

# CAEP Accountability Measure 1

Measure 1 (Initial). Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1)

## South Dakota Teacher Effectiveness Law and Resources

The data below are from the pilot of adding survey questions to the Common Metric Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS). This survey is collected in May and June. After completing their first year of teaching, initial licensure graduates are asked to self-report their teaching evaluation required by South Dakota. These measures include: SLO data (measures **impact on student growth**), Danielson Supervisor Evaluation (**Completer Effectiveness**) and their over-all teacher effectiveness rating. Teacher education faculty analyzed the data and compared it to the key assessment data collected before graduation. Faculty then used results to drive curricular changes. <https://doe.sd.gov/Effectiveness/Teacher.aspx>

## Completer (Teacher) Effectiveness

**Danielson (Professional Practice Rating)** All administrators evaluating teachers are trained and complete score calibrations through Frontline Education (Provided by Department of Education).

### Analysis

Faculty Analysis: Very few that were rated as basic, which we believed was a good sign. Most are at the proficient, with a handful of elementary at the distinguished. Fewer missing responses.

### Use of Results

Data analysis indicates that graduates are doing well once they get into the field, beyond a couple that have maybe struggled a bit more. Missing responses are a continued area for growth. Residency instructors will continue to contact graduates to encourage their and their supervisors to participate.

### Data

ELEMENTARY=17 MIDDLESCHOOL=9 HIGHSCHOOL=2	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory
ELEMENTARY (16)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	0	0
MIDDLESCHOOL (9)	0	9 (100%)	0	0
HIGHSCHOOL (2)	0	2 (100%)	0	0

## Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

### Student Growth Rating known as SLO

Administrators are trained through the DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION to support and evaluate teachers' SLOs. The DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION provides training to teachers in how to design, administer and assess SLOs.

#### Analysis

TRE faculty analysis: Appears that all teachers are either at expected or high levels. Large number of no responses.

#### Use of Results

Continue to reach out to candidates to encourage them and their supervisor to participate. Increasing the responses will make the data more actionable.

ELEMENTARY=17 MIDDLESCHOOL=9 HIGHSCHOOL=2	High (Between 85% and 100% met or exceeded goal).	Expected (Between 65% and 85% of students met or exceeded goal)	Low (Less than 65% of students met or exceeded goal)
ELEMENTARY (16)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	0
MIDDLESCHOOL (9)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	0
HIGHSCHOOL (2)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0

### Overall Rating (SLO + Danielson Observation + Supervisor Judgement)

A Matrix is used to calculate overall rating through using the professional practice rating on the X axis and the Student Growth Rating on the Y axis. The cell of the matrix in which they meet provides an indication of the overall rating. Administrators are encouraged to use professional judgment (they take into account variables-for example COVID) in addition to using the matrix. The X and Y axis meet within 3 areas: Exceeds, Meets or Below.

#### Analysis

TRE Faculty Analysis: Vast majority of students are at the meets expectations level, with a few exceeding expectations. We believed this was a good indicator of program success. Several missing responses.

#### Use of Results

Data analysis continues to indicate that graduates are doing well in the field. Will continue to encourage graduates and their supervisors to participate.

ELEMENTARY=17 MIDDLESCHOOL=9 HIGHSCHOOL=2	Exceeds Expectation	Meets Expectation	Below Expectation
ELEMENTARY (16)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	0
MIDDLESCHOOL (9)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	0
HIGHSCHOOL	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0



## CAEP Accountability Initial and Advanced Measure 2

Measure 2. (Initial and/or Advanced). Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement  
(Components R4.2 | R5.3 | RA.4.1)

## Satisfaction of Employers Both Initial and Advanced

### Initial Programs

The Common Metrics Supervisor Survey is sent to K-12 administrators who hire initial licensure graduates. The graduates are asked to provide employment information the summer after graduation. Of the 159 graduates in 2019-2020, we received feedback from employers for 93 or 59.2% of the graduates concerning their teaching effectiveness during their first year. The survey is a four-point Likert scale. Employers are asked to indicate to what extent they agree or disagree with the prompts related to the effectiveness of graduates' abilities as new teachers to apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions learned and practiced during their programs. The categories include: Instructional practice that includes technology application, teaching diverse learners, creating a positive learning environment, and professionalism. The items in the survey are aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium or InTASC standards. Faculty analyze and use the data to review programs and make changes to positively impact graduates' instructional practices. Faculty reviewed data in February 2022. Their analysis and use of results follows.

### Analysis and Use of Results:

#### *Analysis*

The data indicate that there are no alarmingly low areas, but there are some areas that are 'lower' than other areas. We will look at those areas that are lower. Those areas include:

- Engages students in self-assessments

About 15% of employers scored completers in the 2 lowest categories. The average score for the completers was 3.22 out of 4 points.

- Identifies issues of reliability and validity in assessment

About 16% of employers scored completers in the 2 lowest categories. The average score for the completers was 3.17 out of 4 points.

- Differentiates assessments for all learners

About 14% of employers scored completers in the 2 lowest categories. The average score for the completers was 3.26 out of 4 points.

#### *Use of Results*

Have students complete self-assessments for formative feedback. This will demonstrate a self-assessment check with our students and communicate this is something they can do with their own students. In the TET 400 course, there are already self-assessment pieces. This is being modeled. It needs to be articulated more clearly that this is something to use as a classroom teacher with students

- **Reliability & Validity.** Faculty will review courses and find areas in which they can be more intentional about using this language with students throughout coursework/program. Idea to discuss further: Bring an assessment to coursework day and evaluate it for reliability/validity.
- **Differentiated Assessments** Faculty be more intentional about using this language with students throughout coursework/program. Include the ‘differentiated assessment language’ to the USD lesson plan template.

## **Advanced Programs**

### *Analysis*

Feedback concerning satisfaction of employers of EPP advanced programs was collected in May through July. The survey was created by the assessment committee. The advanced programs sent the survey to the programs’ employers. The employer contact information was provided by the graduates in May. The response rate is somewhat representative of programs’ graduate numbers. Disaggregated, the Reading Program had 14% of the responses, Ed Leadership had 57% and School Psychology had 29%. The average percentages of yearly graduates by program are: Reading has 9%, Ed Leadership has 80% and School Psychology has 11% populations of graduates from the school of education.

### *Use of Results*

The preliminary data suggests that employers consider candidates from USD to be well prepared or very well prepared overall. Programs could target technology integration, awareness of mental health issues and support, and working with families as areas in need of improvement.

## **Stakeholder Involvement**

Stakeholders are deeply involved in programs through providing qualitative feedback on surveys and in meetings, reviewing assessment and data, being members of EPP committees, serving with program faculty on state and national committees, and collaborating on specialized projects identified as needs in PK-12.

## **Committee Involvement**

External stakeholders from all programs are members of school of education’s curriculum committees. Faculty are also members of and are involved in state and national professional organizations in which they collaborate with program professionals at the local and national level. Minutes from these meetings are shared within the division meetings and programs use this feedback to monitor and make adjustments to their curriculum. In the descriptions of the committee work, analysis of data and use of results are provided for the 2020-2021 academic year.

