

# 2021 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 EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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

## 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 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure <sup>1</sup>	118
2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) <sup>2</sup>	19

**Total number of program completers** 137

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

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

**Description of data accessible via link:** Accreditation Home Page w Accreditation/Standards and Report/Reviewed and Accredited Programs tabs

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?*

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 release to the EPP. The law prohibits sharing school and district evaluation data of P-12 students or teachers 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.

In this report, the EPP presents data regarding program impact from: 2) PPAT (indicators of teaching effectiveness); and 4) Completer Exit Survey results (satisfaction of completers). 3) Employer Satisfaction Surveys are administered on a 3-year cycle and the period of this report was off cycle so there are no data for inclusion this reporting year. Typically, we report 1) proficiency and growth for P-12 learning and development data (impact of P-12 learning and development) from South Dakota Department of Education Student Teacher Accountability and Reporting System (STARS, aggregate data); however, these data are not available for the reporting period due to COVID-19.

## PROGRAM IMPACT

Impact that Completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development: South Dakota Department of Education Student Teacher Accountability and Reporting System

To measure program impact and teacher-effectiveness of EPP-prepared in-service teachers on P-12 learning and development, the EPP uses STARS data from two districts in the area with high percentage of BHSU graduate hires. STARS provides a variety of academic and demographic data through a centralized system that disaggregates student data to grade; although, only aggregate proficiency data are reported due to privacy laws as stated above.

Typically, STARS proficiency and growth data are reported for Math, English Language Arts (ELA), and Science. Combining proficiency with growth data annually and across time provides a more complete picture of impact when integrated with benchmarks of State averages and ranges. Together, measures of performance and growth provide information for both impact on learners and teacher effectiveness. However, this report period, "Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state assessments were not administered and therefore data for student performance, student progress and school environment are not available for the 2019-2020 school year. Based upon South Dakota's waiver approved by U.S. Department of Education, the overall score was not calculated for schools for the 2019-2020 report cards, and the school support status is based upon school performance results from the 2018-2019 academic year."

Students take the annual state assessments for English language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11, and science in grades 5, 8, and 11. These tests measure proficiency on the concepts and skills taught in the classroom and whether students met the state's grade-level expectations in each subject. No Data for 2019-2020 Due to COVID-19.

The Student Progress measure shows the progress students have made on the state assessments for English language arts and mathematics since the prior school year. It illustrates whether students are learning and improving. No Data for 2019-2020 Due to COVID-19.

The College and Career Readiness measure describes the percentage of students who are fully prepared for postsecondary education and the workforce. Coursework Readiness 93% and 76%; Assessment Readiness 83% and 62%; College and Career Readiness 78% and 54% respectively for the two districts.

Document attached

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT)

Data available from the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) are used as indicators of teaching effectiveness. The PPAT is designed to evaluate student teachers' readiness for entry-level teaching positions across all grade levels and areas of instruction. The PPAT consists of an ongoing, formative evaluation of candidates' knowledge of students and the learning environment; and includes three summative tasks on which candidates demonstrate their ability to assess and collect data, design instruction, and implement and analyze their instructional lessons.

Candidates' PPAT scores were well above the passing score for the state of South Dakota (35). On average, we noted that our candidates had relatively lower scores on the design of instruction (task 3), and implementation and analysis of instruction (task 4) than on the initial and second tasks, with a wider range of variability in scores on the latter step. However, overall, their scores reflect the propensity for effective teaching as candidates reach the conclusion of their educational program.

Document attached

Satisfaction of Completers: Completer Exit Surveys (Completers' Perceptions of Preparedness)

Another 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. Surveys are administered to completers at the SOE graduation exit seminar. The same survey question content, with audience variations, is administered to employers (principals) and alumni on three year cycles; this report period is off cycle for these respondents.

In general, most candidates appear satisfied with the preparation received in their programs, with the overwhelming majority rating their satisfaction at the highest levels for all elements of the survey.

Document attached

## OUTCOME MEASURES / CONSUMER INFORMATION

The measures of program outcome and consumer information include 1) graduation rates from preparation programs; 2) ability of completers to meet licensing (certification), and any additional state requirements; 3) ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared; and 4) student loan default rates and other consumer information.

All education program completers meet or exceed licensing requirements due to EPP integration of SD DOE certification requirements within curriculum, policy, and graduation requirements. Policy and graduation requirements are inclusive of the SD Board of Regents mandates. This ensures that completers meet and exceed certification requirements and are fully qualified for employment in the content area and level for which they were prepared.

Document attached

In March 2020, when the US COVID shut-down started the Field Experiences Office had candidates in student teaching assignments (interns) remain with their clinical educators assisting them with online and remote instruction until April 30. Although the state granted a waiver that candidates could be done at 10 weeks, our interns remained assigned for 15 weeks. Meetings

(PPAT & exit meetings) continued to be held via zoom. Another waiver that was allowed was the 1-year COVID provisional teaching certificate (rules signed by the governor are attached) whereby students could graduate without passing the PPAT, but then had 1-year to finish the PPAT or to take a PLT exam for initial 5-year certification.

