

# 2022 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP ID: 12103

Institution: University of South Dakota

Unit: School of Education

AACTE SID: 4270

## Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

Please review the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS and update the following information for: Contact Persons, EPP Characteristics, Program Listings. [See the Annual Report Technical Guide for additional guidance.]

### 1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

1.1.1 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head."

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

**Agree**

1.1.2 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator". [The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

**Agree**

1.1.3 I confirm that the EPP has provided updated contact information for two distinct people for these roles.

[CAEP requires that EPPs provide information for two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personal turnover.]

**Agree**

### 1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

1.2.1 *Basic Information* - I confirm that the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

**Agree**

1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS [The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

**Agree**

1.2.3 *Program Options* - I confirm that EPP's program listings (including program name, program

review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should be archived and not listed in AIMS).

Agree

## Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

### 2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2020-2021?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 114

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)<sup>2</sup> 93

**Total number of program completers 207**

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#)

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Please report on any substantive changes that have occurred at the EPP/Institution or Organization, as well as the EPP's current regional accreditation status.

### Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2020-2021 academic year?

3.1 Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?

**No Change / Not Applicable**

3.2 Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teachout agreements?

**No Change / Not Applicable**

3.3 Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?

**No Change / Not Applicable**

3.4. What is the EPP's current regional accreditation status? Accreditation Agency:

**CAEP**

Status: **Probationary Accreditation**

Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?

**No Change**

3.5 Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per CAEP's Accreditation Policy?

**No Change**

## Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

Please update the EPP's public facing website to include: 1) the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP (NCATE, or TEAC) reviewed programs, and 2) the EPP's data display of the CAEP Accountability Measures for Academic Year 2020-2021.

### 4.1. EPP's current CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided

along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.  
<https://www.usd.edu/Academics/Colleges-and-Schools/school-of-education/Accreditation>

#### **4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]**

Provider shares a direct link to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures, as gathered during the 2020-2021 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

[CAEP Accountability Measures \(for CHEA Requirements\) \[2020-2021 Academic Year\]](#)

**Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)** Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth AND (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

**Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**  
Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.

**Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**

Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)

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

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] <https://www.usd.edu/Academics/Colleges-and-Schools/school-of-education/Accreditation>

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] <https://www.usd.edu/Academics/Colleges-and-Schools/school-of-education/Accreditation>

### **Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations**

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

**The EPP provided insufficient evidence that candidate's clinical experiences ensure that they demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. (Component 2.3)**

The EPP is on schedule to meet the phase in plan goals for the Impact on Student Learning (ISL) assessment to demonstrate that candidates are developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. During 2020- 2021, the faculty agreed to implement the ISL assessment into the field (1st experience- before entering the program), internship (second/before residency) and continue to use it during residency. Faculty developed scaffolded ISL assignments to ensure candidates are building on prior knowledge learned in courses. During spring of 2021, rubrics and assessment expectations was validated using the Lawshe method to establish content validity ratio. The expert panel was a pool of P-12 educators. The rubrics and assessments were adjusted. Inter-rater reliability was established with faculty teaching the field, internship and residency experiences. Currently (Spring 2022), a pilot is being completed and faculty will review data in order to assess if changes are needed. In the probation self-study and visit, the EPP provided evidence that the phase in plan was being followed and site visitors accepted the improvements and recommended that this AFI be removed.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP provided an insufficient plan to regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards, track results over time, test innovations and the effect of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, or use results to improve program elements and processes. (Component 5.3)**

Faculty collaborated to design and establish an annual cycle that provides appointed times for faculty to review program data from key assessments in addition to monitoring established faculty goals in recruitment and candidate expectations. The faculty completed their first data review cycle based on the established procedures in 2020 based on data from 2019-2020 data. The faculty reviewed the following data: grades, Praxis content and PLT tests, key assessment results and results from the exit, completer and employers surveys. Faculty recommended changes in programming and goals were established and documented in Nuventive. In the probation self study and visit, the EPP provided evidence that the quality assurance and continuous improvement plans were being followed and site visitors accepted the improvements and recommended that this AFI be removed.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP provided an insufficient plan to measure the impact of completer data on P-12 student growth. (Component 5.4)**

The state does not share student learning growth measures associated to individual classroom teachers. The EPP piloted adding 3 questions to the TTS survey for South Dakota teachers to self-report their SLO, Danielson and overall teacher effectiveness rating (Survey completers answered if they were teaching in South Dakota and if they reported yes, they were asked to provide information for the 3 prompts. The data is what South Dakota uses for measuring teacher effectiveness. All supervisors are trained in using Danielson and how to calculate overall teacher effectiveness rating. South Dakota teachers and administrators are both trained on the development and implementation of the SLO (Student Learning