## Committees and Organizations

EPP Committees	Professional Organizations
TEAC (Teacher Education Advisory Committee) Members are from PK-12, Arts/Sciences, Fine Arts and Teacher Education	NASP National Association of School Psychologists (State and National) Faculty are members and attend meetings with stakeholders
Dean's External Advisory Committee One or more members are from all of EPP programs	SASD School Administrators of South Dakota Faculty attend monthly meetings and annual conferences (also present at conferences)
Prepared to Teach (Bank Street Grant) and Communities of Practice Funding student teaching EPP Members are PK-12 partners and program leaders. National members are same from multiple states. Collaboration on the national level.	Faculty members of Reading Recovery Active in leadership roles
Education Discipline Committee Members are from all SD universities, DOE and Board of Regents	

### Feedback Excerpts from Committee Feedback for Initial and Advanced

<b>I would like to recommend that the following changes be made to the USD program:</b>
Provide more training in the area of assessing students with English as a second language, areas of disproportionality, and the use SRBI to meet the needs of all students
Focus on moving theory to practice. Candidates and or practicing administrators seem to have a good background in theory but lack application "doing."
USD has a solid program and reaches out to work closely with the schools. We appreciate that. I feel USD has taken great steps in offering alternative programming and process to allow individuals to reach their desire to become educators and administrators, but this is also an area that needs continual growth for all involved.
Drive graduate students to research projects that can improve and inform local school district practices.

<b>I would like to highlight the following characteristics as beneficial to the USD program:</b>
I appreciate that USD provides opportunities for students seeking advanced degrees an opportunity to advance their content knowledge while working in a school setting. I would like to see a reintroduction of the PDC program.

<b>I would like to highlight the following characteristics as beneficial to the USD program:</b>
Always great professors and they continue to be available as professional colleagues once into your leadership role
Year long residency.
Continue to highlight and focus on instructional leadership
As stated, USD has an outstanding program. Their staff are knowledgeable and trustworthy. They continually work with us to foster new endeavors and approaches that are mutually beneficial. We appreciate their staff and programs.
Faculty emphasis on connecting with K-12 leadership and being responsive to current needs in the field of K-12 education benefits not only USD, but South Dakota Education in a greater way.

***Documentation of Collaboration on Committees and Special Projects***

Dean’s External Advisory Committee Excerpt: February 1, 2022. Committee is comprised of representatives from all programs: both employers and graduates. The committee worked on defining our values. Values were looked at- both faculty ideas and USD strategic plan. When there is a necessity, K-12 systems can reach out. It is building the relationships so that projects can easily start. Beresford collaborated with ELL training to K-12 teachers.

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Project: The EPP is creating a CTE methods course to be delivered starting summer 2022. This was a request from health sciences and South Dakota’s CTE Office. During this work, we discovered that PK-12 partners have a need for this methods course as well as Project Lead The Way known as PLTW graduate credits through their training. We are currently in conversations with PLTW and the state to discuss options.

ISLP Validity Work with Teachers

Teachers worked with the TRE division to review the rubric and tasks in the ISLP projects candidates complete in their last semester of residency. Teachers scored all tasks as essential and the rubric prompts accurately describe the performance levels for scoring.

TEAC Discussions

TEAC is comprised of faculty from the following schools: School of education, fine arts and arts and sciences; in addition to representatives from PK-12 stakeholders. The committee has been reviewing program courses and candidates’ assessment data. A discussion was held concerning the CORE Praxis Test entrance requirement for teacher education and will be addressed in 2021-2022 meetings. The committee also reviewed the transition to teaching and employer survey results. The USD data appears to be higher than the aggregate of institutions in the areas: effectively teaching subject matter, selects instructional strategies, clear learning objectives, critical thinking and using multiple sources of evidence. The committee noted that USD data is slightly lower for completers in: Regularly adjusts plans to meet student needs and provides meaningful feedback. The committee recommended that a crosswalk be completed to

determine where assessment is addressed in curriculum and make changes in key courses. The committee will review 2020-2021 data next year to identify if this is a trend.

State Initiatives Driving Curriculum

After a review of assessment data for EDAD 742 Leading School Improvement, Susan Curtin and Dr. Jennifer Lowery collaborated to add a PDSA cycle component to EDAD 742 Leading for School Improvement to increase candidates’ understanding of the practical implications of the continuous improvement process. This curricular change aligns with initiatives in South Dakota to use PDSA cycles as part of the continuous improvement process. The change was initiated by Dr. Lowery from her perspective as scholar-practitioner and supports the division’s commitment to continuous improvement and ensuring the curriculum is current and relevant. The change was discussed in the fall of 2019 and implemented in the spring of 2020. Curricular change was instituted and progress measurement started in 2020-2021 data cycle.

Communities of Practice

The Prepared to Teach grant has communities of practice groups that meet monthly to discuss education issues. Each education preparation provided has local member comprised of faculty and employers of educators at both the initial and advanced levels of licensure that are members of break out groups. These groups collaborate to discuss and find solutions to various national challenges (problems of practice) facing education.

**2021 Employer Satisfaction Survey Results for Initial Programs Data for 2019-2020 Graduates**

<b>Prompt for Instructional Practice on a 4 Point Scale</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Effectively teaches the subject matter in his/her licensure area.	89	3.66	0.58
Selects instructional strategies to align with curriculum standards.	88	3.65	0.5
Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	89	3.52	0.66
Accounts for students’ prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	87	3.47	0.58
Designs long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	86	3.33	0.65
Regularly adjusts instructional plans to meet students’ needs.	88	3.56	0.62
Plans lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	89	3.64	0.57
Designs and modifies assessments to match learning objectives.	89	3.46	0.64

<b>Prompt for Instructional Practice on a 4 Point Scale</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	88	3.44	0.67
Engages students in self-assessment strategies.	81	3.22	0.79
Uses formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	85	3.45	0.58
Identifies issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	76	3.17	0.75
Analyzes multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	88	3.35	0.69
Differentiates assessment for all learners	87	3.26	0.72
Uses digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	88	3.66	0.54
Engages students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	87	3.54	0.60
Helps students develop critical thinking processes.	86	3.38	0.63
Helps students develop skills to solve complex problems.	84	3.31	0.67
Makes interdisciplinary connections among core subjects.	79	3.30	0.68
Knows where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	86	3.34	0.69
Helps students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	86	3.28	0.71
Effectively teaches students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	84	3.56	0.54
Differentiates instruction for a variety of learning needs.	87	3.48	0.71

<b>Prompt for Instructional Practice on a 4 Point Scale</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Differentiates for students at varied developmental levels.	87	3.46	0.67
Differentiates to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	83	3.46	0.65
Differentiates instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	83	3.55	0.61
Differentiates instruction for students with mental health needs.	79	3.43	0.67
Differentiates instruction for gifted and talented students.	68	3.4	0.64
Differentiates instruction for English-language learners.	61	3.52	0.59
Accesses resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	82	3.37	0.67

