BLACK HILLS

STATE UNIVERSITY

2024 EPP Performance Report of CAEP Accountability Measures

(reporting semester data Fall 2022 – Spring 2023)

School of Education

in the

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

CAEP Accountability Measures Overview 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	2-year cycle Semester Semester
Outcome Measures	**Assessment**	**Administration cycle/time**
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 site visit, piloting)	Pass required prior to clinical internship Pass required prior to graduate Final reported (3-6 formative per placement) Clinical internship reported (tracked from admission to exit) Pilot phase
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	Continuous monitoring to exit Continuous monitoring to exit

Impact Measures 1 & 2 Detailed

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

R Student-Teacher Assessment Report System (STARS)

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.

2022-2023 ESSA State Plan Addendum Items:
1) For the 2022-2023 Report Card, only one year of student performance data are being utilized to calculate SPI points.
2) For the 2022-2023 Report Card, SPI points will only be reported on the private report card.

Completer's Impact on P-12 Learning

STARS: Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2022-2023 Academic Year	English Language Arts		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency	50	55	50
% Elementary Only: K-5		54	37
% of Students Demonstrating Growth	53	54	61
% of Students Demonstrating Growth		55	54

STARS: Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2022-2023 Academic Year	Math		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency	43	48	37
% Elementary Only: K-5		54	43
% of Students Demonstrating Growth	48	49	46
% of Students Demonstrating Growth Elementary Only: K-5		54	52

STARS: Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
2022-2023 Academic Year	Science		
	State	District 1	District 2
% of Students Demonstrating Proficiency	43	47	44
% Elementary Only: identification		data not reported to prevent student	
% of Students Demonstrating Growth	New reporting; baseline being determined		
% of Students Demonstrating Growth Elementary Only: K-5			

Student/Teacher Accountability and Reporting System			
College and Career Readiness 2022-2023 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	22	21
Coursework	72	71	55
Assessment	57	67	51
College and Career	54	60	43

R Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and R Faculty Evaluation (Danielson Framework)

Data for SLO and Teacher Evaluation-Ratings are returned to school faculty and may be voluntarily provided to the EPP in May of the following year. *This data will be updated as it is received in May and June.*

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

Impact Measures	Assessment	Administration Cycle/Time
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	2-year cycle Semester Semester

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

InTASC		**The BHSU prepared teacher under my supervision…**					
1	1	effectively teaches developmentally appropriate breadth and depth of content.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 7, 8	2	designs learning experiences that promote P-12 learning.	1	2	3	4	NC
7, 8	3	uses pedagogical research to create meaningful learning experiences.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 3, 7,	4	demonstrates respect for diversity of P-12 students.	1	2	3	4	NC
6, 7, 8	5	creates instructional activities responsive to diversity of P-12 students.	1	2	3	4	NC
8	6	uses a variety of instructional strategies to promote learning in each domain, cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.	1	2	3	4	NC
6, 8	7	integrates P-12 student use of technology to enhance learning.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 3	8	establishes a safe environment.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 3, 9	9	creates an environment that encourages learning.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 3, 5, 8	10	effectively incorporates a variety of communication modes (e.g. verbal, nonverbal, media) to enhance P-12 learning.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 4, 6, 7, 9	11	plans effective lessons based on national or state standards.	1	2	3	4	NC
6	12	uses a variety of assessment methods to promote best educational practices.	1	2	3	4	NC
2, 6, 7	13	Uses results of assessments to inform future lessons.					
9	14	reflects on instruction to improve future teaching.	1	2	3	4	NC
9, 10	15	seeks opportunities for professional growth and development.	1	2	3	4	NC
9, 10	16	interacts positively with parents/guardians, colleagues, and the community.	1	2	3	4	NC
9	17	demonstrates awareness of legal and ethical responsibilities of a professional educator.	1	2	3	4	NC

Employer Survey: 1-3 years in-service EPP completers with a desired Target of ≥ 3 3-year rotation will be changed to 2-year rotation								
Item	Year	Returned/ sent	% returned*	1	2	3	4	NC
1	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			2	13	
	2018	12/22	55			1	11	
2	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
3	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			1	14	
	2018	12/22	55			1	11	
4	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
5	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			1	14	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
6	2024 +	4/31	13			2	2	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
7	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55			1	11	
8	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			1	14	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
9	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
10	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			1	14	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
11	2024 +	4/31	13				4	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
12	2024 +	4/31	13				4	
	2021	15/25	60				15	

