BLACK HILLS

STATE UNIVERSITY

CAEP Accountability Measures

EPP Performance Report

(reporting data fall 2019-spring 2021)

School of Education
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

CAEP Accountability Measures R = initial A = advanced		
Impact Measures	**Assessment**	**Administration cycle/time**
Measure 1 (Initial). Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1)	R Student-Teacher Assessment Report System (STARS) R Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) R Faculty Evaluation (Danielson Framework)	Annually Annually Annually
Measure 2. (Initial and/or Advanced). Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2|R5.3 | RA.4.1)	R/A Employer Survey (Danielson Framework) R/A Teacher Education Advisory Committee Agenda/Summary R Field Experience Governance Committee Agenda/Summary	3-year cycle Annually Semester
Outcome Measures	**Assessment**	
Measure 3 (Initial and/or Advanced). Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3 |RA3.4)	R/A Praxis Content – Proprietary R PPAT – Proprietary R Clinical Intern Evaluations R Professional Dispositions A Rubrics (per 2018 advanced program review; rubrics are in development)	Pass required prior to student teach Pass required prior to exit Final reported (3-6 formative) Student teaching reported (tracked from admission to exit) In development
Measure 4 (Initial and/or Advanced). Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared	R Licensure requirements all met prior to graduation A Endorsement requirements all met prior to graduation	Throughout program Throughout profram

Impact Measures	Assessment
Measure 1 (Initial). Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1)	R Student-Teacher Assessment Report System (STARS) R Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) R Faculty Evaluation (Danielson Framework)

Impact measures of completer effectiveness demonstrate that our graduates from teacher education are effectively teaching K-12 students across the nation.

South Dakota Codified Law 13-42-70, a law ensuring privacy protection for P-12 students and teachers in South Dakota, legally prevents the State DOE from providing data to the EPP. This means that our EPP cannot get data for a specific teacher's students to help show student growth.

The EPP at Black Hills State University has developed strategies to gather multiple measures of Completer Impact on P-12 Learning and Development. SD law prohibits sharing evaluation data of P-12 students and teachers obtained in schools and districts that is disaggregated further than school level. Therefore, it was necessary for the EPP to create a unique process for data collection. The EPP uses direct and indirect measures 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 voluntarily provided Student Learning Outcome (SLO) employer evaluations, Teacher Evaluation -Ratings, 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. Only the STARS data may be legally disclosed publicly. Indirect measures include employer, graduate, alumni surveys, and advisory committee recommendations.

The SD DOE and STARS reporting noted that (Underlining is added for clarity of missing data in tables below): Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and unprecedented learning conditions, this year's Report Card data are not comparable to past years. Certain data are incomplete and not representative of the student population.

An overall score was not calculated for schools for the 2020-2021 Report Cards. In addition, a school's "school support" status is based upon performance results from the 2018-2019 school year. Finally, student progress data are not available for the 2020-2021 school year.

Completer's Impact on P-12 Learning –

Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2020-2021 Academic Year	**English Language Arts**		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency		56	45
Elementary Only	53	60	51
% of Students Demonstrating Growth			

Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2020-2021 Academic Year	**Math**		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency		45	34
Elementary Only	43	54	54
% of Students Demonstrating Growth			

Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2020-2021 Academic Year	**Science**		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency		41	39
% of Students Demonstrating Growth			

Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
College and Career Readiness 2013-2016 Academic Years: Range for Percentage of Students Achieving the Benchmark			
State ACT Benchmark	State	District 1	District 2
Engl > 18			
Math >20			
2020-2021 only avg provided	22	23	22
Coursework	82	86	82
Assessment	63	69	54
College and Career	57	65	52

Assessment Readiness for College or Career	Coursework Readiness for College or Career* 2020-21 Report Card
✓ **College English Readiness-** **meet 1 of 3 options:** 1. State Assessment-ELA (Level 3 or 4) 2. ACT English (sub-score 18) 3. Accuplacer-Sentence Skills (Score 86-120 OR Accuplacer- NextGen Writing (score263+) ✓ **College Math Readiness-** **meet 1 of 3 options:** 1. State Assessment-Math (Level 3 or 4) 2. ACT Math (sub-score 20) 3. Accuplacer-Algebra (score 76-120) OR Accuplacer- NextGen-Quantitative Reasoning, Algebra & Statistics (score 255-300)	✓ **CTE Concentrator** • 2 approved CTE courses from the cluster, pathway, or dual credit level within the same career cluster ✓ **Dual Credit** • 1 course completed in the state-sponsored dual credit program* ✓ **Advanced Placement exam** • 1 course completed with an exam score of 3 or higher
✓ **Career English and Math Readiness-** **earn silver or higher** • National Career Readiness Certificate	✓ **High School Graduation Advanced Endorsement**** • Earn 1 or more endorsements

**In 2020, the benchmark for completing dual credit could be either a "C or higher" or a "pass" due to the pandemic; in future years (2021 and forward) the benchmark will go back to "C or higher".*

***In the 2021 report card, students that earn 1 or more advanced endorsements will count in the coursework readiness measure.*

Student Learning Outcomes and Faculty Evaluations by the Administrator

Data for SLO and TE-Ratings are returned to school faculty and may be voluntarily provided to the EPP in May of the following year. This data will be posted upon receipt.

Impact Measures	Assessment
Measure 2. (Initial and/or Advanced). Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2|R5.3 | RA.4.1)	R/A Employer Survey (Danielson Framework) R/A Teacher Education Advisory Committee Agenda/Summary R Field Experience Governance Committee Agenda/Summary

Employer Survey – Professional Teacher Preparation Program

The Employer and Alumni Survey Questions delve into employer determination of the completer's a) Planning and Preparation, b) Classroom Environment, c) Instruction, and d) Professional Responsibilities. The instrument is aligned with InTASC Standards and the Danielson Framework. https://danielsongroup.org/framework/ ; https://ccsso.org/taxonomy/term/208 Questions are mirrored, yet tailored to the specific respondent, to evaluation of growth and research into employer, alumni, and completer (at graduation) data.

Teacher grade/content you are rating:

- Indicate to what degree you believe BHSU has prepared you to do the following, with 1 lowest, 5 highest, and NA to indicate not applicable. We will also appreciate your comments.