In addition, the EPP monitors developmental progression of content, pedagogy, and dispositions to help candidates with decisions related to admission, continuation, and graduation in the education profession. Candidates unable to meet EPP requirements are counseled out, removed, or required to remediate prior to graduation as needed. This contributes positively to the strong graduation rate. Preparation in each candidate's field of interest aligning with certification and licensure requirements helps with career placement and subsequently, the ability of the graduates to repay loans. BHSU 2017 (most recent Federal data released) 3 year aggregate default rate was 8.2% (aggregate means all BHSU students inclusive of all years and all programs university-wide; schools or degree are not reported). The national rate was 9.7, SD 12.9, public 2-3 year 15.2 and 4 year 7.1.  
<https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>

## 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)**

In 2018, the EPP received accreditation with no stipulations, yet one area for improvement was noted. The EPP-created Professional Disposition Assessment and satisfaction survey instrument lacked sufficient validity. The foundation for creation of these tools was the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching and InTASC Standards, yet the newly reconstructed tools were not determined to have research-based content validity and reliability (decision was received November 15, 2018). Since that time, the EPP has been working toward remediation of the AFI. A plan and timeline for reconstruction of the instruments and process for determining validity and reliability were put in place in 2018. During this report period, work was interrupted in Spring 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Further delay was incurred and work halted when adjustments had to be made to the data collection process format and a proposal for this change had to be taken back to the IRB. The EPP submitted a revised timeline along with Advanced Program Self Study materials (March 2021).  
Document attached

## 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:

The EPP is continually evolving in its approach to assuring the quality of its programs. The process by which the EPP conducts its program review and examines outcomes has not changed significantly during this report period, but we have made strides in identifying ways in which we can continue to improve our quality assurance mechanisms systematically. We describe these efforts which we have invested a great deal of time and effort in during this report period.

#### DATA STORAGE AND MANAGEMENT PLATFORM TO ENHANCE QUALITY ASSURANCE

The EPP recently completed a self study of the advanced level program, MEd in Reading. This self study led to identification of a few key areas for attention that we believe will provide benefits to all programs leading to initial licensure as well to the advanced level program. We developed a phase in plan for the purchase of a platform for data storage and management. All programs will certainly benefit from improved record keeping, easier access and management of data, and more efficient systems and tools for analyses. The EPP will demonstrate continuous improvement in record-keeping, data storage, and management by adopting a platform in which to house and organize data from key assessments across all programs. The new platform for record-keeping, storage, and management will facilitate improved tracking of candidate proficiencies and skills and monitoring and supporting candidates from admission to completion. In addition, preservation of detailed levels of data regarding candidate performances from a wide variety of authentic course embedded assessments will provide important information back to the program about areas of relative strengths and weaknesses.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF ANALYTIC RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE PROFICIENCY

Another outcome of the EPP's recent advanced level program self study was the emergence of a plan for the development of analytic rubrics for the evaluation of performance proficiency on a number of course embedded assessments. EPP programs will demonstrate improvement in generating data to 1. monitor and assess candidate proficiencies in the application of knowledge, execution of instructional, assessment, and leadership skills of the reading specialist, and demonstration of professional dispositions appropriate to the field; and 2. provide information important for on-going program evaluation and modification in order to maintain quality. The program will engage in a process of assessment instrument improvement / construction; specifically analytic rubrics to be used to evaluate candidate proficiency on course embedded assessments and clinical experiences, and admissions essay task for pre-, post-, and self-assessment. The plan outlines the steps by which the EPP will engage in analytic rubric specification and clarification then analytic rubric review and revision, and have the analytic rubrics ready for use for assessment of proficiencies within a two to three year time frame. The plan also outlines the processes which will be used to create instrumentation that can yield reliable, valid, and actionable data.

In a related effort, an ad hoc committee was formed to examine courses and assignments in the elementary education program to better align these with the elementary education standards (CAEP). The EPP believes this process will facilitate the identification of course embedded assignments for which analytic rubrics can be created to provide important proficiency information back to the program for evaluation and maintenance of quality.

#### CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

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 the 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: measures of content, certification proprietary exam, ability to plan instruction, effect on student learning, pedagogy based instruction, professional dispositions, and clinical internship performance. 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 (superintendents, principals, diverse population representatives, community content specialists, teacher fair representatives, etc.).




We believe that we will gain even greater assurance of quality in all our programs (initial as well as advanced) with the combination of a new data storage and management platform, the development of analytic rubrics that capture data on all features of performance of greatest value to the programs, and the continued use of a thorough, systematic program review process

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

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.  
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **Executive\_Order\_and\_Conditional\_Certification\_Due\_to\_COVID.pdf**  
 **Eight\_Annual\_Performance\_Measures\_20192020\_(Autosaved).docx**  
 **Phase\_in\_Plans\_\_All\_Adv(1).pdf**

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete 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 review 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**