**2021 Employer Satisfaction Survey Results for Advanced Programs Data for 2019-20 Completers**

<b>Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Reading Teacher (5)</b>	<b>Ed Leadership (21)</b>	<b>School Psych (11)</b>
The USD program prepared him/her to understand the theoretical and content knowledge foundations of their profession.	6	5.25	5.33	5.64
The USD program prepared him/her to apply the content knowledge and theoretical foundations of his/her profession to professional practice.	6	5.25	5.24	5.55
The USD program prepared him/her to apply content knowledge to help all students/clients respond in a meaningful manner.	6	5.25	5.2	5.27
The USD program prepared him/her to apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students/clients respond in a meaningful manner.	6	5.25	5.1	5.36

Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice	Possible Points	Reading Teacher (5)	Ed Leadership (21)	School Psych (11)
The USD program prepared him/her to assume a leadership role in the profession and share knowledge and expertise with others in their profession and community.	6	4.5	5.33	5.09
The USD program prepared him/her to use a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate one's performance.	6	5	4.76	5.45
The USD program prepared him/her to use a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate the performance of others.	6	4.67	5	5.36
The USD program prepared him/her to use technology in their professional practice.	6	5.25	4.95	5.36
The USD program prepared him/her to leverage up to date technologies to plan, design, and evaluate learning experiences.	6	5.25	4.9	5.09
The USD program prepared him/her to employ ethical use of technology to further their professional productivity.	6	5.25	5.1	5.09
The USD program prepared him/her to foster and maintain positive work relationships.	6	5.5	5.19	5.27
The USD program prepared him/her to model and use effective communication (verbal, non-verbal, and written).	6	5.5	5.15	5.27
The employee demonstrates knowledge of various assessment and evaluation methods as well as the skills needed to define problems, identify student needs and assets, and estimate current functional status. The employee links assessment data to the development of effective interventions and utilizes formative and summative assessment to inform future intervention decisions. - Selected Choice	3	N/A	N/A	2.82
The employee demonstrates knowledge of consultation and collaboration models and methods and the abilities needed to apply these skills at individual, group, and system levels. The employee utilizes communication, consultation, and collaboration skills to facilitate the design,	3	N/A	N/A	2.82

Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice	Possible Points	Reading Teacher (5)	Ed Leadership (21)	School Psych (11)
implementation, and evaluation of services and programs. - Selected Choice				
The employee demonstrates knowledge of biological, cultural, and social influences on academic skills; human learning, cognitive, and developmental processes; and evidence-based curriculum and instructional strategies. The employee possesses the skills needed to assess cognitive abilities, academic skills, and environmental variables and, in collaboration with others, utilize results to develop appropriate cognitive and academic goals, support the integrity of service delivery, and evaluate the effectiveness of services used to support cognitive and academic skills.	3	N/A	N/A	2.55
The employee demonstrates knowledge of biological, cultural, developmental, and social influences on behavior and mental health; behavioral and emotional impacts on learning and life skills; and evidence-based strategies to promote social–emotional functioning and mental health. Possess skills needed to collaborate with others in the process of utilizing assessment and data-collection methods to select, implement, and evaluate empirically supported models and strategies designed to promote children’s mental health, socialization and life skills. - Selected Choice	3	N/A	N/A	2.36

Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice	Possible Points	Reading Teacher (5)	Ed Leadership (21)	School Psych (11)
<p>The employee demonstrates knowledge of individual differences, abilities, and disabilities and of the potential influence of social, cultural, ethnic, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in development and learning. The employee demonstrates respect for diversity and advocacy for social justice. The employee demonstrates the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristics and implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristics. - Selected Choice</p>	3	N/A	N/A	2.64
<p>The employee demonstrates knowledge of school and systems structure and organization and of general education and regular education. The employee facilitates and/or contributes to the development of policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others. - Selected Choice</p>	3	N/A	N/A	2.36
<p>The employee demonstrates knowledge of principles and research related to resilience and risk factors in learning and mental health, services in schools and communities to support multitiered prevention, and evidence-based strategies for effective crisis response. The employee possesses the skills needed to collaborate with others to design, implement, and evaluate prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of children and youth and prevent disease, disability, or harm (e.g., crisis intervention, stress management, teenage pregnancy, AIDS prevention, etc.). - Selected Choice</p>	3	N/A	N/A	2.73

Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice	Possible Points	Reading Teacher (5)	Ed Leadership (21)	School Psych (11)
The employee demonstrates knowledge of family systems, strengths, needs, and culture; methods to involve families in education; and strategies to support family influences on children’s learning, socialization, and mental health. The employee can apply this knowledge and collaborate with others to design, implement, and evaluate programs that promote school, family, and/or community partnership. The employee works effectively with families, educators, and others in the community. - Selected Choice	3	N/A	N/A	2.36
The employee demonstrates knowledge of research, statistics, and evaluation methods. The employee possesses the skills needed to evaluate research, translate research into practice (e.g., research based interventions and progress monitoring), and conducts program evaluations to support effective practices at the individual, group, and/or systems levels. - Selected Choice	3	N/A	N/A	2.55
The employee understands the history and foundations of school psychology; has knowledge of ethical, professional, and legal standards; engages in responsive ethical and professional decision making; and practices in ways that are consistent with ethical, professional, and legal standards. The employee has the knowledge and skills needed to acquire career-long professional development. - Selected Choice	3	N/A	N/A	3
The USD program prepared him/her to read and interpret the professional literature.	6	4.67	5.1	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to apply information from research to their professional practice.	6	5	5.1	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to foster active inquiry and engagement in lifelong learning to prepare students/clients.	6	4.67	5.1	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to integrate professional standards into practice.	6	5.33	5.1	N/A

<b>Please indicate what position USD graduate(s) holds in your district - Selected Choice</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Reading Teacher (5)</b>	<b>Ed Leadership (21)</b>	<b>School Psych (11)</b>
The USD program prepared him/her to be culturally responsive in their professional practice.	6	5.33	5	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to address exceptionality in their professional practice.	6	5	5	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to understand how people learn and develop.	6	5.33	4.71	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to recognize and address current issues in the profession.	6	5.5	4.95	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to solve problems encountered in professional practice.	6	5.5	4.95	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to reflect on professional practice and its effects.	6	6	5.3	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to understand and use a variety of instructional/intervention strategies to encourage development of critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance skills	6	5	5	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to create and maintain a safe and effective work environment.	6	5.5	5	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to use an understanding of individual and group motivation/behavior to foster positive social interaction and active engagement in learning.	6	5	5.11	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to display beliefs, values, and behaviors that guide the ethical dimension of their professional practice.	6	6	5.2	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to understand the technological and societal changes in their profession.	6	5	4.9	N/A
The USD program prepared him/her to uphold the legal and ethical responsibilities of their profession.	6	4.5	5.11	N/A

### **CAEP Accountability Initial Measure 3**

Measure 3 (Initial). Candidate competency at program completion (**Component R3.3**)

The School of Education, known as the education preparation provider, EPP, requires all candidates to successfully complete three summative key assessments that measure their academic competency in the following areas: positive impact on diverse student learning and development, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, technology integration, and critical dispositions with professional responsibilities. Those candidates that do not meet required scores on key assessments are provided support through tutoring services for the standardized Praxis tests and improvement plans with enhanced support from residency instructors if candidates are not meeting expectations on the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool during residency. Faculty analysis and use of results is provided in addition to brief descriptions of the assessments and data.