		RATING SCALE					
		NA	Lowest				Highest
		na	1	2	3	4	5
1	The teacher demonstrates understanding of the fundamental concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content she or he teaches.	na	1	2	3	4	5
2	The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students develop and learn and designs instruction that promotes their mental, social and personal development.	na	1	2	3	4	5
3	The teacher uses research on pedagogy to create meaningful learning experiences.	na	1	2	3	4	5
4	The teacher respects all students and appreciates students from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with exceptionalities.	na	1	2	3	4	5
5	The teacher creates instruction designed for students from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with exceptionalities.	na	1	2	3	4	5
6	The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to promote student's critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	na	1	2	3	4	5
7	The teacher integrates technology to enhance students' learning.	na	1	2	3	4	5
8	The teacher establishes a safe and positive classroom climate.	na	1	2	3	4	5
9	The teacher demonstrates understanding of motivation and behavior to create a classroom environment that encourages active learning and self-motivation.	na	1	2	3	4	5
10	The teacher uses effective verbal, non-verbal and media communication techniques in the classroom.	na	1	2	3	4	5
11	The teacher plans instruction effectively based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, community, and curriculum frameworks, including state and national standards.	na	1	2	3	4	5
12	The teacher demonstrates understanding of assessment strategies to ensure students' intellectual, social, and physical development.	na	1	2	3	4	5

13	The teacher reflects upon and evaluates instructional practices to support student learning.	na	1	2	3	4	5
14	The teacher continually seeks opportunities for professional growth and development.	na	1	2	3	4	5
15	The teacher communicates and interacts positively with parents/guardians, colleagues, and the community.	na	1	2	3	4	5
16	The teacher demonstrates understanding of the legal and ethical responsibilities of the teaching profession.	na	1	2	3	4	5

Employer Survey – Professional Teacher Preparation Program (Results)

Item	Year	returned/ sent	%	1	2	3	4	NA
1	2015	9/40	23%				9	
	2018	6/36	17%				6	
	2021	11/38	29%			2	0	
2	2015	9/40	23%			6	3	
	2018	6/36	17%				4	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
3	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
4	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
5	2015	9/40	23%				9	
	2018	6/36	17%				6	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
6	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
7	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			3	3	
	2021	11/38	29%			2	9	
8	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			3	3	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
9	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
10	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			3	3	
	2021	11/38	29%			2	9	
11	2015	9/40	23%				9	
	2018	6/36	17%				6	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
12	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			3	3	
	2021	11/38	29%			1	10	
13	2015	9/40	23%			6	3	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			3	8	
14	2015	9/40	23%			6	3	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			2	9	
15	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			3	8	
16	2015	9/40	23%			2	7	
	2018	6/36	17%			2	4	
	2021	11/38	29%			2	9	

** % return rate is 22% so not acceptable for strong interpretation; inferences and thoughts but not statistically significant*

Completer Survey Results 2018-2019 Reported as percentage N = 138				
Item		NA 1-3 lowest	4	5 highest
1	The teacher demonstrates understanding of the fundamental concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content she or he teaches.	3	30	67
2	The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students develop and learn and designs instruction that promotes their mental, social and personal development.	4	20	76
3	The teacher uses research on pedagogy to create meaningful learning experiences.	7	31	62
4	The teacher respects all students and appreciates students from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with exceptionalities.	2	8	90
5	The teacher creates instruction designed for students from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with exceptionalities.	7	25	68
6	The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to promote student's critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	3	20	77
7	The teacher integrates technology to enhance students' learning.	8	23	69
8	The teacher establishes a safe and positive classroom climate.	0	11	89
9	The teacher demonstrates understanding of motivation and behavior to create a classroom environment that encourages active learning and self-motivation.	5	30	65
10	The teacher uses effective verbal, non-verbal and media communication techniques in the classroom.	3	27	70
11	The teacher plans instruction effectively based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, community, and curriculum frameworks, including state and national standards.	3	23	74
12	The teacher demonstrates understanding of assessment strategies to ensure students' intellectual, social, and physical development.	9	24	67
13	The teacher reflects upon and evaluates instructional practices to support student learning.	3	20	77
14	The teacher continually seeks opportunities for professional growth and development.	6	19	76
15	The teacher communicates and interacts positively with parents/guardians, colleagues, and the community.	8	21	71

16	The teacher demonstrates understanding of the legal and ethical responsibilities of the teaching profession.	4	19	77

Black Hills State University
Advanced Level Programs Phase In Plans
Phase-In Plan for Program Preparation Satisfaction Survey Development

Relationship to Standard/Component	
CAEP Standard Component Addressed in Plan	Standard 4: Satisfaction with Preparation *The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.* Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice; Partnerships for Clinical Preparation A2.1 *Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for advanced program candidate outcomes.*
Objective	Data regarding the satisfaction of completers, employers, and other program partners or constituents can provide important, highly relevant information for analyzing the outcomes and consequences of program preparation courses and experiences, completer persistence, employment milestones, career orientation and paths of progress that can facilitate program evaluation, planning, and adaptations, adjustments, or revisions. However, current surveys are in need of revision to improve the quality and usefulness of data provided. This plan outlines the process and steps for review and reconstruction of a Program Preparation Satisfaction Survey that can be administered to completers, alumni, employees, and other relevant program partners.
Description of Process for Instrument Design	**Administration and Purpose** The purpose of this phase-in plan is to align the current instrument with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments survey specific indicators. The assessment rubric is the basis for the process to ensure that the survey reaches level 3 or above for the administration and purpose, content, and data quality. Within the phase-in plan is the intent to develop methods to ensure a high response rate. Administration of the survey for each group of intended respondents will be annual at exit and on a 3-year rotation for alumni and employers. **Content** The survey requires detailed review and reconstruction to ensure queries and indicators are properly constructed. Alignment with professional standards will also be reviewed and revised. This alignment is important to ensure that rating choices are reflective of observable and measurable performance or behavior directly related to effective work as a reading specialist.

Cont. Description of Process for Instrument Design	Goals for redevelopment of the instrument include clear delineation of alignment with ILA Standards and establishing validity and reliability. Each item of the Education Survey will be mirrored on Employer and Completer Surveys as a method of examining relationships between responses and determining EPP needs for continuous improvement. While questions will be the same, survey instructions and context will be tailored to the audience. **Data** The survey plan details the use of Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio and methodology to establish instrument validity. Validity of interpretations will be solid since each of the assessments occurs in the daily educational environment of the P-12 teachers. Concerns with validity of interpretations are minimized with extensive assessor training for use of the assessments and review of interpretations by the assessment committee, and EPP and school partners. Results will be shared and discussed with SOE faculty and EPP partners for the purpose of program guidance and enhancement.
Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design	**Fall 2020** Establish Survey Development team: PI will establish and lead a team of 1 EPP faculty, 1 program faculty, and 2 K-12 faculty/administration. Establish research timeline: Survey team discuss and establish a timeline for meetings and expectations to ensure completion. Item determination: Review existing items for 1) CAEP EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS - Survey; 2) structure and content (e.g. clarity v vagueness, singular vs compound, performance/concrete vs behavioral/theoretical, etc); 3) alignment with Professional Standards. **Spring 2021** Establish Survey content validity using CVR as per Lawshe (reference list): Survey items to panel for content validity and later reliability: Determine panel of 5 experts (Employer – principals, Alumni – graduates 1-3 years employed with above basic performance evaluations, Graduate – semester, inclusive of elementary, secondary, and K-12 content areas). Provide Survey items and directions for the evaluation of each item. Return time is 30 days. Progress check and creation of communications Contact all panel members who have not submitted responses reminding of the due date. If needed, bring in an alternate. Data collected: All data is collected and recorded CVR determined: Assessment test and measurement expert analyzes data for the following parameters: CVR minimum of 1.00 and p=.05 Final determination and discussion to take to faculty: Survey team meets, including assessment T and M expert and assessment coordinator and determines conclusions and final Survey inclusions.

