondary	9	11
Science Education (Secondary Physics), BS	Physics Secondary	7	11
Science Education (Secondary Earth Science), BS	Earth Science Secondary	21	21
Science Education (Secondary Biological Science), BS	Biological Science Secondary	88	68
Science Education (Secondary) *(includes Chemistry, Biological Sciences, Earth Science and Physics)*, MAT	Science Education Secondary	198	194
Secondary Social Studies, MAT	Social Studies Composite	0	0
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		5,482	5,128
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
English Language Learning, MA	English as a Second Language	526	427
Endorsement in English Language Learning	English as a Second Language	77	65
Endorsement in Middle Grades Mathematics (Non-degree)	Mathematics Middle Grades	0	0
Endorsement in Middle Grades Science (Non-degree)	Science Middle Grades	0	0
Endorsement in Secondary Biology (Non-degree)	Biological Science Secondary	0	0
Endorsement in Secondary Chemistry (Non-degree)	Chemistry Secondary	0	0

Endorsement in Secondary Earth Science (Non-degree)	Earth Science Secondary	0	0
Endorsement in Secondary Physics (Non-degree)	Physics Secondary	0	0
Endorsement in Early Childhood Education (Non-degree)	Early Childhood Education	0	0
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		603	492
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Educational Leadership, MS	School Leadership	941	775
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		941	775
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
None		0	0
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		7,026	6,395
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		6,919	6,394

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

A. **Total enrollment** in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
6,919
B. **Total number of unique completers** (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above, but only once here.
6,394

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

5,665 recommendations

- 701 = Advanced licenses (ELL and EDL) and 4,964 = initial licenses
  - 6 candidates completed two programs
  - 53 moved and were recommended in 2 states
  - 74 were recommended in 2 states due to reciprocity

D. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

Candidates in undergraduate programs (BA/BS) are expected to complete their programs in 4 years. The expected completion rate for graduate programs (MAT/MA/MS) is 2 years. The table below provides completion data at the licensure level.

Licensure Grouping	Expected Completion	1.5 Expected Completion
Initial Licensure (BA/BS/MAT)	64.1%	85.0%
Advanced (MA/MS)	83.8%	95.4%

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%.

The overall **Praxis** pass rate for the reporting period was 91.4%. **Table 1** presents the overall pass rates for individual exams. The pass rates on each exam are over 80%. The lowest overall pass rate by examination was 84.7% (N = 236) on the Praxis Biology (5236), while the highest was 99.8% (N = 1,120) on the Praxis Special Education: Foundation Knowledge (5355).

Table 1: Praxis Pass Rates

Exam Title	N	Overall Pass Rate
Praxis II Elementary Education: Reading and Language Arts (5002)	1915	92.8%
Praxis II Elementary Education: Mathematics (5003)	1963	90.9%
Praxis II Elementary Education: Social Studies (5004)	1994	86.0%
Praxis II Elementary Education: Science (5005)	1976	87.7%
Praxis II English Language Arts: Content and Analysis (5039)	270	90.0%

	N	
Praxis Middle School Mathematics (5-9) (5164)	176	90.9%
Praxis Mathematics (5165)	191	89.5%
Praxis Biology (5236)	236	84.7%
Praxis Chemistry (5246)	30	86.7%
Praxis Physics (5266)	14	92.9%
Praxis Special Education: Foundation Knowledge (5355)	1120	99.8%
Praxis II English to Speakers of Other Languages (5362)	483	99.2%
Praxis II Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision (5412)	767	99.6%
Praxis - Middle School Science (5442)	41	90.2%
Praxis Earth/Space Science (5572)	37	89.2%

*Individual candidates who attempted the test.

The overall pass rate on the **edTPA** was 86%. **Table 2** presents the overall pass rates for individual exams and programs. Exams with pass rates lower than 80% and Ns of at least 10 were Secondary Science National (77%, N=22) and Secondary Math National (69%, N=13). Exams with pass rates of 100% and Ns of at least 10 were Special Education National (BA and MAT).