#### **Praxis Content Tests for Initial Licensure**

Candidates must pass the content test corresponding to their major before they are allowed to enter residency. The academic advisor and the placement coordinator track this information. Candidates are required to self-report their scores when applying to residency. The advisor and placement coordinator verify the scores through the Praxis data manager website. The placement coordinator records Praxis scores in the cohort tracking database. The results of this data from the 2020-2021 completers is analyzed by faculty and the results are used to inform decision making or program modifications. Data is also shared with external stakeholders such as the Teacher Education Advisory Committee, which is known as TEAC. Members of this committee are from the arts and sciences, fine arts and education schools on campus and K-12 district partners. The committee reviews data, asks questions and provides feedback to the education preparation provider, known as the EPP.

#### *Analysis*

Faculty reviewed Praxis data for 2020-21 completers during a faculty meeting in February, 2022. The faculty noticed that the completers' mean score for the reading section was almost the same as the state mean. When disaggregated by gender, the faculty found no significant differences between the mean scores in the cohort. The faculty also noticed that the EPP's 2020-2021 completers' mean score for social science was below the state's average score. Also, faculty noticed that the special education mean score for the completers was slightly lower than the state average. Due to the small samples in secondary content tests, the faculty were not able to compare the EPP completer scores to those of the state. Faculty did note that the pass rate for the 2020-2021 completers was almost perfect and few candidates had to retake their content tests due to not passing on the first attempt.

#### *Use of Results*

Faculty identified the need for the Center for Student and Professional Services (CSPS) should reach out to students that may need extra support for the identified lower scoring areas and to

encourage students to take advantage of the CSPS' Lending Library for Praxis study materials. This will help students target the areas they need with free resources. [Link to Data](#)

### Skills of Teaching Observation Tool **Otherwise known as STOT**

The Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) is a proprietary assessment based on the InTASC standards and is used as summative assessment during student teaching. It was developed by the North Dakota Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (NDACTE). Details regarding the development and piloting of the program can be found on their website. The 34-item assessment consists of 4 factors: The learner and learning (9 items); Content knowledge (7 items); instructional practice (12 items), and professional responsibility (6 items). The Learner and Learning factor encompasses InTASC standards #1 Learner Development; #2 Learning Differences, and #3 Learning Environments. The content knowledge factor is aligned with InTASC standard #4 Content Knowledge and #5 Application of Content Knowledge. Instructional factors are comprised of InTASC standards #6 Assessment, #7 Planning for Instruction, and #8 Instructional strategies. The final factor of Professional Responsibility aligns with InTASC standards # 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and #10 Leadership and Collaboration. Residency instructors complete training for scoring the assessment and they also complete "in house" calibration.

As the formal assessment tool for the program, candidates are assessed at the end of each semester using the STOT. The STOT is used for monitoring purposes at the conclusion of the first semester of student teaching (Residency I) and as a progression decision at the end of the program (Residency II). Candidates who do not meet expectations are placed on an improvement plan as is detailed in the Residency Handbook. Two additional formative assessments are used each semester as supervisors observe and coach candidates' progress.

After each observation is completed, candidates, the university supervisor, and sometimes the mentor teacher, meet for debriefing. Candidate performance is discussed, areas of strength and for improvement are discussed. The STOT is introduced in the two earlier clinical experiences and discussed in the student teaching coursework days, so candidates are familiar with expectations and performance levels required.

#### *Analysis*

Faculty reviewed the STOT data for 2020-2021 completers and made note that the average mean score for the assessment category is rising but that the elementary/special education double majors' mean score was lower than other majors' score when data was disaggregated by major. The lowest mean score across programs was in the area of application of content.

### *Use of Results*

After reviewing the data, the faculty decided that they will be looking deeper into the elements of the application of content section of the STOT evaluation to see if there is key language or components that need more focus in coursework before residency. [Link to Data](#)

### **Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test**

Candidates must pass the PLT test corresponding to their teaching grade levels before they are graduate and receive licensure from the state. Candidates usually take this test during their final semester of residency. The academic advisor and the placement coordinator track this information. Candidates are required to self-report their scores after taking the test. The advisor and placement coordinator verify the scores through the Praxis data manager website. The placement coordinator records Praxis scores in the cohort tracking database. The results of this data from the 2020-2021 completers is analyzed by faculty and the results are used to inform decision making or program modifications. Data is also shared with external stakeholders such as the Teacher Education Advisory Committee, which is known as TEAC. Members of this committee are from the arts and sciences, fine arts and education schools on campus and K-12 district partners. The committee reviews data, asks questions and provides feedback to the education preparation provider, known as the EPP.

### *Analysis*

In looking at the PLT data, faculty noted that the EPP's 2020-2021 cohort average was above the state's mean score and that there are very few students that did not pass.

### *Use of Results*

In order to continue to enhance completers' PLT scores, the faculty recommended including PLT practice and resources into the course: ELED 433 Professional and Ethical Issues. This course provides candidates the opportunity to enhance practice and skills in pedagogy and professional dispositions and ethics. [Link to Data](#)

### **Praxis Content Test Data for 2020-2021 Completers**

Data is disaggregated by program and gender.

Completer data is compared to state averages.

### **Elementary Test 5002 Reading Sub-score**

Required Score- 150

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=80	165.39	140	188
All South Dakota= 370	165.46	119	195

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Male University of South Dakota=9	165.44	151.00	179.00
Male South Dakota= 47	165.06	145.00	184.00
Female University of South Dakota= 71	165.38	141.00	188.00
Female South Dakota= 323	165.51	119.00	195.00

Elementary Test 5003 Math Sub-score

Required Score- 146

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=80	177.42	146.00	200.00
All South Dakota= 370	173.65	124.00	200.00
Male University of South Dakota=9	185.75	156.00	200.00
Male South Dakota= 47	179.16	149.00	200.00
Female University of South Dakota= 71	176.00	146.00	200.00
Female South Dakota= 323	172.73	124.00	200.00

Elementary Test 5004 Social Science

Required Score- 147

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=80	159.49	146.00	186.00
All South Dakota= 328	161.74	123.00	200.00
Male University of South Dakota=9	170.25	150.00	186.00