Continued: Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design	SOE input and vote: Information shared with all faculty for review, schedule discussion times and vote. **Spring 2022** Survey Administration Survey administration will occur: Employer: each 3rd year starting on an even fall, Alumni: each 3rd year starting on an odd fall, Graduate: each semester
Resources and Personnel Responsible	The following College of Education faculty and staff are responsible for the implementation of this plan: Program Coordinator and Faculty of the M.Ed. Reading: --Dr. Denice Turner, ELA, M.Ed. Coordinator --Dr. Jarrett Moore, Graduate Research --Dr. Ryan Amys, Secondary Ed, Director Project Second --Dr. Faye LaDuke Pelster, Reading --Dr. Brian Eberhard, Social Sciences, MSCI Director --Dr. Rich Carriveau, Reading Capital: SOE Operating Budget Technology: EPP Website
Assurance of Data Quality	Annual assessment reports by the SOE Assessment Committee, written and verbal, will include summary of FA in aggregate for EPP and each program disaggregated. Assessment retreat for discipline and EPP review and discussion Reports to be available through the Assessment Coordinator and Committee

Teacher Education Advisory Council Agenda/Summary

The Teacher Education Advisory Council, TEAC, is an important partner group that provides our EPP with insight, advice, and awareness. The TEAC is comprised of school personnel including administrators, human resources, counselors, education-related entities such as TIE-SD. The council annually reviews EPP data, processes, and policy from admission to graduation.

BHSU SOE Advisory Council
Minutes – October 28, 2021

Members Present: details redacted for partners and external members; EPP names included.

Time	Topic
11:30	Dr. L.P. welcomed members followed by lunch downstairs.
11:45	Lawshe Validation – members completed this and submitted their feedback Dr. L.P. indicated she will summarize the findings and bring results to the next meeting Additional groups for validation – SOE Faculty, P-12 Teachers The following input was provided by members: • "Educated language" – clarify if this is education lingo or grammatically correct language (JM) • "Indirect teaching styles and direct teaching styles" – what is this and is this language outdated? (JM) • Important to consider what interns have coming in and what they leave ST with (BH) • A lot of the items on the PDA p. 2 are "bonus" (DO) • Add "Seek ways to become active in the field" (JH)
11:45	Dr. Denice Turner provided an update on the M.Ed. in Reading • CAEP Accreditation • No areas for improvement • Working to develop reliable analytical rubric (growth model – Admission thru Completion) • Council members expressed the value of this program and the high number of graduates they employ.
12:00	Strengths and Areas for Growth as Identified by Board Members • Have we ever considered a Diagnosis and Remediation course for math? (JH) • Candidates are coming to the schools knowing what to do (program requirements, processes, etc) (DO) • Great candidates-a lot of drive, willingness to succeed (BH) • Administrators have complete confidence hiring our graduates. (DO) • Some interns ask administrators to come observe them, but not all. Should this be a requirement? (BH) • Clinical educators express very positive feedback about interns (JB) • Interns are open to feedback and this is an important quality for a future teacher (JH) • How much emphasis is given to teaching interns how to engage virtual learners? Learning Management Systems (LMS) are not just for virtual learning. How much is this covered in the preparation program? (JH) • Standards-based grading…is this covered? Interns don't seem to know about this. (BH) • Competency-based grading is the next thing moving forward. Personalized competency based grading (JM)

	• Can districts get feedback on the CE's in their buildings? (BH) • Can BH SOE Faculty support teachers after they graduate? (DO) • Newcastle's New Teacher Induction program is stellar. Can SOE faculty fit as part of something similar to that in partner schools? (JH) • A reminder about the state mentoring program for new teachers…(JH)
12:30	Needs identified at last spring's meeting were reviewed, along with BHSU responses (see attached PowerPoint)
12:45	Selection of Clinical Educators – Dr. L.P. shared CAEP language from STD R2.2. Discussion ensued about various processes and requirements for selecting CE's. • Sharla sends an email. I'm picky about who gets an intern in my building. It would be helpful if a specific grade level or grade level band was included with the request for placement. (BH) • CE's need training. The webinars don't seem to be the best way to do that…not well-attended. (DO) • The paperwork that comes with each intern's request for placement is helpful. (JB) The council will continue this discussion at our Spring 2022 meeting and address the following: • Look at current BHSU SOE requirements for CE's. • Brainstorm incentives for CE's (e.g. credit, increased stipend, etc…)
1:30	Meeting Adjourned

Black Hills State University
School of Education: Field Experience Governance Committee
Wednesday, November 4, 4:000 pm via ZOOM

Proposed Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

THANK YOU **to schools for continuing to partner and work with BHSU students during the COVID response!**

Members (bold members present)

[redacted]
Teacher, Belle Fourche Middle School
Rapid City HR
Belle Fourche Elementary
BHSU, Physical Education faculty
BHSU, Director of Field Experiences
Principal, Douglas High School
Teacher, Belle Fourche Elementary
BHSU, Assistant Professor, Elem Lit Edu
Stagebarn Middle School
Rapid City HR
Teacher, Spearfish Mt. View Elementary
Principal, Creekside Elem, Spearfish
Principal, Stagebarn Middle School
BHSU, Office of Field Experience
Principal, New Underwood Jr/Sr High
Teacher, Rapid City Stevens High School
Teacher, Belle Fourche Middle School
BHSU, SPED faculty, SPED-MAT Director

Purpose, as per the School of Education Policy and Procedures:

1.3.3 Field Experience Governance Committee

a. This committee shall include the Director of Field Experiences (Chair), university faculty representatives, P-12 clinical faculty and partner school administrative representatives.
b. The committee shall be responsible for:
    1. Meeting twice a year, in the fall and spring.
    2. Making recommendations regarding governance and policy of field experiences.
    3. Designing, implementing, and evaluating field experiences and clinical practices in collaboration with school partners.
    4. Ensuring that candidate experiences include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.
    5. Ensuring input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators on candidate preparation.
    6. Keep minutes in the Office of Field Experiences.

Reports:

Fall 2020 Placement Statistics: (placements were a little tougher to fill than usual)

EDFN295 (151 placement requests = 124 placements @ 20 hr each) [-38 change from Fall 2019]
ECE (43 placement requests = 27 placements @40-90 hrs each) [-3]
SEED495 (50 requests = 34 placements @45 hrs each)
MLED495 (7 = 3 placements @135 hrs each)
ELED495 (39 in field @6 weeks each)
SPED495 (18 requests = 15 placements @90 hrs each)
495 placements [+47]
EDFN595 (45 requests = 39 placements @40 hrs each) [+21]
ED695 (50 requests = 41 placements @45 hrs each) [+20]
ST (46 in field) [+15]
TOTAL = 368 (60 more than Fall 2019)

Field Office Changes – forms have moved to online submissions in Rapid City as well as at BHSU.

Teacher Fair – will be virtual on Wednesday, April 7, 2021 – more information to come

Feedback – please let student teachers know they should be applying for jobs before this date and not waiting until the teacher fair. Schools will be having openings posted and may have filled some jobs by April 7.

Items for Discussion:

Thoughts about p9 in student teacher handbook?

- # of observations? (Supervisors propose 4 for 16-wk; 3 for 10-wk; 2 for 8-wk; eliminate 6wk)

Feedback – this seems reasonable to clarify so it is more clear to everyone.

Other thoughts about the student teacher handbook?

[redacted] brought up topic of Plan of Assistance and Lesson Planning:

Plan of Assistance – should there be more guidance about when to start a PoA?

Lesson Planning – should there be more directive about when an intern should submit utilizing the formal BHSU lesson plan template vs using more teacher-friendly templates?