	2018	12/22	55				12	
New question only 2024	2024	4/31	13			2	2	
13	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
14	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60			1	14	
	2018	12/22	55			1	11	
15	2024 +	4/31	13			1	3	
	2021	15/25	60				15	
	2018	12/22	55				12	
16	2024 +	4/31	13			2	2	
	2021	15/25	60			2	13	
	2018	12/22	55				11	1

		31	468	1
		6%	94%	<.2%

+ methodology change to targeting 1 or 2 completers per respondent; prior respondents had up to 6 completers to rate which led to either incomplete responses (only responding to the first names listed) or no responses.

* % return rate is recognized acceptable for interpretation; the EPP recognizes inherent bias as the respondents personally know faculty, often work with, or have prior positive experiences with completers from the EPP

**3-year response cycle was implemented at the request of prior respondents who reported survey fatigue with annual expectation

*teaching in certified minor area **earned multiple certified areas; teaching in more than 1 + PE with APE; teaching stand-alone APE		
grade level		
Program		

Number of Employees rated for content preparation	Teaching only certified content area	Teaching both in and out of certified content	Not certified for for any content assigned	1 certified Content area	>1 certified content area; teaching in 1	>1 certified content area; teaching in > 1	K-12 teaching across all grades	K-12 teaching specific grade clusters	K-12 PE w/APE teaching ≥ 1 stand-alone APE
EARLY LEARNING									
Early childhood special education (birth-grade 3)				2					
ELED (K-8)				5	9	1			
K-12									
Art									
Music									
Physical Education								3	1
Special Education							3	3	
SECONDARY									

(5-12)									
Biology				1					
English				1					
History									
Language Arts Composite									
Math						1			
Math-Science Composite						1			
Science Educatic Composite									
Social Science Composite									

Open ended responses: (infrequently received)
I would like to add:

- We interview teachers from many regional universities, BHSU ELED and PE are unequivocally the best prepared for immediate effectiveness in the classroom.
- It is noted that our request for SLO preparation was integrated.
- Across the nation, mental health emerges as the biggest weakness for our experienced teachers and new hires. Curricula for preparatory programs is certainly extensive, however, it will become necessary to integrate mental and behavioral health more effectually integrated.
- YES! Continue to prep as you do – our BHSU teachers come in as both leaders and team-players.
- We need more teachers; how do we help and partner to make this happen?
- The higher expectations of BHSU graduates led to a few 3's for one hire. Better than new hires from other institutions, just not at BHSU standard

Alumni Survey: 1-3 years in-service with a desired Target of $\geq$ 3

Administered on a 2 or 3-year rotating schedule (changed to 2 years after 2022 administration); participant details below response table

Item	Year	Returned/ sent	% returned*	1	2	3	4	NC
1	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
2	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
3	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
4	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64				16	
	2019	20/28	71				20	
5	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
6	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64				16	

	2019	20/28	71				20	
7	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
8	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64				16	
	2019	20/28	71				20	
9	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
10	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64				16	
	2019	20/28	71				20	
11	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
12	2024	4/10	40					
	2022	16/25	64				16	
	2019	20/28	71				20	
New question only 2024	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
13	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
14	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
15	2024	4/10	40			1	3	
	2022	16/25	64			1	15	
	2019	20/28	71			2	18	
16	2024	4/10	40				4	
	2022	16/25	64				16	
	2019	20/28	71				20	
		39	601					
		6%	94%					

The EPP recognizes inherent bias as the respondents personally know faculty, often work with, or have prior positive experiences with completers from the EPP

Number of Employees rated for content preparation	Teaching only certified content area	Teaching both in and out of certified content	Not certified for for any content assigned	1 certified Content area	>1 certified content area; teaching in 1	>1 certified content area; teaching in > 1	K-12 teaching across all grades	K-12 teaching specific grade clusters	K-12 PE w/APE teaching ≥ 1 stand-alone APE
EARLY LEARNING									
ECE/SPED (birth-grade 3)	1			1					
ELED (K-8)	9			7	2				
K-12									
Art									
Music									
Physical	4						14	2	2

Education									
Special Education	6						4	2	
SECONDARY (5-12)									
Biology	1			1					
English	1			1					
History									
Language Arts Composite									
Math	1					1			
Math-Science Composite	1					1			
Science Education Composite									
Social Science Composite									

For the advanced program, a master's degree in reading, the surveys are in development and the plan for completion is included below. CAEP Advanced Review approved.