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Male South Dakota= 44	171.61	150.00	200.00
Female University of South Dakota= 71	157.73	146.00	186.00
Female South Dakota= 284	160.21	123.00	200.00

Elementary Test 5005 Science Sub-score  
Required Score- 150

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=80	166.96	142.00	194.00
All South Dakota= 310	166.89	114.00	200.00
Male University of South Dakota=9	171.25	142.00	194.00
Male South Dakota= 47	171.14	142.00	197.00
Female University of South Dakota= 71	166.25	150.00	188.00
Female South Dakota= 268	166.22	114.00	200.00

Special Education Test 5354  
Required Score- 145

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=23	167.2	153.00	182.00
All South Dakota= 144	170.34	112.00	193.00
Male University of South Dakota=1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male South Dakota= 20	168.50	153.00	184.00

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Female University of South Dakota= 22	169.27	155.00	186.00
Female South Dakota=124	170.64	112.00	193.00

Art Test 5134

Required Score- 157

University sample size is too small to compare

Biology Test 5235

Required Score- 157

University sample size is too small to compare

Physical Education Test 5091

Required Score- 140

University sample size is too small to compare

English Test 5038

Required Score- 167

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota=5	176.8	167.00	194.00
All South Dakota= 81	176.21	137.00	194.00
Male University of South Dakota=2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male South Dakota= 16	175.63	158.00	193.00
Female University of South Dakota= 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female South Dakota= 65	176.35	137.00	194.00

History Test 5941

Required Score- 135

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota= 5	163.55	148.00	180.00
All South Dakota= 49	160.37	137.00	197.00
Male University of South Dakota= 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male South Dakota= 33	161.45	137.00	197.00
Female University of South Dakota= 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female South Dakota= 16	158.13	142.00	180.00

Math Test 5161 (Changing to 5165)

Required Score- 160

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota= 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
All South Dakota= 49	160.37	137.00	197.00
Male University of South Dakota= 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male South Dakota= 33	161.45	137.00	197.00
Female University of South Dakota= 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female South Dakota= 16	158.13	142.00	180.00

Music Test 5113

Required Score- 150

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota= 13	166.11	149.00	181.00

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All South Dakota= 63	164.89	142.00	187.00
Male University of South Dakota= 7	163.63	149.00	181.00
Male South Dakota= 22	165.91	147.00	184.00
Female University of South Dakota= 5	168.10	149.00	178.00
Female South Dakota= 41	164.34	142.00	187.00

#### Skills of Teaching Observation Tool Data

Data is reported providing the average score for each INTASC standard question. For example, INTASC 1 has 2 relevant questions on the assessment. These 2 scores are averaged into 1 score for the candidate for this report. The data is reporting the final assessment for completers in 2020-2021 academic year. The scale is 1= underdeveloped, 2=emerging, 3=proficient, 4=distinguished.

<i>INTASC Standard</i>	<i>Elementary 87 candidates</i>	<i>Elementary and Special Education 35 candidates</i>	<i>Art, PE (K-12) 11 Candidates</i>	<i>High School 32 Candidates</i>
Learner Development	3.15	3.00	2.98	3.14
Learning Differences	3.15	2.99	3.00	3.05
Learning Environments	3.24	2.95	3.08	3.24
Content Knowledge	3.12	2.93	2.91	3.12
Application of Content	3.07	2.75	2.80	3.04
Assessment	3.10	2.80	2.90	3.03
Planning for Instruction	3.16	3.04	2.97	3.14
Instructional Strategies	3.22	3.03	3.05	3.18

<i>INTASC Standard</i>	<i>Elementary 87 candidates</i>	<i>Elementary and Special Education 35 candidates</i>	<i>Art, PE (K-12) 11 Candidates</i>	<i>High School 32 Candidates</i>
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	3.33	3.22	3.25	3.28
Leadership and Collaboration	3.26	3.15	2.98	3.20

<i>INTASC Standard</i>	<i>Male=18 Candidates</i>	<i>Female= 60 Candidates</i>
Learner Development	2.99	2.97
Learning Differences	2.94	2.95
Learning Environments	3.11	3.09
Content Knowledge	2.96	2.92
Application of Content	2.90	2.79
Assessment	2.83	2.83
Planning for Instruction	2.83	2.98
Instructional Strategies	2.99	3.06
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	3.15	3.24
Leadership and Collaboration	2.93	3.12

### Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis Tests

Elementary Education PLT 5622

Required Score=160

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota= 70	174.09	137.00	193.00
All South Dakota= 252	173.06	142.00	193.00
Male University of South Dakota=8	170.63	160.00	179.00
Male South Dakota= 40	170.18	148.00	183.00
Female	173.93	137.00	193.00

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
University of South Dakota= 62			
Female South Dakota= 212	173.60	142.00	193.00

Secondary Education PLT 5624

Required Score=157

<i>Student Population</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
All University of South Dakota= 29	174.10	131.00	186.00
All South Dakota= 258	173.31	108.00	196.00
Male University of South Dakota= 14	171.53	131.00	186.00
Male South Dakota= 118	169.92	108.00	196.00
Female University of South Dakota= 15	176.50	162.00	184.00
Female South Dakota= 140	176.16	148.00	195.00

## **CAEP Accountability Advanced Measure 3**

Measure 3 (Advanced). Candidate competency at program completion ([Component RA3.4](#))

The advanced programs have separate key assessments that are used to ensure that candidates possess academic competencies in the areas of: positive impacts on diverse student learning, content knowledge, data literacy and research-driven decision making, collaboration skills and application of technology. The programs' analysis and use of data, description of assessments and disaggregated data is reported according to each program.

### **School Psychology**

The school psychology program identifies the following as its key assessments: the Graduate Record Examination, known as the GRE; the Praxis 5402 School Psychology Exam; and the internship experience.

#### **GRE Entrance Exam**

The GRE General Test is required for the Specialist of Education degree program with a minimum score of 145 in the Verbal section and 143 in the Quantitative section for full admission. The GRE General test is required for the Doctor of Philosophy degree program with a minimum score of 147 in the Verbal section and 145 in the Quantitative section for full admission. GRE General Test at Home will be accepted through spring 2023.

#### Analysis and Use of Results

All accepted candidates met the minimum score requirements. The average score for the verbal section was 149 and the quantitative section average was 145. Faculty will continue monitoring the scores of applicants to ensure that cut scores are sufficient.

#### **Praxis 5402 School Psychology Exam**

The Praxis 5402 exam is a national minimum competency exam for school psychologists. The test is scored by ETS. The Criteria For Success is that students must obtain an average score or higher on content category IV (which measures school and system organization and policy development in addition to consultation and collaboration) of the Praxis II relative to national records of examinees completing the exam during the previous three years. We expect that at least 90% of students in the program will meet this criterion.

#### Analysis and Use of Results

Candidates all met the national minimum competency on the national examination. When evaluating individual student data, there was some variability among students. Faculty will review the examination practices in the systems prevention course to ensure that course objectives are aligned with the national examination.