Feedback was neutral. These topics will be brought up with university supervisors at their next meeting.

Black Hills State University
School of Education: Field Experience Governance Committee
Tuesday, April 20, 2021 - 4:000 pm via ZOOM

https://bhsu.zoom.us/j/98897005828?pwd=aGVOUFFDbWVLU3h5ck5sRFdNUXI1UT09&from=addon

Proposed Agenda

Welcome and Introduction



THANK YOU teachers & administrators for partnering to work with BHSU students!

Members (bold members present)

[redacted] SPED Teacher, Belle Fourche Middle School
[redacted] Rapid City HR
[redacted] Belle Fourche Elementary
[redacted] BHSU, Physical Education faculty
[redacted] BHSU, Director of Field Experiences
[redacted] Principal, Douglas High School
[redacted] Teacher, Belle Fourche Elementary
[redacted] BHSU, Assistant Professor, Elem Lit Edu
[redacted] Stagebarn Middle School
[redacted] Rapid City HR
[redacted] Teacher, Spearfish Mt. View Elementary
[redacted] Principal, Creekside Elem, Spearfish
[redacted] Principal, Stagebarn Middle School
[redacted] BHSU, Office of Field Experience
[redacted] Principal, New Underwood Jr/Sr High
[redacted] Teacher, Rapid City Stevens High School
[redacted] Teacher, Belle Fourche Middle School
[redacted] BHSU, SPED faculty, SPED-MAT Director

Purpose, as per the School of Education Policy and Procedures:

1.3.3 Field Experience Governance Committee

c. This committee shall include the Director of Field Experiences (Chair), university faculty representatives, P-12 clinical faculty and partner school administrative representatives.
d. The committee shall be responsible for:
   7. Meeting twice a year, in the fall and spring.
   8. Making recommendations regarding governance and policy of field experiences.
   9. Designing, implementing, and evaluating field experiences and clinical practices in collaboration with school partners.
   10. Ensuring that candidate experiences include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.
   11. Ensuring input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators on candidate preparation.

12. Keep minutes in the Office of Field Experiences.

Reports:

Spring 2021 Placement Statistics:

ED295 (13 placement requests = 13 placements @15 hr each) [-2 change from Spring 2020]
EDFN295 (132 placement requests = 112 placements @ 20 hr each) [-4]
ECE (8 placement requests = 7 placements @40-135 hrs each) [-6]
SEED495 (20 requests = 19 placements @45 hrs each) [-2]
MLED495 (0 = 0 placements @135 hrs each) [-3]
ELED495 (17 in field @6 weeks each) [-8]
SPEDX95 (25 requests = 23 placements @45-90 hrs each) [+14]
Student Teachers (99 in field) [+9]

TOTAL = 290 placements [+7 more than Spring 2020]

Teacher Fair – was held virtual on Wednesday, April 7, 2021 – 41 schools participated, 79 teacher candidates participated. See school list at https://bhsu.joinhandshake.com/career_fairs/21084#employers

BHSU Camp Invention 2021, academic STEM camp June 21-25 for students entering K-5. https://www.bhsu.edu/About-BHSU/Community/Summer-Academic-Camps We are welcoming 65 campers this summer and 3 of our undergraduate students (in addition to certified teachers) will facilitate and lead students in a series of hands-on, creative, and problem-solving modules from the National Inventors Hall of Fame. (scholarships available too)

BHSU has a new logo. https://www.bhsu.edu/About-BHSU/New-Logo

Old Business:

- # of observations was passed (4 for 16-wk; 3 for 10-wk; 2 for 8-wk; eliminated 6wk placements)

New Business:

Questions/Concerns/Comments:

- Sub pay concern. Should student teachers be paid for subbing? (This is at the discretion of the district and should be discussed with the BHSU Director of Field Experiences before student teachers serve as a substitute – as per handbook, pg8 of 2020-2021 internship handbook)
- Background checks are still taking a long time to return. Rapid City schools have written a "pending policy" whereby interns can start when their fingerprinting as been submitted. August Hicks offered to share their policy. Sharla shared her discussion with DCI in Pierre. (SDCL pasted below)
- Congratulations to [redacted], new Assistant Principal position in Meade County 😊
- **13-10-12. Criminal background investigation--Prospective employees, technical college instructors, and student teachers--Temporary employment pending results.**
- Each person over eighteen years of age hired by a school district shall submit to a criminal background investigation, by means of fingerprint checks by the Division of Criminal Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The school district shall submit completed fingerprint cards to the Division of Criminal Investigation before the prospective new employee enters into service. If no disqualifying record is identified at the state level, the fingerprints shall be forwarded by the Division of Criminal Investigation to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a national criminal history record check. Any person whose employment is subject to the requirements of this section may enter into service on a

temporary basis pending receipt of results of the criminal background investigation. The employing school district may, without liability, withdraw its offer of employment or terminate the temporary employment without notice if the report reveals a disqualifying record. The employing school district may pay any fees charged for the cost of fingerprinting or the criminal background investigation for any person whose employment is subject to the requirements of this section. Any person hired to officiate, judge, adjudicate, or referee a public event sponsored by a school district is not required to submit to a criminal background investigation as required in this section. In addition, any instructor employed by a technical college is required to submit to a criminal background investigation as required in this section at the time of initial employment.

- The criminal investigation required by this section with respect to a student teacher completing requirements for teacher certification shall be conducted by the school district. A criminal background investigation, of a student teacher, conducted by a school district may be provided to any other school in which the student engages in student teaching. The school district conducting the criminal background investigation of a student teacher may rely upon the results of that investigation for employment of that person as an employee of the district.

Outcome Measures	Assessment
Measure 3 (Initial and/or Advanced). Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3 |RA3.4)	R/A Praxis Content – Proprietary R PPAT – Proprietary R Clinical Intern Evaluations R Professional Dispositions A Rubrics (per 2018 advanced program review; rubrics are in development)

How Praxis Content Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards
Praxis is a proprietary assessment required by the state Department of Education for licensure and BHSU/BOR prior to clinical internship.

The EPP requires candidates PASS prior to Clinical Internship so by default a 100% pass rate.

Advanced Programs 2020-2021

Test Name	*Test Code*	*SD Pass*	*BHSU Average Score*
Reading Specialist (7 completers)	**5301**	**164**	**175**

Initial Programs FA20 Praxis Scores

Test Name	*Test Code*	*SD Pass*	*BHSU Average Score*
Eled: MS Reading Lang Arts Sbtst	**5002**	**150**	**163**
Eled: MS Mathematics Subtest	**5003**	**146**	**170**
Eled: MS Social Studies Subtest	**5004**	**147**	***162***
Eled: MS Science Subtest	**5005**	**150**	***166***
Aggregate of Programs < 10 completers (not detailed to ensure candidate privacy)	**n=32**	**Fail=3**	**Pass=29**

Test Name	Test Code
Education of Young Children	**5024**
Eng Lang Arts: CK	**5038**
Social Studies: CK	**5081**
Physical Ed: CK	**5091**
Music: CK	**5113**
Art: CK	**5134**
Biology: CK	**5235**
SE: Core Knowledge & Appl	**5354**
General Science: CK	**5435**
Middle School Science	**5440**
SPED:Preschool/Early Childhood	**5691**
World & US History: CK	**5941**