Report of Completion During 2022-2023 for the 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. 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 2021 Establish Survey Development team: PI will establish and lead a team of 1 EPP faculty, 1 program faculty, and 2 K-12 faculty/administration. Our proposed timeline for the survey creation process began in Fall 2021, following our initial CAEP accreditation report (February 2021). Timeline start was delayed one year (Fall 2022) to allow virtual data collection (rather than face-to-face collection) due to Covid. Survey creation was further delayed in 2022 by the Program Coordinator's sabbatical, which pushed the initiation of the plan to Fall 2023. During this semester, faculty met to 1. Discuss potential members for the Survey Development team, 2. Discuss a reasonable research timeline, and 3. Review potential items for alignment with program/ ILA goals. 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 2022: amended timeline and virtual instead of f2f data collection. All deadlines pushed back 1 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.

	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 2025 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. 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

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- November 1, 2023

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

Board Members:

Lead/Deadwood
Spearfish School District
Belle Fourche School District
Meade Co. School District
Meade Co. School District
Spearfish School District
Meade Co. School District
Black Hills Special Services
Two members from Technology and Innovation in Education
Rapid City Area Schools

Minutes/Feedback from Advisory Council Members:

- Send SoE to high schools to recruit for the profession.
- RCAS Pathways – we have a SoE representative – Dr. Johanna Sailor

- Suggestion to ask ourselves, "What sets us apart?"
- CTE certificate/endorsement?

- Do we have data on education majors who don't end up finishing?
- Discussion was held regarding student teacher permits.
- X mentioned the value of SD DOE IEP workshops.
- Suggestions were made to enhance preparation of teachers specific to behavior issues.
- Suggestion was made to split up topics covered in ELED 408 and SEED 408.
- A suggestion was made to have a panel of teachers discuss classroom management.
- SoE Department Chair shared possible topics for summer workshops based on previous feedback from council members and clinical educators.
    - AI
    - Behavior Management
    - Teacher Wellness
    - CE Training
- Discussion was held regarding more regular training opportunities for clinical educators.

BHSU SOE Field Experience Governance Council
Minutes- November 29, 2023

Members

Special Education Teacher, Sundance
BHSU Physical Education Faculty
BHSU, Office of Field Experiences
BHSU Assistant Professor, Special Education
BHSU Assistant Professor, School of Education
Teacher, Belle Fourche Elementary
Stagebarn Middle School, IT
BHSU, Director of Field Experiences
Rapid City Human Resources
Teacher, Spearfish Mt. View Elementary
Teacher, Belle Fourche Middle School
Principal, Creekside Elem, Spearfish
Principal, Stagebarn Middle School
Principal, New Underwood Jr/Sr High
Teacher, Creekside Elem, Spearfish

New Business

- Summer courses for educators:
  ED 692 Teacher Wellness 1.0-- June 7-9
  ED 692 Teacher Wellness 2.0 – June 7-9
  ED 691 Clinical Educator Training--June 13-14
  Family Engagement 101—June 20-22

Discussion held on the availability and number of participants for the summer courses. So far, each of the courses have between 10-15 educators who have signed up to attend a course.

The elementary/secondary and Project Second/MAT SPED majors for spring 2023 are down from previous years. The outreach for music and math teachers has been an ongoing trend for administration reaching out to the field office for possible teaching candidates.