[Link to Data](#)

## **Internship Evaluation**

The evaluation is based on the National Association of School Psychologists, abbreviated as NASP. Direct - Summative - Internship Evaluation Form, a rating scale, completed by interns' supervisors. The program coordinator will compute the average each student obtains on items related to this objective. Criteria for success is that candidates must receive an overall rating of 3 or better (1=unsatisfactory; 2= below expectations; 3=meets expectations; 4=exceeds expectations; 5=outstanding) on Internship Evaluation Form items pertaining to this learning objective. We expect that 90% of students in the program will meet this criterion. The school psychology program are following a phase in plan to complete validity and reliability studies on the internship assessment. The program met the fall 20221 deadline to study and establish content validity.

*Phase In Plan Update:* The faculty completed a validity study on the internship evaluation. The content validity ratio or CVR needed to be equal to or greater than 0.49. Faculty have started work to study and establish reliability for this key assessment. Work is projected to be completed in or before spring 2023.

## Analysis and Use of Results

No changes to learning outcomes are needed as program goal criterion was met. Continue to provide high-quality instruction and experiences. We will monitor progress to ensure goals are met. Question adjustments were made based on the validity study completed in 2021. Below are the changes:

- Faculty will change the internship question regarding prevention practices to reflect prevention programs that are relevant in the State of SD (ie. PBIS)
- The crisis prevention question, we will add examples relevant in SD (ie. PREPaRE training).
- Population-based services question: Faculty will add examples to this question (ie. PBIS, preschool/kindergarten screening, CBMs)
- RE: technology questions may be elevated due to connectivity issues in SD schools; continued efforts to build infrastructure are in place, however, we also teach how to provide School Psych services where connectivity is an issue. Faculty choose not to change this question.
- Demonstrates knowledge and skills needed to select and implement empirically supported models and strategies designed to promote mental health and life skills of children.; change this question to reflect adaptive and social skills for children
- Demonstrates knowledge and skills needed to identify and address factors that have an impact on family-school-community interactions when developing and providing services for families.—faculty met and discussed the emerging trends in the field and family engagement is critical to creating systems change. The question remains unchanged.
- Research and program evaluation questions: Although this is not a core role of school psychologists and aligned with school's mission statement, the SPSY program is teaching more relevant single case design methodological practices. This will be included in the question

[\*\*Link to Data\*\*](#)

- Demonstrates the ability to evaluate and synthesize research findings as a foundation for effective service delivery. (ie. Effectiveness of an intervention using single case design)
- Demonstrates knowledge/skills in program evaluation methods at the individual, group, and systems levels. (ie. Effectiveness of a curriculum or behavior referrals)

## **Educational Leadership**

### **Entrance Writing Sample**

The Entrance Writing Prompt is aligned to the division's student learning outcomes and National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards. The prompt is a component of the evidence used to approve or deny entrance into the program. Our writing prompt is very important as we strive to meet CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity. After discussing our division goals during full division meetings over a span of two years, we established division goals aligned to the NELP Standards. CAEP Standard 3 helped our division create a writing prompt based on our division goals, which aids in our efforts to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. The writing prompt helps us create a program that reflects the diversity of America's PreK-12 students. It also helps us prepare school leaders to lead throughout the region.

### Analysis and Use of Results

The division is working through a phase in plan in order to ensure validity and reliability of scoring. In the summer of 2021, the program sent a survey to 20 Ed Leadership Stakeholders (experts in the field such as superintendents, principals and other PK-12 administrators) responded to a survey asking them to review writing prompts (asked of applicants to Ed Leadership programs) and internship expectations that are required of Ed Leadership candidates. The stakeholders were to decide if the questions/prompts were: Essential, Useful but not essential, or Not essential. A content validity ratio (CVR) was calculated for each writing prompt, using the rating results of the expert panel. The critical value = .42. The CVR value must be .42 or below for it to be within range of content validity. If the value was smaller than .42, faculty reviewed the item to make adjustments and redid the CVR or eliminated the prompt. Inter-rater reliability was completed in October 2021. The first complete data for the revised key assessment will be in 2023-2024 academic year.

[Link to Data](#)

### **Internship Evaluation**

Criteria For Success: Graduate students will achieve Acceptable or Target for 80% of the criteria. The results will be used to assess ability to apply content from the course to an authentic field based assignment monitored by the instructor and a field based mentor. If graduate student

falls below the acceptable margin, remediation will occur. If more than 50% of the students do not reach acceptable, the instructor will re-examine the project goals, criteria, instructions and assessment tool. Faculty are working on a phase in plan to ensure the assessment meets CAEP sufficiency levels. Validity was established in August 2021 with a critical value of .42 generated from feedback of 20 panelists. Discussion centered on the wording of questions and the necessity to fine tune language.

### Analysis and Use of Results

Looking at 2020-2021 data, we had already identified 1.1.1, 1.1.4, and 1.1.6 as areas in need of improvement and have made curricular Changes. ACTION: We would like to review additional cycles of data to ensure that the raw numbers are sufficient for analysis.

[Link to Data](#)

### **Praxis Test**

The Ed Leadership programs are phasing out comprehensive exams as a key assessment to replace it with Praxis 6990 for PK-12 principals and Praxis 6991 for PK-12 superintendents. The cut score for Praxis 6990 is 146 and 162 for Praxis 6991 (No completers have yet taken the 6691 test). The programs' goal for this key assessment is that 80% of students meet minimum score for each subcategory.

### Analysis and Use of Results

100% of candidates met or exceeded the state passing test score of 146. After reviewing the data, the programs have decided to recommend that candidates take the PRAXIS in the last semester so that they have the practical experience to support their theoretical understanding. Based upon a review of the PRAXIS data, we will advise students to take PRAXIS in the final spring semester during their internship to ensure that they have experience with NELP standard 7. We believe students took the PRAXIS too early to "get it out of the way" which does not reflect a true measure of their understanding of standard 7 operational management. This allows them to apply theory to practice and may increase their understanding of operational management and their capacity to enact this in their leadership positions following graduation.