Table 2: edTPA Pass Rates

edTPA Exams	Programs	N*	Overall Pass Rates
SELN-Secondary English National	English Education (Secondary), MAT	6	100.0%
ELTN-Elementary Literacy National	Elementary Education, BA	1	0.0%
SMAN-Secondary Math National	Mathematics Education (Middle Grades), BS	4	100.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Secondary Biological Science), BS	8	88.0%
SMAN-Secondary Math National	Mathematics Education (Secondary), BS	7	86.0%
MSCN-Middle Childhood Science National	Science Education (Middle Grades), BS	2	100.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Secondary), MAT	36	89.0%
ELCN-Elementary Combined National	Elementary Education, BA	168	85.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Secondary Chemistry), BS	2	50.0%
SPDN-Special Education National	Elementary (K-12) /Mild to Moderate Special Education, BA	10	100.0%
SPDN-Special Education National	Special Education K-12, MAT	11	100.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Secondary Earth Science), BS	1	100.0%

SMAN-Secondary Math National	Mathematics Education (Secondary), BS	22	77.0%
MMAN-Middle Childhood Math National	Mathematics Education, BS (Middle Grades)	1	100.0%
SPDN-Special Education National	Special Education Mild to Moderate, BA	7	86.0%
MMAN-Middle Childhood Math National	Mathematics Education, BS (Middle Grades)	6	83.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Secondary Physics), BS	1	0.0%
ELCN-Elementary Combined National	Elementary Education, MAT	275	86.0%
SMAN-Secondary Math National	Mathematics Education (Middle Grades), BS	13	69.0%
SSCN-Secondary Science National	Science Education (Middle Grades), BS	2	100.0%

*Individual candidates who attempted the test.

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

A survey is sent to WSE initial and advanced program completers every six months by Benchworks. The tables below present two cycles of alumni feedback collected by Benchworks during the 2024-2025 academic year. The surveys use a 7-point Likert scale (1= Not at all, 4= Moderately, 7= Extremely) with a benchmark goal of 5.50 (75% of 7) for factor means. Benchworks has established a baseline goal of 5.50 or higher (75% of 7 = 5.50 mean) for the Factor Mean.

Initial-Licensure Programs
The data in **Table 1** reflect the perceptions of 229 initial program completers who teach in their fields of preparation, evaluating their preparation in key areas of teaching practice aligned with the InTASC standards.

Table 1: Initial-Licensure Survey Responses

How well did the teacher education program enhance your ability to apply knowledge and strategies pertaining to:	7/2024-12/2024 Mean N= 106	1/2025-6/2025 Mean N=123
Content	5.96	6.04
Lesson Planning	6.05	6.08
Diversity	6.07	6.12
Professional Relationships	5.83	5.74
Technology	5.69	5.84
Assessment	5.90	5.95
Classroom Management	5.82	5.70

	5.85	5.93
Instruction	5.85	5.93
Professional Development	6.10	6.07

All responses were above the goal of 5.50. The mean rose in six of the nine categories. The highest mean score was in Diversity, with a mean of 6.12 (+0.05 from the previous survey). The biggest increases were in the areas of Content and Instruction, both +0.08. The data provide compelling evidence of WSE's effectiveness in preparing candidates across multiple dimensions of professional practice. The upward trends across all three cycles reflect a responsive and evolving program that is attentive to feedback from completers. While all areas exceed the benchmark, the relatively lower score for Professional Relationships highlights a key area for strategic improvement.

Advanced-Licensure Programs

Completers of the advanced-level degree programs, MA, English Language Learning (MAELL), and MS Educational Leadership (MSEDL), responded to a similar Benchworks survey between June 2024 and June 2025. Prompts were aligned with their specialized professional standards. The data in **Table 2** reflect the perceptions of 41 MAELL program completers, and **Table 3** reflects the perceptions of 215 MSELD completers.

Table 2. MA, English Language Learning Survey Responses

How well did the English Language Learning program enhance your knowledge, skills, and ability in the following areas?	6/2024-12/2024 Mean N= 16	1/1/2025-6/2025 Mean N= 25
How well did the program prepare you to promote acquisition of reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills across content areas? (TESOL 1a)	6.0	5.76
How well did the program prepare you to demonstrate knowledge of second language acquisition theory and facilitate language learning? (TESOL 1b)	6.19	6.00
How well did the program help you to apply knowledge of English academic language functions and vocabulary to promote academic achievement across content areas? (TESOL 1d)	6.0	5.88
How well did the program prepare you to demonstrate knowledge of how cultural and social contexts impact the education of ELLs? (TESOL 2a)	6.44	6.00
How well did the program prepare you to devise and implement methods to develop effective, individualized	6.0	5.84

instructional and assessment practices for ELLs? (TESOL 2c)		
How well did the program prepare you to scaffold instruction for ELLs using evidence-based, student-centered, and interactive approaches? (TESOL 3b)	6.25	5.80
How well did the program prepare you to adjust instructional decisions after critical reflection? (TESOL 3c)	6.06	5.72
How well did the program prepare you to use and adapt relevant materials and resources to foster student learning? (TESOL 3e)	6.12	5.64
How well did the program prepare you to analyze and interpret student data from multiple sources to scaffold instruction and make informed decisions to promote learning? (TESOL 4)	6.12	5.68
How well did the program prepare you to advocate for the rights of ELLs? (TESOL 5)	6.19	6.24

