

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	12127	AACTE SID:	400
Institution:	Black Hills State University		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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

Total number of program completers 142

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

Addition of an MAT in Special Education - approved by HLC Spring 2020 begins Fall 2020.

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: <https://www.bhsu.edu/Academics/The-Colleges/College-of-Education-and-Behavioral-Sciences/School-of-Education/Accreditation>

Description of data accessible via link: 8 reporting measures; aggregate annual performance report information

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Black Hills State University

The EPP at Black Hills State University has developed strategies to gather multiple measures of Completer Impact on P-12 Learning and Development and Teacher Effectiveness. Due to South Dakota Codified Law 13-42-70, a law ensuring privacy protection for P-12 students and teachers in SD, the State DOE limits data released to the EPP that is disaggregated further than grade level. Therefore, it was necessary for the EPP to create a unique process for direct and indirect data collection to assess program and completer impact on P-12 learning and development. Direct measures provide data from teacher performance and value-added assessments. These measures include Student Learning Outcome (SLO) achievement, employer evaluations, Teacher Effectiveness-Ratings, action research, and South Dakota Department of Education Student Teacher Accountability and Reporting System (STARS, aggregate data) of proficiency and growth for P-12 learning and development. Indirect measures include employer, alumni, and graduate surveys and advisory committee recommendations as well as partner input.

LONG-TERM, EXPECTED, or UNEXPECTED TRENDS
BASED on BENCHMARKED DATA

EPP-graduate impact on student learning data for the 2018-2019 academic year indicate stability and above State averages for both performance and growth rates across all measures for District 1. District 2 data indicates improvement in performance and growth for mathematics and performance for science (growth data still being determined due to recent reporting by State). ELA data shows lower performance and growth from the previous 2 years. The Assessment Chair and Committee are investigating reasons for this definite decrease by EPP-prepared teachers including: a) teachers included in the 1-5 year-out data set b) review of teachers in district back to performance while in preparation; c) school-based academic changes in administration, emphases, curriculum; and d) SLO achievement and TE-Ratings voluntarily provided.

Measures of students' Assessment Readiness in each district indicate at or above State level performance for students completing the ACT: District 1, 1 point above, and District 2 at State average. This is an increase for District 2. College and Career-Readiness are significantly higher than the State average for each District.

Integration of STARS, SLO, and action-research data strengthen conclusions that EPP-prepared teachers contributed to P-12 student-learning growth and were effective teachers. Findings of SLO data for the two selected partner districts supported aggregate STARS data determining completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning. The SLO data demonstrated that EPP-prepared teachers met and exceeded expectations for student growth within their classrooms. STARS data demonstrated both proficiency and growth for students in schools with a preponderance of EPP-prepared in-service teachers.

The supervisor TE-Rating provides another measure of impact on student learning. Although district TE- Rating reporting varies within parameters allowed by the SD DOE, minimally, districts must evaluate teacher effectiveness relative to the state-mandated Danielson Framework. However, additional research-based teacher effectiveness evaluation options may be added as approved by the SD DOE. Although the TE-rating instrument is consistent, districts are provided flexibility for scoring. District 1 used a 4 point scale, 4 being the highest; District 2 used a descriptive interpretation of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. All teachers included demonstrated proficient or stronger TE-ratings in the classroom. This finding is consistent with the positive evidence of growth relative to performance and high percentages of students meeting college and career ready expectations. Taken together with the growth, proficiency, and college and career ready data, EPP-prepared teachers demonstrate a positive impact on student learning.

EMPLOYER, ALUMNI, COMPLETER SURVEYS:

Another critical component to measuring EPP impact is the perception by candidates of their preparedness for the teaching profession. Indirect measures of perceptions of program preparation include graduate, alumni, and employer surveys and advisory council input. The EPP currently administers surveys directly aligned with the InTASC Standards which is one of the EPP foundations, therefore surveys directly relate to the EPP curriculum. The same survey question content, with audience variations, is administered to each respondent group, completers, alumni, and principals, to enable direct comparison of responses.

Principals and alumni receive the survey on off-set three year cycles and completers at the SOE graduation exit seminar. Employer and completer survey data indicate strengths for behaviors related to research-based teaching-learning and professional development, caring-related concerns, and most pedagogical practices. Areas of relative concern between the completer and employer include assessment and management and motivation. The employers indicate a higher sense of confidence in completer performance in-service than completer's prior to service for relating to diverse backgrounds and use of technology.

PROGRAMMATIC/PROVIDER-WIDE CHANGES IMPLEMENTED AND BEING PLANNED AS A RESULT OF THESE DATA

The EPP developed and implemented two specific courses Fall of 2017 to address the concerns determined from the long-term data. All programs require a specific Classroom Management course and Elementary Education and the Composite Elementary Education-Special Education added Assessment for the Elementary Teacher. Impact of these programs will be evident with completers Spring 2021; employer determined impact will be evident through surveys starting Spring 2021.