- Student teaching permits

Last week the SD Department of Education voted in favor of proposed changes to ARSD 24:08:09 Educator Permit Requirements. The rule changes pave the way for certain student-teachers to be issued permits to work in South Dakota classrooms for up to one year, as one avenue for addressing ***teacher*** *shortages. Discussion about the two different types of permits: student teacher permit and advanced student teacher permit was held. It was discussed how this could be beneficial for schools with substitute teacher shortages and beneficial that the students would receive pay for substitute teaching. However, the students would not be getting the full student teaching experience and unforeseen problems may arise. Who would be responsible? The rules package will go before the Legislature's Rules Review Committee before becoming final. We will be hearing more about this later when rules are final.*

- **End of semester strengths:**

- *The students requesting the RCAS seem to be following the placement process better. They are using the RCAS website correctly for their initial student teaching placement process.*
- *Students this semester seem to be well prepared and enjoy being at the schools.*
- *The clinical educators like that they are being cc'd on the student emails that come from the field office. The emails contain the student's placement information. This helps the clinical educators know that the student has received notification and that they can expect the student to be contacting them about setting up a schedule.*

- **End of semester weaknesses:**

It does not seem that Middle School placements are being assigned as often for student teaching placements. It was discussed that students have shared concerns with clinical educators that they were unsure of how or if they could have a student teaching placement in the middle school. The field office will make it a point to discuss this option at orientations and student meetings----secondary student teachers (not K-12) have the option to complete their student teaching at the middle school level as long as prior practicums have been completed in the high school.

Outcome Measures	Assessment	Administration cycle/time
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 clinical internship Pass required prior to graduate Final reported (3-6 formative per placement) Clinical internship reported (tracked from admission to exit) Pilot phase

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 for completers. Overall 98% pass rate for first time test-takers.

Advanced Program MEd – Reading Praxis 5302
Students who completed and reported passing scores are eligible for SDDOE Reading Endorsement

ETS Test Takers N=6
Reporting to BHSU N=5
Not reporting to BHSU N=1
Students not passing N=2

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

PPAT Task 2 InTASC 2 b & f			4	3.5	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	0.5	0
Fall 2022	Task 2 Step 1	26 Reporting (100%)	11.5%	0.0%	76.9%	0.0%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Task 2 Step 2	26 Reporting (100%)	7.7%	0.0%	88.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Task 2 Step 3	26 Reporting (100%)	15.4%	0.0%	69.2%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Spring 2023	Task 2 Step 1	76 Reporting (100%)	2.6%	0.0%	92.1%	1.3%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

	Task 2 Step 2	76 Reporting (100%)	1.3%	0.0%	85.5%	2.6%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Task 2 Step 3	76 Reporting (100%)	1.3%	0.0%	77.6%	2.6%	15.8%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
			6.6%	0.0%	81.6%	1.1%	10.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
PPAT Task 3 InTASC 2 a, b, c, f			**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**2.5**	**2**	**1.5**	**1**	**0.5**	**0**
Fall 2022	Task 3 Step 1	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	69.23%	15.38%	15.38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 3 Step 2	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	76.92%	11.54%	3.85%	0%	0%	0%	7.69%
	Task 3 Step 3	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	73.08%	19.23%	7.69%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 3 Step 4	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	53.85%	15.38%	30.77%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Spring 2023	Task 3 Step 1	76 Reporting (100%)	5.26%	0%	75.00%	6.58%	13.16%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 3 Step 2	76 Reporting (100%)	7.89%	0%	76.32%	3.95%	11.84%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 3 Step 3	76 Reporting (100%)	5.26%	0%	77.63%	7.89%	9.21%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 3 Step 4	76 Reporting (100%)	6.58%	0%	68.42%	3.95%	19.74%	1.32%	0%	0%	0%
			3.1%	0.0%	71.3%	10.5%	14.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
PPAT Task 4 InTASC 2 a, b, c, f			**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**2.5**	**2**	**1.5**	**1**	**0.5**	**0**
Fall 2022	Task 4 Step 1	26 Reporting (100%)	3.85%	0%	76.92%	15.38%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.85%
	Task 4 Step 2	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	73.08%	19.23%	3.85%	0%	0%	0%	3.85%
	Task 4 Step 3	26 Reporting (100%)	3.85%	0%	65.38%	7.69%	11.54%	0%	0%	0%	11.54%
	Task 4 Step 4	26 Reporting (100%)	0%	0%	80.77%	11.54%	3.85%	0%	0%	0%	3.85%
Spring 2023	Task 4 Step 1	76 Reporting (100%)	3.95%	0%	85.53%	5.26%	5.26%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Task 4 Step 2	76 Reporting (100%)	0%	1.32%	80.26%	5.26%	10.53%	0%	0%	0%	1.32%
	Task 4 Step 3	76 Reporting (100%)	1.32%	0%	75.00%	7.89%	10.53%	2.63%	1.32%	0%	1.32%
	Task 4 Step 4	76 Reporting (100%)	2.63%	0%	80.26%	5.26%	10.53%	1.32%	0%	0%	0%
			1.948%	0.164%	77.151%	9.691%	7.009%	0.493%	0.164%	0.000%	3.214%