[Link to Data](#)

### **School Psychology Data**

#### **GRE Entrance Exam Data**

2020-2021 Graduates

7 Completers

<b>Qualitative or Verbal Average</b>	<b>Quantitative Average</b>
149.6	145.6

## Praxis 5402 School Psychology Exam

2020-2021 Graduates

National Association of School Psychologist test cut off score is 149

8 Completers

<b>Average Score</b>	179
----------------------	-----

<b>Test Category</b>	<b>Average Percent Correct</b>
Professional Practices	84.85%
Direct and Indirect Services	76%
Systems-Level Services	76.47%
Foundations of Service Delivery	85.71%

## School Psychology Internship Evaluation

Ratings are on a 5 point Likert scale

<b>NASP Domains</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Mean Ratings 2020-21</b>
2.1 Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability	8. Demonstrates knowledge of various models and methods of assessment and the ability to use such models and methods to collect data for effective decision-making and problem-solving.	4.63
	12. Demonstrates the ability to accurately interpret and integrate assessment data to formulate appropriate recommendations based on the assessment data.	4.25
	13. Demonstrates the ability to translate assessment results into empirically based decisions regarding service delivery.	4.13
	29. Demonstrates the knowledge and skills needed to use assessment and data collection methods to measure response to, delivery of, and outcomes for services.	4.50
	30. Demonstrates the ability to access information and technology resources to enhance data collection and decision-making.	4.38
	33. Demonstrates the ability to implement methods for promoting and measuring treatment/intervention integrity.	4.25
	<b>Domain Mean Rating</b>	<b>4.36</b>
2.2 Consultation and Collaboration	14. Demonstrates the ability to effectively present and disseminate information to parents, teachers, team members, and other professionals.	4.63
	19. Demonstrates knowledge of and skills in various models of consultation/collaboration & is able to apply them to particular situations (e.g., consulting w teachers, parents, colleagues, & other agencies).	4.50
	20. Is able to effectively collaborate with others in problem-solving processes at the individual, group, and system levels.	4.50

NASP Domains	Items	Mean Ratings
		2020-21
	27. Demonstrates familiarity with information and instructional technology relevant to his/her work and utilizes it to improve his/her practice.	4.29
	31. Demonstrates knowledge and skills needed to consult and collaborate in development, implementation, and evaluation of instructional and mental health interventions.	4.25
	<b>Domain Mean Rating</b>	<b>4.43</b>
	2.3 Interventions and Instructional Supports to Develop Academic Skills	9. Demonstrates knowledge of learning processes and the ability to utilize a wide range of cognitive and academic assessment instruments and techniques to assess the processes.
	16. Demonstrates the ability to develop and implement classroom interventions designed to improve cognitive and academic skills and to evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions.	4.25
	32. Demonstrates knowledge of empirically supported models in psychology and education to promote cognitive and academic skills, including those related to needs of children with diverse backgrounds and characteristics.	4.50
	34. Demonstrates the knowledge and skills needed to implement evidence-based services that support cognitive and academic goals across multiple settings including classroom and home settings.	4.25
	<b>Domain Mean Rating</b>	<b>4.38</b>
	2.4 Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	10. Demonstrates the skills to use behavioral, affective, and social assessment instruments and techniques for the purposes of planning, supporting, and evaluating interventions that support socialization and mental health.
	17. Demonstrates the ability to develop and implement behavioral interventions designed to improve social and adaptive behavior skills and to evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions.	4.25
	18. Demonstrates knowledge of various models of counseling and is able to utilize appropriate counseling interventions.	3.83
	35. Demonstrates skills needed to use assessment data appropriately when developing social-emotional and behavioral goals for children with diverse backgrounds and needs.	4.25

## Educational Leadership Data

### Admissions Writing Prompt

2020-2021 Data

<b>2020 Admission (3 Point Scale)</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Cohort Average</b>
PK-12 Principal Ed.D	n=5	n=3	n=8
Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Core Values Question: Describe how you have inspired a shared mission and vision of an organization.	2.02	2.25	2.1
Standard Two: Ethics and Professionalism Standard Six: Management of People, Data, and Processes Question: Describe one example from your own experience in which you identified the root cause of a complex problem and designed a plan to solve it.	2.0	2.46	2.15
Standard Three: Equity and Cultural Leadership Question: Describe how you have modeled equity-oriented inclusive leadership.	1.71	1.89	1.95
Standard Eight: Internship and Clinical Practice Question: Describe an experience in which you facilitated the inclusion of multiple perspectives and/or diversity of thought.	1.98	2.46	2.14
Standard Five: Community and External Leadership Question: Describe how you developed strong partnerships.	2.13	2.25	2.17
Standard Four: Instructional Leadership Standard Seven: Policy, Governance and Advocacy Question: Describe a time when you led a systemic change.	1.98	2.5	2.15

**Internship PK-12 Principal Data**  
NELP Standards Aligned

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Component 1.1 collaboratively communicates a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.	3.22	0.48	3.28	0.06
Component 1.2 leads improvement processes that include data use, design, implementation, and evaluation.	3.22	0.42	3.35	0.11
Component 2.1 reflects on, communicates about, cultivates, and models professional dispositions and norms.	3.56	0.5	3.57	0.04
Component 2.2 advocates for ethical and legal decisions.	3.51	0.5	3.37	0.12
Component 2.3 models ethical behavior in personal conduct and relationships and cultivates ethical behavior in others.	3.56	0.5	3.59	0.03
Component 3.1 understands and demonstrates capacity to use data to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.	3.5	0.55	3.47	0.04
Component 3.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and technologies.	3.42	0.6	3.38	0.08
Component 3.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive, and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff.	3.47	0.55	3.48	0.03

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Component 4.1 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology-rich curricula programs.	3.44	0.6	3.41	0.03
Component 4.2 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate, instructional practices, resources, technologies, and services that support equity, digital literacy, and the school's academic and non-academic systems.	3.5	0.55	3.38	0.12
Component 4.3 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate accessible assessments that support data-informed instructional improvement and student learning.	3.44	0.6	3.42	0.04
Component 4.4 understands and can demonstrate capacity to implement the school's curriculum, instruction, technology, and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.	3.53	0.55	3.43	0.1
Component 5.1 understands and demonstrates capacity to collaboratively engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.	3.4	0.49	3.4	0.07
Component 5.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.	3.39	0.49	3.44	0.06

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Component 5.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to communicate within the larger community, and political contexts when advocating for the needs of their school and community.	3.39	0.49	3.32	0.08
Component 6.1 understands and demonstrates capacity implement management, communication, technology, school-level.	3.25	0.43	3.34	0.12
Component 6.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to evaluate, develop, and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan.	3.19	0.52	3.3	0.13
Component 6.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.	3.19	0.46	3.26	0.09
Component 7.1 understands and has capacity to develop the school's professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting, and hiring staff.	3.31	0.46	3.31	0.07
Component 7.2 understands and has capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention.	3.42	0.55	3.45	0.03

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Component 7.3 understands and has capacity to personally engage in, and collaboratively engage school staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership.	3.31	0.57	3.42	0.09
Component 7.4 understands and has the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement systems of supervision, support, and evaluation designed to promote school improvement and student success.	3.33	0.53	3.36	0.06

Internship PK-12 Superintendent Data  
NELP Aligned

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Component 1.1 collaboratively communicates a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.	3.22	0.06
Component 1.2 leads improvement processes that include data use, design, implementation, and evaluation.	3.22	0.11
Component 2.1 reflects on, communicates about, cultivates, and models professional dispositions and norms.	3.56	0.03
Component 2.2 advocates for ethical and legal decisions.	3.51	0.13
Component 2.3 models ethical behavior in personal conduct and relationships and cultivates ethical behavior in others.	3.56	0.03

