Section 1. EPP Profile
After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider’s (EPP’s) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).
https://www.usd.edu/education/accreditation

Section 2. Program Completers
2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.)

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of program completers 241

1 For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual
2 For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

### Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 | A.5.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)</td>
<td>5. Graduation Rates (initial &amp; advanced levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)</td>
<td>6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial &amp; advanced levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3</td>
<td>A.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4</td>
<td>A.4.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Link:** [https://www.usd.edu/education/accreditation](https://www.usd.edu/education/accreditation)

**Description of data accessible via link:** CAEP Accreditation Report, CAEP Annual Reporting Measures, CAEP Annual Report, Initial and Advanced Programs, Title II from present year and past 2 years.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Annual Reporting Measure</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial-Licensure Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced-Level Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

- Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?
- Are benchmarks available for comparison?
- Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

The EPP shares this information on its website and also provides and discusses data at meetings with both external and internal partners. During program, division, external and internal meetings, 2019-20 data is compared to the 2 prior years' data. Programs set benchmarks for success at the beginning of the year and review results to monitor if they are meeting expectations. Measure 1 and 2: The EPP identifies that initial program completers are successful in meeting or exceeding teacher effectiveness (4.2) and student growth (4.1) state expectations after graduating. The data is limited in that it is collected through case studies of PK-12 partners that hire some of our graduates. We are in conversations with the state to collect teacher effectiveness and student growth through the state mentoring program on all 1st year teachers employed by South Dakota districts. By collecting this data, the EPP will have a more robust data set to review.

Completers are meeting or exceeding expectations based on the Danielson framework and SLO data and professional practice rating (100% met or exceeded expectations). The data suggests we are preparing teacher candidates to be successful in their first year of teaching based on the evaluations by their administrators and by their completion of their SLO. The system itself is somewhat limited. It is very hard for a first year teacher to get a ‘low attainment’ rating with the overall TEacher Effectiveness rating system SLO/Danielson. (the low number of students involved is also a limitation in the system). We should increase the number of samples by partnering with the state mentoring program. The hope is to collect data from more completers and to be allowed to use Danielson, SLO, and professional practice ratings. We would also like to find out how we will be collecting data
from completers who obtain jobs outside of SD.

Measure 3: The data from the common metrics report designed to collect employer satisfaction (4.3) of initial licensure EPP graduates indicates that more than 90% of employers are satisfied or extremely satisfied with EPP completers. The response rate is relatively strong- 41%. Professionalism tends to be the highest scored area (3.49-3.88) in which EPP graduates score and working with diverse learners and learning environments score slightly lower (3.32-3.55 and 3.44-3.66) on a 4 point scale. A suggestion from faculty when reviewing data was to perhaps remove gender binary language for more inclusive language. This will need to be approved by other Common Metrics EPPs. An employer survey will be implemented for advanced programs. Our goal is to ensure that all of the EPP’s programs have these items by May 2021. Completers will provide employer information so that a survey can be sent out one-year post hire to evaluate employer satisfaction. Employer information and emails will be collected this year and implementation will begin next year via Qualtrics.

Measure 4: In reviewing initial data from the Common Metrics TTS (Transition to Teaching) survey administered to graduates after 1 year of teaching, the faculty suggested the following- Weaknesses found from the survey include: selecting instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards, designing long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals, providing students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning, analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs, differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students, differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs, helping students regulate their own behavior, respond appropriately to student behavior, accessing the professional literature to expand knowledge about teaching and learning, and seeking out learning opportunities that align with professional development goals as areas in which the EPP might focus attention to preparation. In addition, it might be useful to identify specific patterns and themes about students who did not get a full-time job nor seek employment. The EPP did not meet its goal of 90% of completers believe that they were very well prepared (62.5). Candidates not selecting "very well prepared" did select "somewhat prepared." No EPP candidates indicated that they were not prepared. The EPP notes that its 62.5% believing they were very well prepared is significantly higher than the aggregate percentage (53.27) of NExT partner EPPs. In addition, if the response rate improves, the EPP might see percentage of "very well prepared" increase.