Initial Programs SP21 Praxis Scores

Test Name	*Test Code*	*SD Pass*	*BHSU Average Score*
Eled: MS Reading Lang Arts Sbtst	**5002**	**150**	**168**
Eled: MS Mathematics Subtest	**5003**	**146**	**174**
Eled: MS Social Studies Subtest	**5004**	**147**	**167**
Eled: MS Science Subtest	**5005**	**150**	**173**
English Language Arts: CK	**5038**	**167**	**180**
Aggregate of Programs < 10 completers (not detailed to ensure candidate privacy)	**n=82**	**Fail=2**	**Pass=80**

Test Name	Test Code
Education of Young Children	**5024**
Early Childhood Education	**5025**
Eng Lang Arts: CK	**5038**
Social Studies: CK	**5081**
Physical Ed: CK	**5091**
Business Education: CK	**5101**
Music: CK	**5113**
Art: CK	**5134**
Mathematics: CK	**5161**
Middle School Mathematics	**5169**
Chemistry: CK	**5245**
SE: Core Knowledge & Appl	**5354**
General Science: CK	**5435**
Earth & Space Sciences: CK	**5571**
Special Ed: Preschool/Early Child.	**5691**
World & US History: CK	**5941**
Elem Ed: CKT Science Subtest	**7804**
Elem Ed: Social Studies Subtest	**7805**

How PPAT in Totum Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

InTASC Standards are the best-practice guide of "what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure every K-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today's world." Accepted and endorsed by numerous professional education organizations such as AACTE, NASBE, and NEA (and many others), InTASC certainly provides appropriate standards for alignment. Praxis alignment of PPAT tasks with InTASC standards provides evidence that completers achieving passing scores for have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for effective impact on P-12 learners.

Alignment of PPAT Task Requirements with Discipline Standards		
PPAT task	Number of indicators	Indicators
Task 2	11	1(a), 2(b), 2(f), 6(b), 6(c), 6(d), 6(g), 6(h), 7(d), 8(b), 9(c)
Task 3	22	1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f), 3(e), 4(e), 4(f), 4(g), 6(a), 6(c), 6(d), 6(g), 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), 7(f), 8(a), 8(b), 9(c)
Task 4	27	1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 3(d), 3(f), 4(c), 4(d), 4(f), 4(h), 5(h), 6(a), 6(b), 6(c), 6(g), 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), 7(f), 8(a), 8(b), 8(f), 8(h), 8(i), 9(c)
Overall	33	1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f), 3(d), 3(e), 3(f), 4(c), 4(d), 4(e), 4(f), 4(g), 4(h), 5(h), 6(a), 6(b), 6(c), 6(d), 6(g), 6(h), 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), 7(f), 8(a), 8(b), 8(f), 8(h), 8(i), 9(c)

Research of validity for PPAT –InTASC alignment is found at https://www.ets.org/s/ppa/pdf/RM-15-10.pdf

CAEP Data Analysis: PPAT

FACTOR	YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	MEAN
TOTAL TASK 1 SCORE	F 2020 S 2021	141 unduplicated Scores Results include 3 candidates who did not pass; candidates do not graduate until a passing score of 35 is achieved	60	**53.33**
TOTAL TASK 2 SCORE			12	**8.34**
TOTAL TASK 3 SCORE			16	**11.66**
TOTAL TASK 4 SCORE			32	**23.11**
TOTAL TASKS 2, 3, AND 4 SCORE			60	**43.41***

How Clinical Internship Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

The student teaching experience is the clinical practice that occurs just before completion of all teacher certification programs at Black Hills State University. Therefore, the student teaching final appraisal is a summative evaluation of all aspects of pedagogy as applied in clinical practice. This instrument is a rubric completed by both clinical faculty in P-12 schools and university supervisors. The program collects data for program evaluation from the forms completed by clinical faculty. Each performance indicator on the rubric is evaluated by circling O for *outstanding performance*, P for *proficient*, U for *unsatisfactory*, or NA for *not applicable*. The "not applicable" rating may be used only by university supervisors since clinical faculty have many ongoing opportunities to observe performance on all indicators. A rating of "proficient" is required in all areas for successful completion of the student teaching experience.

The rubric assesses program-specific state/national standards as reflected on the data chart and simultaneously assesses the ten standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). Detail of the InTASC Standards may be found at: https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf

2020-2021 Final Appraisal Data Aggregate Clinical Educator and University Supervisor	
n= 104	% Distinguished or Proficient by CE or US
inTASC1a	**96**
inTASC1b	**94**
inTASC2	**96**
inTASC3a	**92**
inTASC3b	**99**
inTASC3c	**97**
inTASC4	**93**
inTASC5a	**97**
inTASC5b	**95**
inTASC6a	**93**
inTASC6b	**92**
inTASC7a	**96**
inTASC7b	**93**
inTASC7c	**96**
inTASC8a	**95**
inTASC8b	**89**
inTASC8c	**94**
inTASC9a	**97**
inTASC9b	**97**
inTASC10a	**94**
inTASC10b	**95**
EPP minimum acceptable rate 80%	
number of students with Basic	
0	
1 to 3	13
4 to 6	0
≥ 7	7

How Professional Dispositions Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

The Professional Disposition Assessment (PDA) demonstrates candidate mastery of professionalism and dispositions essential for an effective teacher. The PDA dispositions echo the BHSU mission of Competent, Confident, and Caring Professionals and includes the South Dakota Code of Ethics for Teachers. The assessment aligns directly with InTASC Standard content related to confident and caring as well as professional development and professional relationships and interactions with P-12 students and parents, district personnel, and community. InTASC Standards are referenced within the assessment tool.

The PDA is a rubric administered formally by faculty and clinical educators at each of 3 transition points in the program. Only the final PDA during transition point 3 completed during the final clinical evaluation by the clinical educator is used for this assessment. However, the education program tracks the development of professionalism formally with the PDA at each of the three transition points explained in the program overview. Additionally, the PDA may be used by any faculty university-wide, at any time, to document TC behavior that warrants review. This helps ensure that there is growth and development of professionalism

rather than a one-shot measure.

EPP Achievement

(next page) (next page)

% of Consistently	% of Most of the Time	% of Occasionally % of Rarely % of Never	% of Not Observed	Dispositional Behavior
				Professional Conduct (SD Code of Ethics for Teachers)
94%	**5%**	**1%**	**0%**	1. is present, punctual, and prepared for class
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. completes assigned tasks that demonstrate high personal standards and best effort
96%	**4%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. models professional attire and personal hygiene
92%	**8%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. models educated language and behavior (InTASC 5)
82%	**4%**	**0%**	**14%**	5. recognizes her/his professional responsibility by being actively engaged in class (InTASC 9)
100%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	6. complies with university/SOE/school building/district policies and/or procedures
99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	7. maintains professional relationships with students (InTASC 10)
90%	**0%**	**0%**	**10%**	8. maintains confidentiality of professional information acquired about students, peers, and professional members of the university & P-12 schools (InTASC 10)
				Competent Professionals
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. knows subject matter is not a fixed body of facts but is continuously evolving (InTASC 4)
90%	**10%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. is committed to continuous learning and engages in professional discourse about subject matter knowledge and students' learning of the discipline (InTASC 4)
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. knows plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on classroom circumstances, student needs, and student ideas (InTASC 7)
78%	**22%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. values the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities (InTASC 5 & 9)
81%	**19%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. is committed to the continuous development of individual students' abilities and considers how motivational strategies encourage development for each student (InTASC 1 & 8)
65%	**31%**	**0%**	**4%**	6. is committed to using assessment and evaluation to identify student strengths and promote student growth (InTASC 6)
				Confident Professionals
99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. shows respect for the individual learner and/or diverse talents of all learners (InTASC 2)
73%	**27%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. uses students' strengths as a basis for growth and their errors as an opportunity for learning (InTASC 2)
76%	**24%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning (InTASC 3)