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Component 3.1 understands and demonstrates capacity to use data to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.	3.5	0.04
Component 3.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and technologies.	3.42	0.08
Component 3.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive, and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff.	3.47	0.03
Component 4.1 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology-rich curricula programs.	3.44	0.03
Component 4.2 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate, instructional practices, resources, technologies, and services that support equity, digital literacy, and the school's academic and non-academic systems.	3.5	0.12
Component 4.3 understands and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate accessible assessments that support data-informed instructional improvement and student learning.	3.44	0.05

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Component 4.4 understands and can demonstrate capacity to implement the school’s curriculum, instruction, technology, and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.	3.53	0.09
Component 5.1 understands and demonstrates capacity to collaboratively engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.	3.4	0.06
Component 5.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.	3.39	0.06
Component 5.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to communicate within the larger community, and political contexts when advocating for the needs of their school and community.	3.39	0.08
Component 6.1 understands and demonstrates capacity implement management, communication, technology, school-level.	3.25	0.12
Component 6.2 understands and demonstrates capacity to evaluate, develop, and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan.	3.19	0.13
Component 6.3 understands and demonstrates capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.	3.19	0.09

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Component 7.1 understands and has capacity to develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting, and hiring staff.	3.31	0.06
Component 7.2 understands and has capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention.	3.42	0.03
Component 7.3 understands and has capacity to personally engage in, and collaboratively engage school staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership.	3.31	0.1
Component 7.4 understands and has the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement systems of supervision, support, and evaluation designed to promote school improvement and student success.	3.33	0.05

**Praxis 6990 School Leader Licensure Exam**

2020-2021 Graduates

test cut off score= 146

Completers that took test= 8

Strategic Leadership Cohort Ave	12.63	77%
possible points	16.38	
Instructional Leadership Cohort Ave	17.88	78%
possible points	23.00	
Climate and Cultural Leadership Cohort Ave	13.38	75%
possible points	17.88	
Ethical Leadership Cohort Ave	11.38	71%
possible points	16.00	

Organizational Leadership Cohort Ave	7.63	62%
possible points	12.25	
Community Engagement Lead Cohort Ave	9.75	76%
possible points	12.88	
Analysis of Constructed Response Cohort Ave	15.50	65%
possible points	24.00	

Data by Gender

Male=2

Female=6

Strategic Leadership Cohort Ave possible points 16.38	Male	Female
	14.81	12.63
Instructional Leadership Cohort Ave possible points 23.00	Male	Female
	19.83	17.88
Climate and Cultural Leadership Cohort Ave possible points 17.88	Male	Female
	16.44	13.38
Ethical Leadership Cohort Ave possible points 16.00	Male	Female
	12.50	11.38
Organizational Leadership Cohort Ave possible points 12.25	Male	Female
	10.75	7.63
Community Engagement Lead Cohort Ave possible points 12.88	Male	Female
	10.69	9.75
Analysis of Constructed Response Cohort Ave possible points 24.00	Male	Female
	17.58	15.50

Data by Individual

Strategic Leadership Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
14.00	16.00	88%
13.00	16.00	81%
9.00	17.00	56%
12.00	16.00	75%
13.00	16.00	81%
13.00	17.00	81%

13.00	16.00	81%
14.00	17.00	88%
Instructional Leadership Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
19.00	23.00	83%
19.00	23.00	83%
15.00	23.00	65%
17.00	23.00	74%
20.00	23.00	87%
16.00	23.00	70%
20.00	23.00	87%
17.00	23.00	74%
17.88	23.00	78%
Climate and Cult Lead Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
16.00	18.00	89%
8.00	18.00	44%
13.00	18.00	72%
14.00	18.00	78%
14.00	18.00	78%
13.00	18.00	72%
15.00	18.00	83%
14.00	17.00	82%
13.38	17.88	75%
Ethical Leadership Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
12.00	16.00	75%
8.00	16.00	50%
14.00	16.00	88%
11.00	16.00	69%
13.00	16.00	81%
7.00	16.00	44%
10.00	16.00	63%
16.00	16.00	100%
11.38	16.00	71%
Organizational Leadership Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
10.00	12.00	83%
9.00	12.00	75%
8.00	13.00	62%
6.00	12.00	50%

7.00	12.00	58%
8.00	13.00	62%
8.00	12.00	67%
5.00	12.00	42%
7.63	12.25	62%
Community Engagement and Leadership Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
10.00	13.00	77%
9.00	13.00	69%
10.00	13.00	77%
10.00	13.00	77%
8.00	13.00	62%
9.00	13.00	69%
13.00	13.00	100%
9.00	12.00	75%
9.75	12.88	76%
Analysis of Constructed Response Candidate Score	possible points	percentage
17.00	24.00	71%
14.00	24.00	58%
17.00	24.00	71%
13.00	24.00	54%
19.00	24.00	79%
12.00	24.00	50%
18.00	24.00	75%
14.00	24.00	58%
15.50	24.00	65%

## **CAEP Accountability Initial and Advanced Measure 4**

Measure 4 (Initial and/or Advanced). Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared

The state of South Dakota's Board of Regents tracks graduate placement in state one year after graduation. The data is one year behind the CAEP Annual reporting measures' data cycle expectation. For CAEP's 2020-2021 annual reporting cycle, the EPP is using data from the most recent graduation year reported by the state: 2019. The Graduate placement rate reported is a conservative estimate in that it does not track South Dakota universities' graduates who are employed out of state. The source for the data provides is from the link below.

<https://www.sdbor.edu/dashboards/Pages/GraduatePlacement.aspx>

### **Advanced Programs**

#### **School Psychology**

The placement rate for School Psychology (including Counseling) is 54% of graduates are employed in South Dakota as school psychologists or counselors according to the SDBOR Graduate Placement Dashboard for fiscal year 2019. The number of graduates is 26 with 14 of them gaining employment in South Dakota.

#### **School Leadership**

The placement rate for the EPP's Educational administration completers was 56% in South Dakota according to the SDBOR Graduate Placement Dashboard for fiscal year 2019. There were 135 graduates and 75 of these graduates became employed in South Dakota as school administrators. Graduates not employed in South Dakota are not counted in the percentage employed.

### **Initial Programs**

#### **Teacher Education**

The state data report the following numbers for completers in teacher education for fiscal year 2019: Elementary education had 70 graduates and 43 became employed in South Dakota for a state placement rate of 62%; there were 68 elementary/special education double majors with 40 of them gaining employment in South Dakota for a percentage of 59%; and there were 35 graduates of a secondary education content area with 15 of them finding employment in South Dakota for 43%. The school of education tracks completers after graduation in order to gather data concerning preparation one year after graduation. Residency instructors request graduates to disclose where completers are employed during their first year of teaching. We track all candidates in all states. Our records indicate that 71 percent of our graduates were employed one year after graduation. Our records indicate that 33 percent of our graduates in 2020-2021 are employed as teachers outside of South Dakota and 9 percent decided to go to graduate school.