The MAELL program showed strong performance in Cycle 1, with scores frequently exceeding 6.30 in areas such as content, diversity, instruction, and professional relationships. However, Cycle 2 scores were slightly lower across most domains, though still above the benchmark. For example, instruction dropped from 6.38 to 5.50, and professional relationships from 6.62 to 5.36. Despite these declines, completers continued to rate the program highly in terms of its relevance to career success (6.32) and advocacy for English Language Learners (ELLs) (6.24). TESOL-aligned items also reflected solid preparation in language acquisition, scaffolding instruction, and cultural responsiveness.

Table 3. MS, Educational Leadership Survey Responses

How well did the education program enhance your knowledge, skills, and ability in the following areas?	6/2024-12/2024 Mean N= 140	1/2025-6/2025 Mean N= 75
How well did the program prepare you to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision? (NELP 1.1)	5.82	6.29
How well did the program prepare you to lead improvement processes that include data use, design, implementation, and evaluation? (NELP 1.2)	6.08	6.2

Question		
How well did the program prepare you to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model professional dispositions and norms that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult? (NELP 2.1)	5.92	6.31
How well did the program prepare you to use data to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive culture? (NELP 3.1)	5.97	6.31
How well did the program prepare you to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive, and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff? (NELP 3.3)	5.97	6.29
How well did the program prepare you to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology rich services that support equity and digital literacy? (NELP 4.2)	5.38	5.94
How well did the program prepare you to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support data-informed instructional improvement and student learning and well-being? (NELP 4.3)	5.56	6.09
How well did the program prepare you to engage families, community and school personnel to strengthen student learning and school improvement? (NELP 5)	5.90	6.31
How well did the program prepare you to improve the management, communications, technology, and school-level governance to develop and improve data-informed resources plans? (NELP 6)	5.82	6.20
How well did the program prepare you to build the school's professional capacity and engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture? (NELP 7)	5.90	6.43

Completers of the MSEDL program reported consistently high ratings across both cycles, with notable growth in key leadership competencies. Areas such as professional development (6.10-6.31), diversity (5.78-6.05), and assessment (5.96-6.12) demonstrated strong performance. Instructional leadership also improved from 5.38 to 5.76, indicating enhanced confidence in guiding teaching and learning. Overall satisfaction, program effectiveness, and learning exceeded 6.0, with Cycle 2 scores reaching 6.42, 6.36, and 6.32, respectively. These results suggest that the program is effectively preparing candidates to lead school improvement efforts and foster inclusive, data-informed practices.

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

When a completer submits the Benchmark survey and grants permission for WSE to contact their employer, a survey covering the same topics is sent to those employers. The employer surveys use the same 7-point Likert scale (1= Not at all, 4= Moderately, 7= Extremely) with a benchmark goal of 5.50 (75% of 7) for factor means. Benchworks has established a baseline goal of 5.50 or higher (75% of 7 = 5.50 mean) for the Factor Mean. The small sample sizes (7 for the initial licensure program and 5 for the advanced licensure programs) limit the generalizability of the data and may not fully reflect the broader employer experience. WSE is actively working to increase response rates in future cycles to ensure more representative and actionable feedback.

Initial-Licensure Programs
The data in **Table 4** reflect the perceptions of initial completers' employers, evaluating their preparation in key areas of teaching practice aligned with the InTASC standards.