80%	**20%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. uses language to foster self-expression and identity development (InTASC 6)
75%	**25%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. values the role of students in promoting each other's learning (InTASC 3)
82%	**17%**	**0%**	**1%**	6. values and encourages many modes of communication in the classroom (InTASC 8)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	7. displays a positive, enthusiastic attitude toward the discipline(s) taught (InTASC 4)
94%	**6%**	**0%**	**0%**	8. is committed to reflection and continuous refining practices (InTASC 9)
				Caring Professionals
96%	**4%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. appreciates and values human diversity, shows respect for others' varied talents and perspectives (InTASC 1 & 2)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. believes all children can learn and persists in helping others achieve success (InTASC 2)
99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. respects others as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests (InTASC 2 & 3)
95%	**5%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. takes responsibility for establishing a positive classroom climate by making students feel valued and helps them to value each other (InTASC 3)
95%	**5%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. is concerned about all aspects of a child's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical), and is alert to signs of difficulties (InTASC 1)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	6. is willing to work with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment for students (InTASC 10)

% of Consistently	% of Most of the Time	% of Occasionally % of Rarely % of Never	% of Not Observed	Dispositional Behavior
				Professional Conduct (SD Code of Ethics for Teachers)
94%	**5%**	**1%**	**0%**	1. is present, punctual, and prepared for class
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. completes assigned tasks that demonstrate high personal standards and best effort
96%	**4%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. models professional attire and personal hygiene
92%	**8%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. models educated language and behavior (InTASC 5)
82%	**4%**	**0%**	**14%**	5. recognizes her/his professional responsibility by being actively engaged in class (InTASC 9)
100%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	6. complies with university/SOE/school building/district policies and/or procedures
99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	7. maintains professional relationships with students (InTASC 10)
90%	**0%**	**0%**	**10%**	8. maintains confidentiality of professional information acquired about students, peers, and professional members of the university & P-12 schools (InTASC 10)
				Competent Professionals
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. knows subject matter is not a fixed body of facts but is continuously evolving (InTASC 4)
90%	**10%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. is committed to continuous learning and engages in professional discourse about subject matter knowledge and students' learning of the discipline (InTASC 4)
89%	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. knows plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on classroom circumstances, student needs, and student ideas (InTASC 7)
78%	**22%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. values the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities (InTASC 5 & 9)
81%	**19%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. is committed to the continuous development of individual students' abilities and considers how motivational strategies encourage development for each student (InTASC 1 & 8)
65%	**31%**	**0%**	**4%**	6. is committed to using assessment and evaluation to identify student strengths and promote student growth (InTASC 6)
				Confident Professionals

99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. shows respect for the individual learner and/or diverse talents of all learners (InTASC 2)
73%	**27%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. uses students' strengths as a basis for growth and their errors as an opportunity for learning (InTASC 2)
76%	**24%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning (InTASC 3)
80%	**20%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. uses language to foster self-expression and identity development (InTASC 6)
75%	**25%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. values the role of students in promoting each other's learning (InTASC 3)
82%	**17%**	**0%**	**1%**	6. values and encourages many modes of communication in the classroom (InTASC 8)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	7. displays a positive, enthusiastic attitude toward the discipline(s) taught (InTASC 4)
94%	**6%**	**0%**	**0%**	8. is committed to reflection and continuous refining practices (InTASC 9)
				Caring Professionals
96%	**4%**	**0%**	**0%**	1. appreciates and values human diversity, shows respect for others' varied talents and perspectives (InTASC 1 & 2)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	2. believes all children can learn and persists in helping others achieve success (InTASC 2)
99%	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	3. respects others as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests (InTASC 2 & 3)
95%	**5%**	**0%**	**0%**	4. takes responsibility for establishing a positive classroom climate by making students feel valued and helps them to value each other (InTASC 3)
95%	**5%**	**0%**	**0%**	5. is concerned about all aspects of a child's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical), and is alert to signs of difficulties (InTASC 1)
98%	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	6. is willing to work with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment for students (InTASC 10)

Black Hills State University

Advanced Level Programs Phase-In Plans
Phase-In Plan for Performance Proficiency Analytic Rubric Development

Relationship to Standard/Component	
CAEP Standard Component Addressed in Plan	*A.1.1 Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced.* *A.3.3 The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion*
Objective	Creation of Analytic Rubrics to evaluate candidate proficiencies on key course embedded assessments, performance in clinical experiences, professional dispositions, and pre-/post-/self-assessment essay task. BHSU School of Education, M.Ed. in Reading, 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.

Description of Process for Instrument Design	For key course embedded assessments, clinical experiences performance assessments, professional disposition assessments, and pre- /post- essay task:
	• Determine Performance Criteria
	  ○ Sources in addition to Program Faculty brainstorming and discussion: Practicing professionals whose expertise provides knowledge of the skill set needed in the profession; Professional organizations that define requisite skills for certification; Certification exams (may reveal areas with the greatest importance in the profession); Academicians at other institutions; Academic literature search.
	  ○ Essentially, this "reflection" process calls for extensive input and discussion.
	• Set Performance Levels
	  ○ Identify type of scores to assign
	  ○ Determine number of levels
	  ○ Develop scaling / descriptive labels
	• Write Performance Descriptors for Each Level
	  ○ Write statements of expectations for each performance level for every criterion (specific and measurable, parallel language across criteria)
	• Clarifying of the Analytic Rubric

Continued: Description of Process for Instrument Design	○ Identify Anchor products, artifacts, etc. for use as exemplars ○ Evaluate: 1) Are the scoring categories well defined? 2) Are the differences between the score categories clear? And 3) Would two independent raters arrive at the same score for a given response based on the scoring rubric? • Seek Outside Review and Feedback Consider the effectiveness of the rubric: ○ Grade sample project (product) ○ Solicit review and feedback from: faculty, candidates, teachers, reading specialists, other persons with expertise in the field • Revise Analytic Rubric as Needed
Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design	Analytic Rubric Construction ***--Fall 2021*** Analytic Rubric Specification and Clarification ***--Fall 2022*** *Analytic Rubric Review and Revision* ***--Fall 2023*** Analytic Rubric Ready for Use for Assessment of Proficiencies ***--Fall 2024*** At this point, instrumentation (analytic rubrics) will be in full use with three cycles of data on candidate proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and fulfill roles and demonstrate skills appropriate to their professional field. Based on the timeline above, new data will become available for analysis at different points between our February 2021 Advanced Self-Study Submission and the completion of our Phase-in Plan.
Resources and Personnel Responsible	The following College of Education faculty and staff are responsible for the implementation of this plan: • Program Coordinator and Faculty of the M.Ed. Reading: --Dr. Denice Turner, ELA, M.Ed. Coordinator --Dr. Jarrett Moore, Graduate Research --Dr. Ryan Amys, Secondary Ed, Director Project Second --Dr. Faye LaDuke Pelster, Reading --Dr. Brian Eberhard, Social Sciences, MSCI Director --Dr. Rich Carriveau, Reading • CAEP Committee Chair • Assessment Committee Chair
Assurance of Data Quality	**Steps to Assure Validity and Reliability of Analytic Rubrics Constructed** **Validity**