Advanced- the Advanced Level Completer Survey (NExT)(A.4.2) will be used to assess graduates’ self-perceptions of their readiness to enter the field and the overall quality of programs. This survey (to be implemented across 3 states) was specifically designed to examine graduate’s satisfaction with their learning experiences, including preparation for practice across multiple domains (e.g., instructional practice, working with diverse learners, professionalism). Again, responses from this survey will help identify areas of improvement in degree offerings. When assessed in concert, the faculty group discussed that the hiring data collected offer limited information. In order to fully understand the current status and to connect the meaning of the data to the Measure 7 – Ability of Completers to be Hired, additional data are needed such as the number of students actually applying for jobs, response rates, and job details (e.g., full time, part time, advanced degree). The group acknowledged that the current data collection method has been a topic of discussion over the years but was unable to come up with a new suggestion. The group discussed that similar data can be beneficial for currently non-participating programs possibly collecting data through utilizing the center for student and professional service.

Measure 5: Graduation rates remain consistent or are trending higher for all programs in that retention to completion rates are 80% or higher for all programs. The faculty who reviewed the data indicated that they liked the new version of the data report and that they believe that data should not be collected at the institution level but rather to use a standardized format across the different divisions and programs within the SOE when tracking candidates.

Measure 6: Meeting certification requirements and obtaining licensure are conditions for graduation for initial and advanced programs. As a result, the rate remains consistent at 100%. Certification in South Dakota for initial licensure was recently revised, establishing multiple pathways for certification. The program requirements continue to ensure that candidates are prepared for licensure in the state and region. The South Dakota Department of Education (SD-DOE) does not require the passing of content exams for program completion for the three advanced programs that prepare students to serve in P-12 schools. However, the state does explicitly say that the School Counselor Program and P-12 Principal Programs meet the CACREP and NELP standards, respectively. These accreditors require passing scores of their content exams for degree conferral. The SD-DOE’s Education Specialists page does not have any accreditor or content exam requirements posted. However, USD School Psychology's accreditor (NASP) requires a passing score of 147 or higher. Faculty review of data advised the following: Our wonders include how programs use the data for continuous improvement, marketing strategies, and whether or not we are able to disaggregate data beyond the binary gender categories to ensure equitable outcomes for all students. Additionally, we could conduct research on any interventions programs may take to improve outcomes.

Measure 7: Initial-Data gathered from the Transition to Teaching survey, administered one year after graduation, indicate that the majority of students who seek employment are successful. Geographical location is the most frequently cited factor of those unable to find jobs. Social media is proving to be an asset to both partners and candidates. As notices of vacancies are received by CSPS, they are posted to the School of Education social media accounts for immediate availability to candidates. Advanced- Data was gathered through the Board of Regents dashboards. Goal for both initial and advanced programs is that we have 75% of completers documented in employment. The faculty group discussed that the hiring data collected offer limited information. In order to fully understand the current status and to connect the meaning of the data to the Measure 7 - Ability of Completers to be Hired, additional data are needed such as the number of students actually applying for jobs, response rates, and job details (e.g., full time, part time, advanced degree). The group acknowledged that the current data collection method has been a topic of discussion over the years but was unable to come up with a new suggestion. The group discussed that similar data can be beneficial for currently non-participating programs possibly collecting data through utilizing the center for student and professional service.

Measure 8: Collected 2017 (Most recent) data from national website pertaining to the university’s students’ default rates on student loans. The EPP goal is to be lower than the national average and also the other state BOR EPPs. The South Dakota Board of Regents provided a student loan average three-year default rate of 7.3% across all public universities in the state (considerably
Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

**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)

To address the AFI for Standard 2.3 in the initial programs, faculty have developed a detailed plan that is carefully sequenced and designed to ensure that the component is thoroughly addressed at multiple points in the clinical experiences. The plan features a multi-year backwards design approach beginning with a thorough revision of the Impact on Student Learning Project, which is our summative assessment for this component. In FY 20/21, the program faculty began a detailed examination of the assessment, formerly known as the SLO assignment. We developed a reiterative process that used the CAEP sufficiency rubric as a guiding document, beginning with indicators 1 Administration and Purpose and 2 Content of Assessment. We began with the residency instructors, who administer and score this assessment, examining all documents related to the assessment and evaluating them against the CAEP rubric, making revisions as deemed necessary to ensure clarity and consistency. The resulting revised document was distributed to all program faculty in the fall semester and the process was repeated. Each faculty member independently scored the assessment directions and documents against the CAEP rubric and submitted scores to the chair for tabulation. The results of the process indicate a high level of agreement among program faculty for the majority of indicators, with the exception of indicators 1.a and 1.b. The differences were discussed in a faculty meeting, and the residency instructors again revised the document, focusing specifically on addressing those indicators. Two further steps are planned for this work. In April, the documents and rubric will be distributed to the members of the Teacher Education Advisory Council which includes faculty members from other divisions within the School of Education, other campus units such as the College of Fine Arts, and external stakeholders. The process will be repeated as described above. At the same time, the documents and rubric will be distributed to a focus group of P12 teachers to get their input into the process. It is hoped that this stage of development will be completed by the close of the spring semester.