DATA SHARING WITH PARTNERS INTERNALLY AND EXTERNAL TO THE EPP

Data review begins internally with the School of Education Assessment Committee then extends to program coordinators across schools, (departments/divisions at the university), and then is reviewed by the entire School of Education.

The Teacher Education Advisory Committee and Field Experience Committee also review and provide input. Prospective students and families may find the legally shared information on the BHSU website. In the last review of the annual report, reviewers noted a lack best practice for our posting; the EPP will have improved display by June of the reporting year.

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.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP did not provide sufficient information regarding validity and reliability. (component 5.2)

Progress to determine validity and reliability for the Professional Disposition Assessment instrument and the Final Appraisal as described in the previous 2017-2018 annual report are progressing as stated. Although the return of data expected spring of 2020 halted with the pandemic, we are confident the delay will be a single semester and Summer and Fall 2020 data will be gathered. The Final Appraisal is progressing according to the SIP timeline. (tagged)

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?

QUALITY ASSURANCE: TESTING INNOVATIONS AND IMPLEMENTING EVIDENCE DRIVEN CHANGES

A closely monitored EPP program concern was the Elementary Education Praxis content Social Science subtest. Scores for this subtest, although passing, were relatively low; additionally, candidates reported less confidence in the content. EPP members of the Elementary Education program process reviewed the data, curriculum, and discussed with in-service clinical educators with a resultant course inclusion targeting this weakness. Completers for 2018-19, who were the first benefactors of the new course, demonstrated strong improvement. The average score was 16 points above the pass score with 10 completers in the National 75% and an additional 23 completers above the 25th percentile. The EPP is pleased with the progress compared to national test-takers. Two additional items of interest for the EPP relate to the Special Education discipline. EPP interactions with the Teacher Education Advisory Council and Field Experience Governance Committee added to needs of the State and region indicated two needs: 1) Special Education teachers, and 2) programs that are not completely online. The increasing need for Special Education teachers coupled with regional needs of college graduates desiring to enter the teaching profession led to the development and implementation of a MAT in Special Education. Approval from HLC was received Spring 2020 so the program will begin Fall 2020. This MAT is completely on-line; the EPP is initiating discussion relative to completely online programs.

QUALITY ASSURANCE: ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS, STANDARDS, AND FRAMEWORK

This EPP's approach to quality assurance is continually evolving to reflect research-based best educational practice as well as EPP goals and accreditation expectations. Proprietary and EPP-created measures combine to create verifiable, relevant, and actionable analyses of candidate, program (licensure discipline), and EPP outcomes. Proprietary assessments used by the EPP are the 1) ETS Praxis discipline content, 2) Praxis Performance Assessment of Teachers (PPAT). ETS provides national benchmarks for each assessment which the EPP uses for candidate performance comparison (tagged as 8-measures and standards performance data). EPP-created measures include the Professional Dispositions Assessment (PDA), Formative and Final Clinical Evaluations (FA), and surveys of employers, alumni, and completers. Minimum benchmarks and expectations determined by the EPP with partners add accountability. Non-academic performance information are included within the PPAT and supplemented by PDA and surveys. The FA report summarizes the formative assessment rubric content as a synopsis of candidate growth through the clinical experience.

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS AND OUTCOMES






Parallel to the EPP report, program, and candidate data reviews occur annually. At the program level, the School of Education Assessment Committee reviews, analyzes, and interprets data then shares the reports with content and EPP faculty for discussion,

recommendations, and action. Benchmarks are the foundation for annual program reports; proprietary assessments are correlated to ETS provided National and State data while EPP-created measures have partner-created minimum requirements for passing. The annual reporting process includes both program and aggregate analyses of 7 outcomes: (tagged)
2 measures of content:
a) certification proprietary exam,
b) per program need
Ability to plan instruction
Effect on student learning
Pedagogy-based instruction
Professional Dispositions
Clinical Internship
Each program report provides evidence and analysis to demonstrate CAEP SPA or State expectations. The SOE Assessment committee reviews trends across time and programs, interpretation of benchmark comparisons, and implementation of changes deemed necessary from data analysis. The assessment committee members initially collaborate with program coordinators across colleges for discussion and interpretation of the data. Next, discussion expands to incorporating data from alumni, employer, and graduate surveys, and input gleaned from partners (e.g. superintendents, principals, diverse population representatives, community content specialists, teacher fair representatives).

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **SS_subtest_scores.docx**
-  **ViewTSAReport__SPED_shortage_national.pdf**
-  **SD_teacher_shortage__link.docx**
-  **AC_Meeting_Notes_Spring_2018minutes_suggestions.docx**
-  **8_mearr_and_stnd_performance_data_1819(1).docx**

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone: 605-642-6551

E-mail: Sharman.Adams@BHSU.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

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

Acknowledge