Continued: Assurance of Data Quality	Content 1. Do the evaluation criteria address any extraneous content? 2. Do the evaluation criteria of the scoring rubric address all aspects of the intended content? 3. Is there any content addressed in the task that should be evaluated through the rubric, but is not? Construct 1. Are all of the important facets of the intended construct evaluated through the scoring criteria? 2. Is any of the evaluation criteria irrelevant to the construct of interest? Criterion 1. How do the scoring criteria reflect competencies that would suggest success on future or related performances? 2. What are the important components of the future or related performance that may be evaluated through the use of the assessment instrument? 3. How do the scoring criteria measure the important components of the future or related performance? 4. Are there any facets of the future or related performance that are not reflected in the scoring criteria? In addition, use of Lawshe's Content Validity Equation which essentially serves as an index of the communality or overlap between (a) performance on the evaluation instrument (analytic rubric) and (b) ability to function in the defined job performance domain. Rubric criteria to panel of 5 reading specialists: Provide directions for the evaluation of each criteria. Coefficient calculated. **Reliability** Interrater Agreement Use of rubric training sessions: All users of the rubrics established will be formally trained in its use initially; they will be trained on the meaning and intent of each criteria; calibrated to master criteria for assigning performance ratings (levels) through use of anchor products and practice scoring sessions, training will continue until higher than 90% interrater agreement is established, and users will periodically be formally checked for maintenance of calibration. Cohen's Kappa estimate of accuracy will be the coefficient used to measure interrater agreement initially and at check-ins. Intrarater Agreement Scoring procedures will be documented and reviewed with faculty; training provided to faculty on factors that could interfere or unduly influence coding. Rubric users will be expected to revisit scoring criteria prior to evaluations. **Steps for Data Use for Continuous Improvement** College of Education program faculty hold semi-annual work sessions in which they analyze program data. Each time program faculty meet to analyze data, the group will complete a Data Analysis Record form in which they note the

Continued: Assurance of Data Quality	specific data examined and interpretations that were identified during their meeting. Every fall, Faculty will analyze Standard 1 data as described above. Then, early in the spring semester, faculty will analyze signature assessment data. Based on interpretations of analyzed rubric data and signature assessment data, identified members of the program faculty will write an annual report in which they identify program strengths, trends, opportunities for improvement. Program faculty will develop actionable goals for the upcoming academic year based on the strengths, trends, and opportunities for improvement identified. Goals will be included in the annual report, as well. This year-long procedure will be on-going so that the College of Education can continuously work toward improving its programs in a manner that is informed by evidence.

Outcome Measures	Assessment
Measure 4 (Initial and/or Advanced). Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared	R Licensure requirements all met prior to graduation A Endorsement requirements all met prior to graduation

South Dakota Board of Regents and BHSU policy requires passing all required licensure tests prior to degree conference and graduation. Additionally, all degree programs must be aligned with SDDOE licensure requirements. Thus, since program aligns with testing requirement, all completers are able to be hired in the education position for which they have been prepared.

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS
Policy Manual
SUBJECT: Teacher Education Programs
NUMBER: 2:16

7. Assessment & Student Teaching
7.1. In compliance with ARSD 24:53:04:02, Regental teacher education programs are required to measure students' content and pedagogical knowledge with the South Dakota state certification exams before graduation or program completion.

7.2. Teacher education students must take the South Dakota state certification content exam for their major(s) level of preparation before the semester in which they student teach. Students must achieve the qualifying score for certification in South Dakota prior to beginning student teaching when required as the sole method for determining licensure under ARSD 24:53:04:02.

Black Hills State University

Advanced Level Programs Phase-In Plans

Phase-In Plan for Program Preparation Satisfaction Survey Development

Relationship to Standard/Component	
CAEP Standard Component Addressed in Plan	Standard 4: Satisfaction with Preparation *The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.* Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice; Partnerships for Clinical Preparation A2.1 *Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for advanced program candidate outcomes.*
Objective	Data regarding the satisfaction of completers, employers, and other program partners or constituents can provide important, highly relevant information for analyzing the outcomes and consequences of program preparation courses and experiences, completer persistence, employment milestones, career orientation and paths of progress that can facilitate program evaluation, planning, and adaptations, adjustments, or revisions. However, current surveys are in need of revision to improve the quality and usefulness of data provided. This plan outlines the process and steps for review and reconstruction of a Program Preparation Satisfaction Survey that can be administered to completers, alumni, employees, and other relevant program partners.
Description of Process for Instrument Design	Administration and Purpose The purpose of this phase-in plan is to align the current instrument with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments survey specific indicators. The assessment rubric is the basis for the process to ensure that the survey reaches level 3 or above for the administration and purpose, content, and data quality. Within the phase-in plan is the intent to develop methods to ensure a high response rate. Administration of the survey for each group of intended respondents will be annual at exit and on a 3-year rotation for alumni and employers. **Content**

Continued: Description of Process for Instrument Design	The survey requires detailed review and reconstruction to ensure queries and indicators are properly constructed. Alignment with professional standards will also be reviewed and revised. This alignment is important to ensure that rating choices are reflective of observable and measurable performance or behavior directly related to effective work as a reading specialist. Goals for redevelopment of the instrument include clear delineation of alignment with ILA Standards and establishing validity and reliability. Each item of the Education Survey will be mirrored on Employer and Completer Surveys as a method of examining relationships between responses and determining EPP needs for continuous improvement. While questions will be the same, survey instructions and context will be tailored to the audience. **Data** The survey plan details the use of Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio and methodology to establish instrument validity. Validity of interpretations will be solid since each of the assessments occurs in the daily educational environment of the P-12 teachers. Concerns with validity of interpretations are minimized with extensive assessor training for use of the assessments and review of interpretations by the assessment committee, and EPP and school partners. Results will be shared and discussed with SOE faculty and EPP partners for the purpose of program guidance and enhancement.
Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design	**Fall 2020** Establish Survey Development team: PI will establish and lead a team of 1 EPP faculty, 1 program faculty, and 2 K-12 faculty/administration. Establish research timeline: Survey team discuss and establish a timeline for meetings and expectations to ensure completion. Item determination: Review existing items for 1) CAEP EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS - Survey; 2) structure and content (e.g. clarity v vagueness, singular vs compound, performance/concrete vs behavioral/theoretical, etc); 3) alignment with Professional Standards. Spring 2021 (Amended timeline: Due to COVID revisited with IRB for virtual data collection in place of face-to-face data collection. All other deadlines pushed back a year). Establish Survey content validity using CVR as per Lawshe (reference list): Survey items to panel for content validity and later reliability: Determine panel of 5 experts (Employer – principals, Alumni – graduates 1-3 years employed with above basic performance evaluations, Graduate – semester, inclusive of elementary, secondary, and K-12 content areas). Provide Survey items and directions for the evaluation of each item. Return time is 30 days.