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

2022-2023 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	9
4 to 6	0
≥ 7	4

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.

% 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)

Table 1.20 M.Ed. Professional Dispositions Self-evaluation by Applicant

Data Cycles in Review	2020*	2021	2022
Number of program applicants	6	10	5
Number of respondents	4	6	4
Percentage responding	67%	60%	80%

Rating Scale: M=meets; NI=needs improvement

Professional Conduct	The Professional Candidate	2020	2021	2022	% of applicants identifying area for improvement
		N=4	N=6	N=4	
Demonstrates responsibility	1. completes assigned tasks that demonstrate high personal standards and best effort	M 4	M 6	M 3 NI 1	7%
	2. recognizes his/her professional responsibility for engaging in and supporting appropriate professional practices for self and colleagues	M 4	M 6	M 4	0
Is accountable	1. performs duties in accordance with local, state, and federal rules and laws	M 4	M 6	M 4	0
	2. maintains professional relationships with students and colleagues	M 4	M 6	M 4	0
Maintains confidentiality	1. maintains confidentiality of professional information acquired about colleagues and students	M 4	M 6	M 4	0
	2. discusses professional matters in a professional manner	M 4	M 6	M 4	0

Competent Professionals	The Professional Candidate	2020*	2021	2022	% of applicants identifying area for improvement
		N=4	N=6	N=4	
Demonstrates broad knowledge of content	1. demonstrates that he/she knows complex aspects of the content area(s) taught	M 4 NI 1	M 4 NI 2	M 3 NI 1	29%
	2. applies specialized content language and professional communication	M 3 NI 1	M 5 NI 1	M 4	14%
Applies research-based instructional practices	1. keeps up with new ideas and concepts in the field	M 2 NI 2	M 5 NI 1	M3 NI 1	29%
	2. is a lifelong learner who engages in professional discourse	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	about content and student learning				
Reflects and thinks critically to impact student learning	1. believes plans and practices are open to adjustment and revision based on learning needs and circumstances	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	2. values the development of critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities	M 4	M=5 NI 1	M 2 NI 2	21%
	3. is committed to the continuous development of individual abilities and considers how motivational strategies encourage this development for individuals	M 4	M 5 NI 1	M 3 NI 1	14%
	4. values ongoing assessment as essential to the instructional process and recognizes that many different assessment strategies, when accurately and systematically used, are necessary for monitoring and promoting student learning	M 4	M 6	M 4	

Confident Professionals	The Professional Candidate	2020*	2021	2022	% of applicants identifying area for improvement
		N=4	N=6	N=4	
Positively affects student learning	1. shows respect for the diversity among learners and is committed to helping them develop self-confidenceand competence	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	2. uses individual strengths as a basis for growth and individual challenges as opportunities for learning	M 4	M 5 NI 1	M 4	7%
	3. recognizes the importance of peer and colleague relationships in establishing a climate of learning	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	4. encourages multiple modes of communication in the classroom and school	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	5. demonstrates a positive, enthusiastic attitude toward education	M 4	M 6	M 4	

Caring Professionals	The Professional Candidate	2020*	2021	2022	% of applicants identifying area for improvement
		N=4	N=6	N=4	
Establishes relationships in an environment of mutual respect and rapport as evidenced by students feeling valued and safe	1. appreciates multiple perspectives	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	2. believes all students can learn and persists in helping all	M 4	M 6	M 4	

	students achieve success				
	3. respects students and staff as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	4. is sensitive to community and cultural norms	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	5. shares responsibility for establishing a positive climate in the classroom and in the school	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	6. is concerned about all aspects of students' well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical) and is alert to signs of difficulties	M 4	M 6	M 4	
	7. works with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment	M 4	M 6	M 3 NI 1	7%