Outcome) measurement. Teacher education faculty analyzed the data in comparison to other key assessment data to find possible relationships. Faculty recommended continuing to ask completers to self report this data. In the probation self study and visit, the EPP provided evidence that the quality assurance and continuous improvement plans were being followed and site visitors accepted the improvements and recommended that this AFI be removed.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

##### **The EPP provided limited evidence that stakeholder feedback is provided systematically. (Component 5.5)**

The EPP recognized that it was not effectively documenting its collaborations with external partners and stakeholders. Programs are now keeping meeting minutes in Nuventive. All programs have unique advisory councils and specialized partnerships. The Dean has an external advisory committee made up of stakeholder representative of all EPP programs. This committee meets twice a year to review program curriculum and assessment data. Stakeholders are also asked to provide anecdotal information concerning programs. The EPP programs have documented changes based on stakeholder feedback in division meeting minutes and these changes are monitored through data gathered and reviewed during annual data cycle reviews. In the probation self study and visit, the EPP provided evidence that the quality assurance and continuous improvement plans were being followed and site visitors accepted the improvements and recommended that this AFI be removed.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

##### **The EPP did not provide evidence of a quality assurance system that is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. (Component 5.1)**

In preparation for the probationary site visit, the EPP ensured that all programs were following the EPP policy and procedures established by the assessment handbook and the school of education bylaws. All programs confirmed that they were following the below structure of a quality assurance system that allowed programs to monitor quality of candidates and their progress through programs. Entrance: In order to be accepted into EPP programs, all candidates must meet GPA requirements, standardized test cut scores, or demonstrate proficiency such as the ability to think and write critically. During: Coursework is aligned to SPA standards and scaffolded learning progression of content knowledge, professional dispositions and application in the field happen during the programs. Completion: completers are summatively assessed on content knowledge, professional dispositions, and their abilities to apply these to practice. Completer achievements such as employment and effectiveness are tracked by the EPP through survey instruments such as completer and employer surveys and case studies completed within partnerships with PK-12 districts. The advanced programs have created a phase in plan to collect completer and employer data through surveys. The programs will fully implement the completer survey in June of 2021 with NExT university partners and pilot the employer survey in June 2021. Within this standardized structure described, programs have multiple measures (data from measures are disaggregated by content and, when appropriate, also by gender in each program's Key Assessment documents that include benchmarks, formative/summative assessments and surveys aligned to each program's Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards SPAs and crosswalks. In order to set priorities, and evaluate/monitor operational effectiveness, the EPP programs' coordinators or division chairs document in Nuventive the standards-based goals approved by faculty in curriculum meetings, work with the assessment coordinator to collect the assessment data, review results with faculty during meetings, and then document faculty moving forward decisions in Nuventive. In the probation self study and visit, the EPP provided evidence that the quality assurance plans were being followed and site visitors accepted the improvements and recommended that this stipulation be removed.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

##### **The EPP did not provide evidence of a quality assurance system that relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. (Component 5.2)**

The EPP faculty reviewed all key assessments using CAEP's EPP Created Evaluation Framework. Identified deficiencies were found and the faculty created phase in plans to ensure that all key assessments will meet CAEP sufficiency levels. For the probationary self study report and site visit, the EPP provided "program overviews" with aligned key assessment/survey documents that included disaggregated data and analysis. The evidence provided demonstrated that all programs' key assessments and data either meet expectations of the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments or that there is a detailed phase in plan in place to ensure that the EPP created assessment/survey will meet the framework's expectations and included additional information concerning how validity and reliability were established or it is noted on the document to refer to a phase in plan that details the type and progress of validity and reliability the program plans to complete. The probationary site visitors recommended that this stipulation be removed because they found evidence that the EPP is meeting quality assurance expectations or have phase in plans to meet expectations. Updates in phase in plans (now labeled as transition plans) will be provided in Section 6.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ADV) 4 Program Impact**

##### **The EPP does not document or provide a plan to demonstrate that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention. (component A.4.1)**

The EPP continues its work on the phase in plan to collect employer satisfaction. Pilot data was collected in 2021 summer. Data was analyzed in fall 2021 and faculty used results to make decisions on collection of feedback. Advanced programs will continue to send out the employer satisfaction survey, however, several of the advanced programs will pilot focus group data collection to see if they get more or similar feedback results. Surveys for 2020-2021 completers will be sent out in May and June 2022.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ADV) 4 Program Impact**

##### **The EPP does not document or provide a plan to demonstrate that advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective. (component A.4.2)**