Continued: Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design	Progress check and creation of communications Contact all panel members who have not submitted responses reminding of the due date. If needed, bring in an alternate. Data collected: All data is collected and recorded CVR determined: Assessment test and measurement expert analyzes data for the following parameters: CVR minimum of 1.00 and p=.05 Final determination and discussion to take to faculty: Survey team meets, including assessment T and M expert and assessment coordinator and determines conclusions and final Survey inclusions. SOE input and vote: Information shared with all faculty for review, schedule discussion times and vote. **Spring 2022** Survey Administration Survey administration will occur: Employer: each 3rd year starting on an even fall, Alumni: each 3rd year starting on an odd fall, Graduate: each semester
Resources and Personnel Responsible	The following College of Education faculty and staff are responsible for the implementation of this plan: Program Coordinator and Faculty of the M.Ed. Reading: --Dr. Denice Turner, ELA, M.Ed. Coordinator --Dr. Jarrett Moore, Graduate Research --Dr. Ryan Amys, Secondary Ed, Director Project Second --Dr. Faye LaDuke Pelster, Reading --Dr. Brian Eberhard, Social Sciences, MSCI Director --Dr. Rich Carriveau, Reading • CAEP Committee Chair • Assessment Committee Chair Capital: SOE Operating Budget Technology: EPP Website
Assurance of Data Quality	Annual assessment reports by the SOE Assessment Committee, written and verbal, will include summary of FA in aggregate for EPP and each program disaggregated. Assessment retreat for discipline and EPP review and discussion

	Reports to be available through the Assessment Coordinator and Committee

Black Hills State University

Advanced Level Programs Phase-In Plans
Phase-In Plan for Revised Admissions Essay and Scoring Tool

Relationship to Standard/Component	
CAEP Standard Component Addressed in Plan	*A.3.3* ***Evidence Required for this Component*** *The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion*
Objective	BHSU School of Education, M.Ed. in Reading, will demonstrate continuous improvement in monitoring and supporting candidates from admission to completion by revising current admissions essay task and scoring criteria to 1. More strategically address program goals and performance criteria and, 2. Provide an opportunity for candidate self-assessment in relationship to those goals, 3. Ensure that the task instrument developed will be authentic and detailed, and, 4. Create an analytic rubric for scoring candidate responses, thereby providing more valid and reliable disaggregated data regarding candidate progress from admission to completion.
Description of Process for Instrument Design	• Determine purposes and parameters for authentic essay response • Identify key knowledge and skills to be demonstrated by the essay response. • Develop a task for the essay response that is, 1. Open-ended, 2. Authentic to the role of a reading specialist, and, 3, Formative in nature, capable of allowing for more sophisticated responses as candidates progress through the program. • Follow protocol for developing the scoring rubric (Plan A.1.1: Determine performance criteria, performance levels, performance descriptors, rubric construction, rubric specification and clarification, rubric review and revision.)
Timelines and Strategies for Collecting Data	***--Fall 2022*** • Identify purposes and parameters of essay task • Identify knowledge and skills to be measured by the essay task. • Identify what serves as an indicator of knowledge/ skills. • Develop a task that would provide an authentic demonstration of knowledge/ skills • Design draft of the task ***--Fall 2023*** • Finalize task (essay prompt) • Rubric (developed in Plan A.1.1.) should be at the review and revision stage and ready for use in practice scoring sessions.

Continued: Timelines and Strategies for Collecting Data	• Revise task and scoring tool as needed ***--Fall 2024*** • Integrate into existing admissions protocol • Evaluate first cycle of data ***--Fall 2025*** • Evaluate second cycle of data ***--Fall 2026*** • Integrate candidate self-assessment with 2023 cohort • Collect and evaluate third cycle of candidate admissions essays • At this point, our system will be fully operational with three cycles of data on admissions essay
Resources and Personnel Responsible	The following College of Education faculty and staff are responsible for the implementation of this plan: • Program Coordinator and Faculty of the M.Ed. Reading: --Dr. Denice Turner, ELA, M.Ed. Coordinator --Dr. Jarrett Moore, Graduate Research --Dr. Ryan Amys, Secondary Ed, Director Project Second --Dr. Faye LaDuke Pelster, Reading --Dr. Brian Eberhard, Social Sciences, MSCI Director --Dr. Rich Carriveau, Reading --Dr. Louise Yoho, MAT Coordinator • Dr. Rich Loose, Director of Institutional Research • Jodi Gabriel, Graduate Admissions • BHSU IITS • Assessment Coordinator • CAEP Coordinator
Assurance of Data Quality	**Steps to ensure validity of the task** As validity for the task rests in its authenticity, we will make sure that the task is one relevant to the job and that meets the performance expectations of a reading specialist. **Steps to ensure validity and reliability of the rubric** **Validity** Content 1. Do the evaluation criteria address any extraneous content? 2. Do the evaluation criteria of the scoring rubric address all aspects of the intended content? 3. Is there any content addressed in the task that should be evaluated through the rubric, but is not?

Continued: Assurance of Data Quality	Construct 1. Are all of the important facets of the intended construct evaluated through the scoring criteria? 2. Is any of the evaluation criteria irrelevant to the construct of interest? Criterion 1. How do the scoring criteria reflect competencies that would suggest success on future or related performances? 2. What are the important components of the future or related performance that may be evaluated through the use of the assessment instrument? 3. How do the scoring criteria measure the important components of the future or related performance? 4. Are there any facets of the future or related performance that are not reflected in the scoring criteria? In addition, use of Lawshe's Content Validity Equation which essentially serves as an index of the communality or overlap between (a) performance on the evaluation instrument (analytic rubric) and (b) ability to function in the defined job performance domain. **Reliability** Interrater Agreement Use of rubric training sessions: All users of the rubrics established will be formally trained in its use initially; they will be trained on the meaning and intent of each criteria; calibrated to master criteria for assigning performance ratings (levels) through use of anchor products and practice scoring sessions, training will continue until higher than 90% interrater agreement is established, and users will periodically be formally checked for maintenance of calibration. Cohen's Kappa estimate of accuracy will be the coefficient used to measure interrater agreement initially and at check-ins. Intrarater Agreement Scoring procedures will be documented and training provided on factors that could interfere or unduly influence coding. Rubric users will be expected to revisit scoring criteria prior to evaluations. **Steps for Data Use for Continuous Improvement** College of Education program faculty hold semi-annual work sessions in which they analyze program data. Each time program faculty meet to analyze data, the group will complete a Data Analysis Record form in which they note the specific data examined and interpretations that were identified during their meeting. Every fall, Faculty will analyze Standard 1 data as described above. Then, early in the spring semester, faculty will analyze signature assessment data. Based on interpretations of analyzed rubric data and signature assessment data, identified members of the program faculty will write an annual report in which

Continued: Assurance of Data Quality	they identify program strengths, trends, opportunities for improvement. Program faculty will develop actionable goals for the upcoming academic year based on the strengths, trends, and opportunities for improvement identified. Goals will be included in the annual report, as well. This year-long procedure will be on-going so that the College of Education can continuously work toward improving its programs in a manner that is informed by evidence.