**Data for 2020 only includes applicants for Fall semester, since Target X, our current admissions service, was adopted in Fall 2020. Information prior to Fall of 2020 was not retained.*

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:
	As per our original plan, program faculty have completed the following in the creation of analytic rubrics to track candidate growth through the program:
	Fall 2021:
	
	• 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 criteria (specific and measurable, parallel language across criteria)
	• Clarifying of the Analytic Rubric
	  ○ 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?
	Fall 2022 Program Coordinator on Sabbatical
	
	Fall 2023
	• Analytic rubric review and revision.
	• Faculty orientation; informal interrater reliability sessions
	
	Fall 2024
	• Orient new faculty on rubrics; reorient committee members.
	• Run formal interrater reliability session.
	
	• 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
	Fall 2025 Integrate rubrics at program selection and completion of program

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. Rich Carriveau, Reading • CAEP Committee Chair • Assessment Committee Chair

Assurance of Data Quality	**Steps to Assure Validity and Reliability of Analytic Rubrics Constructed** **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? 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 criterion. 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.

Assurance of Data Quality (Cont.)	**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 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	Administration cycle/time
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 to graduation A Endorsement requirements all met prior to graduation	Continuous monitoring to exit Continuous monitoring to exit

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 eligible 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.

Educator 411 - Educator 411 (sd.gov) for MEd-Reading requirements.

Additionally, all criteria required for SDDOE Reading endorsement are met within the program.

Components of CAEP Standard RA1.1 as defined by and supported by standards in specialized field (International Literacy Association/ ILA, 2017).

Highlighted areas are of particular importance in preparing candidates as Reading Specialists.		
CAEP Standard RA1.1	ILA Standard	ILA Standard Description
Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	1: Foundational Knowledge Reading Specialist PRAXIS Area I	Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of literacy and language, the ways in which they interrelate, and the role of the reading/literacy specialist in schools.
	2: Curriculum and Instruction Reading Specialist PRAXIS Area I	Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula to meet needs of learners, especially those who experience difficulty with literacy; design, implement, and evaluate small-group and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for learners; collaborate with teachers to implement effective literacy practices.
	3: Assessment and Evaluation Reading Specialist PRAXIS Area II	Candidates understand, select, and use valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student literacy achievement; inform instruction and evaluate interventions; assist teachers in their understanding and use of assessment results; advocate for appropriate literacy practices to relevant stakeholders.
Employment of data analyses and evidence to develop supportive, diverse, equitable, and inclusive school environments	5: Learners and the Literacy Environment	Candidates meet the developmental needs of all learners and collaborate with school personnel to use a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners; integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways; foster a positive climate that supports a literacy-rich learning environment.
	4: Diversity and Equity	Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research, relevant theories, pedagogies, and essential concepts of diversity and equity; demonstrate an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings; create classrooms and schools that are inclusive and affirming; advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels.

Use of Research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies	6: Professional Learning and Leadership Reading Specialist PRAXIS Area III	Candidates demonstrate the ability to be reflective literacy professionals, who apply their knowledge of adult learning to work collaboratively with colleagues; demonstrate their leadership and facilitation skills; advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities.
Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues. Teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents		
Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization	2: Curriculum and Instruction Part of ILA Standard 2	Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula to meet needs of learners, especially those who experience difficulty with literacy; design, implement, and evaluate small-group and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for learners; collaborate with teachers to implement effective literacy practices.
Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics, and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization	7: Practicum/Clinical Experiences (for specialized literacy professionals only)	Candidates complete supervised, integrated, extended practica/ clinical experiences that include intervention work with students and working with their peers and experienced colleagues; practica include ongoing experiences in school-based setting(s); supervision includes observation and ongoing feedback by qualified supervisors.

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.

Description of Process for Instrument Design (Cont.)	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 and virtual instead of f2f data collection. All deadlines pushed back 1 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.

Timelines and Strategies for Instrument Design (Cont.)	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.

Timelines and Strategies for Collecting Data (Cont.)	• 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?

Assurance of Data Quality (Cont.)	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

	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.