In Spring 2021, the EPP piloted a completer survey sent to 2019-2020 graduates. In order to collect data concerning how well

the programs prepared them for their first year in the profession. The EPP chose to use the Common Metrics Advanced Program Completer Satisfaction Survey created by NExT. Surveys were sent to the 2019-2020 graduates: 8 School Psychology majors and 106 Education Leadership majors (there were no Reading major graduates). The response rate for the pilot survey was 16% after multiple attempts to encourage alumni to complete the survey. The response rate data was representative in that of the responses, 8% were from school psychologists and 92% were from educational leadership. In analysis of data, faculty identified that the low response rate was an issue. Faculty are considering how response rates might improve. The assessment committee will discuss this before the survey is sent in 2022 to consider the possibility of hosting a focus group to collect additional feedback.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP provided insufficient evidence that it regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, track results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion and uses results to improve program elements and processes. (Component A.5.3)**

The EPP has completed 1 cycle of its annual cycle of setting goals, collecting data, analyzing data and using the results to establish new goals or changes to its programs. Programs have been using Nuventive to document this process. The Nuventive reports along with meeting minutes were used to create the reports for the CAEP Annual Measures in addition to tracking the programs' other priorities. This process has worked well and we will continue to use this for reporting on assessment measures for 2021-2022.

#### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP provided insufficient evidence to assure that appropriate stakeholders are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. (Component A.5.5)**

The EPP has been intentional in collecting meeting data from stakeholder meetings. There are meetings involving established groups such as the Dean's External Advisory Committee (representation of stakeholders from all programs) and TEAC (Teacher Education Advisory Committee). Also, programs' faculty are involved at the state and national level with stakeholders during state and national conferences and meetings. Examples of the programs using feedback from stakeholders can be found in Measure 2 of the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ADV) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP did not provide a plan to ensure that the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. (Component A.5.2)**

In preparation for the probationary site visit, the EPP advanced programs reviewed their key assessments and put into place phase in plans to ensure the assessments were meeting CAEP sufficiency levels. During the 2020-2021 academic year, the programs completed validity and reliability studies on assessments, made changes to the assessments and rubrics, and then piloted the updated assessments. We are in the process of collecting pilot assessment data during the 2021-2022 academic year. Phase in plans were updated for the site visit in November and have continued their progression.

#### **CAEP: Stipulation (ADV) 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**The EPP did not provide a plan to summarize, externally benchmark, analyze, share widely, and act upon in decision making related to program completers, resource allocation, and future direction. (Component A.5.4)**

The EPP has revised its reporting of Title II and CAEP Annual measures in format and content. Presently, the university is in the process of transitioning to a new website and a priority for them is to ensure that the EPP reporting measures are shared prominently on our website. In order to be digitally compliant, the EPP has generated new templates for both Title II data and CAEP reporting measures. The EPP updated the format of data reporting for the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures in that it summarizes how it collects data, analyzes the results, reports how programs will use the results and then provides a link to the end of the document for readers wanting to look more deeply into the data.

### **Section 6. EPP's Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-level) Transition Plans**

Please share any continuous improvement initiatives at the EPP, AND (if applicable) provide CAEP with an update on the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans.

#### **6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year.**

This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

1. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) reviewed key assessment rubrics and approved the programs to use them. Discussion was also held concerning no longer needing to use the Praxis CORE as a measure of basic skill knowledge for CAEP. Arts and

Sciences and Fine Arts were in favor of not requiring the test and PK-12 partners believe it is still important. This information was taken to BARC (Basic Admission and Retention Committee) and the committee decided to keep the CORE requirement in place, but lower the writing score requirement to 155.

2. School Psychology discussed with stakeholders the need to place internship students earlier due to students receiving internship offers in other states much earlier. The stakeholders agreed and this was implemented in 2022. Stakeholders also suggested that school psychology students be involved in state trainings. This was incorporated into the 2021-2022 program. Other topics of discussion were the critical shortages of school psychologists and the credentialing language needing to be updated by the state in order to reflect NASP 2020 standards.

3. Educational Leadership worked with stakeholders to review the new internship assignments in the portfolio key assessment. The program received feedback concerning addressing student behaviors assignment and added information on Tiers, adjusted the timeline of the assignment, behavior identification that is new to the candidates and require candidates to collect, summarize and use data to drive decisions in working with behaviors.

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

Yes

## Section 8: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

**8.1 . [OPTIONAL] Just as CAEP asks EPPs to reflect on their work towards continuous improvement, CAEP endeavors to improve its own practices. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information to identify areas of priority in assisting EPPs.**

8.1.1 What semester is your next accreditation visit? Fall 2026

8.1.2 Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?  
No

**8.2 Preparer's authorization.** *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages are up to date and accurate at the time of submission..*

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Robin Wiebers

Position: Associate Dean

Phone: 605 658 6608

Email: robin.wiebers@usd.edu

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