Table 4: Initial-Licensure Employer Survey Responses

To what degree are you satisfied with recent graduates from this program regarding their:	7/ 2024 -12/ 2024 Mean N=5	1/2025-6/2025 Mean N=2
Exhibit a mastery of relevant content	6.2	4.0
Develop effective lesson plans	6.4	4.0
Reflect the value of diversity in teaching	6.4	4.0
Build collaborative professional relationships	6.4	5.0
Integrate technology into the teaching experience	6.6	4.0
Knowledge of assessment strategies	5.8	4.0
Create a productive classroom environment	6.4	4.0
Demonstrate effective classroom instruction	6.4	4.0
Commitment to their current job	7	5.5

Professionalism	7	5.5
Overall Evaluation	**Mean**	**Mean**
To what degree: Are you satisfied with the overall performance of recent graduates from this program?	6.6	5.5
To what degree: Would you recommend that your school/ organization hire graduates from this program in the future?	6.4	5.5

Employers rated initial-licensure graduates highly for professionalism and commitment to their work, as well as their ability to integrate technology into teaching in Cycle 1. However, Cycle 2 showed a noticeable decline, with most scores at 5.5 or 4.0, particularly in areas such as classroom instruction, lesson planning, and assessment strategies. Despite this dip, employers continued to express moderate satisfaction with graduates' overall performance and work ethic, with Cycle 2 scores for overall satisfaction and likelihood to recommend at 5.5.

Advanced-Licensure Programs
The data in **Table 5** reflect the perceptions of employers of MA English Language (MAELL) completers, evaluating their preparation in key areas of teaching practice aligned with TESOL standards.

Table 5: MAELL Employer Survey Responses

To what degree are you satisfied with recent graduates from this program regarding their:	6/2024-12/2024 Mean N= 0	1/2025-6/2025 Mean N= 3
How well did the program prepare the graduate to promote acquisition of reading, writing, speaking and listening skills across content areas? (TESOL 1a)	-	5.50
How well did the program prepare the graduate to demonstrate knowledge of second language acquisition theory and facilitate language learning? (TESOL 1b)	-	6.00
How well did the program help the graduate to apply knowledge of English academic language functions and vocabulary to promote academic achievement across content areas? (TESOL 1d)	-	6.00

How well did the program prepare the graduate to demonstrate knowledge of how cultural and social contexts impact the education of ELLs? (TESOL 2a)	-	5.50
How well did the program prepare the graduate to devise and implement methods to develop effective, individualized instructional and assessment practices for ELLs? (TESOL 2c)	-	5.50
How well did the program prepare the graduate to scaffold instruction for ELLs using evidence-based, student-centered, and interactive approaches? (TESOL 3b)	-	6.00
Overall Evaluation		
Are you satisfied with the overall performance of recent graduates from the WGU Master's English Language Learning program?	-	6.33
Would you recommend that your school/organization hire graduates from the WGU Masters English Language Learning program in the future?	-	6.33

Employers of MAELL graduates expressed strong satisfaction with their overall performance, assigning scores at or above the benchmark of 5.50. Employers indicated they would recommend hiring MAELL graduates, with a score of 6.33, reflecting strong confidence in the program's ability to prepare effective educators for multilingual learners.

The data in **Table 6** reflect the perceptions of employers of MS Educational Leadership (MSEDL) completers, evaluating their preparation in key areas of teaching practice aligned with NELP standards.

Table 6: MSEDL Employer Survey Responses

To what degree are you satisfied with recent graduates from this program regarding their:	6/2024-12/2024 Mean N= 1	1/2025-6/2025 Mean N= 1
How well did the program prepare the graduate to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision? (NELP 1.1)	4	3
How well did the program prepare the graduate to lead improvement processes that include data use, design, implementation, and evaluation? (NELP 1.2)	4	4
How well did the program prepare the graduate to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model professional dispositions and norms that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult? (NELP 2.1)	4	3
How well did the program prepare the graduate to use data to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive culture? (NELP 3.1)	4	4
How well did the program prepare the graduate to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive, and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff? (NELP 3.3)	4	4
How well did the program prepare the graduate to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology rich services that support equity and digital literacy? (NELP 4.2)	4	4
How well did the program prepare the graduate to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support data-informed instructional improvement and student learning and well-being? (NELP 4.3)	4	4

How well did the program prepare the graduate to engage families, community and school personnel to strengthen student learning and school improvement? (NELP 5)	4	6	
How well did the program prepare the graduate to improve the management, communications, technology, and school-level governance to develop and improve data-informed resource plans? (NELP 6)	4	6	
How well did the program prepare the graduate to build the school's professional capacity and engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture? (NELP 7)	4	4	
Overall Evaluation			
Are you satisfied with the overall performance of recent graduates from the WGU Masters Educational Leadership program?	7	5	
Would you recommend that your school/organization hire graduates from the WGU Masters Educational Leadership program in the future?	7	6	

The employers of MSEDL graduates who responded rated them below the benchmark of 5.50 on the NELP standards, except for engaging families, community, and school personnel to strengthen student learning and school improvement, improving management, communications, technology, and school-level governance to develop and improve data-informed resource plans.
At the same time, employers generally gave high ratings for overall performance and recommended hiring MSEDL graduates.

Increased response rates from employers over the next cycles will provide a clearer picture of completer ability and success in schools.

H. 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.

Eighty percent of completers who responded to the WGU Alumni Survey reported that they were teaching full- or part-time one year after graduation:

Teaching Full-time	Teaching Part-time	Total Teaching
77.7%	3.2%	80.9%

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) 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 (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
WGU-TC is a competency-based program. All courses and all programs have embedded competencies.	In order to pass a course, candidates must all demonstrate competencies at 3.0 GPA equivalent. In order to meet program completion requirements, candidates must pass all courses.	100% of completers meet program competencies.
Demonstration of Learning Progress (DOLP) Final Evaluation	DOLP evaluation is scored and evaluated by INTASC standards, with multiple aspect ratings within each standard. Eighty percent of the standards should be at the target level (2.40) or higher to indicate adequate progression. Scoring levels are: **0 = Not Effective** Performance is below the target of initial student interactions. **1 = Beginning** Target performance at the end of the early clinical experiences, professional core and teaching methods courses **2 = Developing** Target performance at the end of the intermediate clinical experiences, Preclinical Experiences **3 = Effective** Target performance at the end of the culminating clinical experiences, Demonstration Teaching	Data reflect cumulative ratings for all iterations of the assessments taken by all students during the designated data cycle. Fall 2024 = 2.82 (0-3 range) Spring 2025 2.90 (0-3 range)

	NA = Not Observed Used only for observations. Not observed is for classification of an aspect that was not observable or needing to be included based on the lesson delivered. All aspects of an evaluation must be able to be rated and include a measurable score.	
Licensure Exams	Pass with a score greater than 80%	The overall pass rate on Praxis was 91.4% in 2024-2025.

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
EdTPA	The overall pass rate for the EdTPA for TC is greater than 90%. As a program requirement, candidates are expected to achieve the minimum performance expectation that WGU has established.	The overall pass rate on EdTPA was 86% in 2024-2025.
Demonstration of Learning Progress (DOLP) Final Evaluation	DOLP evaluation is scored and evaluated by INTASC standards, with multiple aspect ratings within each standard. Eighty percent of the standards should be at the target level (2.4) or higher to indicate adequate progression. Scoring levels report are: **0 = Not Effective** Performance is below the target of initial student interactions. **1 = Beginning** Target performance at the end of the early clinical experiences, professional core and teaching methods courses	Data reflect cumulative ratings for all iterations of the assessments taken by all students during the designated data cycle. Fall 2024 = 2.82 (0-3 scale) Spring 2025 = 2.90 (0-3 scale)

	2 = Developing Target performance at the end of the intermediate clinical experiences, Preclinical Experiences **3 = Effective** Target performance at the end of the culminating clinical experiences, Demonstration Teaching **NA = Not Observed** Used only for observations. Not observed is for classification of an aspect that was not observable or needing to be included based on the lesson delivered. All aspects of an evaluation must be able to be rated and include a measurable score.	
Professional Portfolio	Candidates must achieve competency in all performance aspects as measured by the task rubrics. The scoring levels are: 0 = No evidence 1 = Approaching competency 2 = Competency achieved	Data reflect cumulative ratings for all iterations of the assessments taken by all candidates during the designated data cycle. All candidates must achieve a final competent rating in order to pass. Fall 2024 = 1.84 (0-2 scale) Spring 2025 = 1.85 (0-2 scale)

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.

The School of Education completed the multi-year Reimagination Project in the fall of 2025. The project addressed challenges facing our programs and candidates. The reimagined licensure programs not only align with new competencies and standards of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE), but they are also designed to optimize teacher preparation, program quality, and School of Education accountability for student outcomes. The reimagined licensure programs are designed to maximize Factored Graduate Return (FGR), a metric WGU uses to show the economic value of its programs by multiplying the median income gain two years after graduation by the graduate's remaining working years (to age 65), then dividing that by the total cost of their program, closing access and attainment gaps. By incorporating greater flexibility into our clinical pathway, the Reimagination Project positions the School of Education as a leading provider of pathways to the K-12 classroom, including teacher apprenticeships and paraprofessional-to-teacher programs. The effort aims to maximize completion rates, close equity and attainment gaps, and future-proof our educator preparation portfolio by developing programs that support professional educator pathways at scale, utilizing models that empower educators and enrich communities.