The next major step in addressing this AFI will be in establishing reliability in our scoring and ensuring that the assessment meets CAEP sufficiency thresholds here as well. Residency instructors will work on revising the scoring rubrics for the assessment during the residency retreat to be held in the summer of 2021. Work on establishing inter-rater reliability is planned for the Fall 2021 semester.

Simultaneously, a subset of faculty who teach the courses associated with the clinical experiences have been meeting to revise assignments in the first two clinical experiences to facilitate monitor candidates' developing competences and impact on P12 student learning. These faculty have met on a regular basis and report out to the division at monthly meetings. To date, the work has focused on establishing a learning progression that can be used to assess growth, again using the backwards design framework. What is reasonable to expect candidates to demonstrate in the field experience, followed by internship, and finally during residency? The goal is to develop a single rubric that can be used through all clinical experiences, with the understanding that candidates in field would be expected to score at the low range of the rubric, candidates in internship would be expected to demonstrate growth and score in the mid-range on the rubric, and only candidates in residency would be expected to score in the upper range of the rubric. The challenges faculty have faced in dealing with covid-19 and the abrupt changes to our teaching modalities this year have slowed our progress in this work; however, we are hopeful that we will again generate some momentum as normalcy returns to campus.

**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)

The EPP programs established an annual cycle in which goals would be set and programs would look for trends at the beginning of the academic term during their first division meetings. The data collected from the previous year as well as historical years' data is now housed in all programs' Nuventive shells. In their Nuventive reports, all programs establish program goals: Learning Outcomes, identify key assessments: Assessment Methods, track results: Results, and establish new priorities or test innovations: Use of Results. Programs' goals are aligned with SPA national standards, InTASC, and/or CAEP Advanced standards and use students' performance on key assessments as indicators of program quality, need for improvement and establishment of new goals. In January 2021, the EPP was informed that the university was updating its Nuventive system and that there will be even more capabilities for programs to house documents, assessments, and surveys. Even more helpful will be that the new system allows more control over changing/adding goals at the program level. As stated previously in 5.1, the EPP is testing an innovation to use Nuventive for collaboration between programs in collecting, reviewing and taking action based on CAEP Annual Reporting Measure data. As the EPP programs become more confident in using the system, the EPP believes that
there is a possible use of Nuventive for collaboration and data comparisons of data across programs.

**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)**

Because the state does not share student learning growth measures associated to individual classroom teachers, the EPP is working with a school district that has a high percentage (80%) of its teachers that graduated from the EPP’s programs. A case study was completed in 2018-19 in order to research the impact on student growth (4.1) and the effectiveness (4.2) of a sample of the EPP’s graduates. The results are shared on the website that is linked to the public website of the school of education under about us/accreditation: https://www.usd.edu/education/accreditation. The findings of the case study indicate that the sample of the EPP graduates make expected or high impact on student growth and also that trained administrators by the State of South Dakota rate the EPP graduates as meets or exceeds expectations of the state requirements for teacher effectiveness. Evidence that both the SLO and the overall teacher evaluations are valid and reliable can be found in the Case Study (11.4) evidence.

- Initial 4.1 https://sites.google.com/usd.edu/usdsoeaccreditationdata/home/impact-on-p-12-learning-and-development-4-1
- Initial 4.2 https://sites.google.com/usd.edu/usdsoeaccreditationdata/home/indicators-of-teaching-effectiveness-4-2

The EPP is following up on its initial findings in that it requested and has been given data permissions to view the results of this sample of teachers’ SLO results (4.1) and also the results of their overall teacher evaluation (4.2).

Future analysis of student impact (4.1) and teacher effectiveness (4.2): The EPP is investigating if other partner schools might be willing to share student growth and teacher effectiveness measures. Recently, the EPP has had preliminary conversations with the SDDOE to investigate if all South Dakota Universities and the State Mentoring Program might be able to partner to investigate the effectiveness of new teachers in the state. The initial proposal is that the state would gather the first year teachers’ teacher effectiveness results, classify teachers’ results by institution, and then provide unidentifiable data results to the teachers’ “home” institution.

**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)**

All EPP programs have unique advisory councils as well as specialized partnerships with external partners, and stakeholders and minutes are now being stored in Nuventive in “dept. folders.” The common external advisory group for the divisions is the Dean’s External Advisory Group. As seen in the Assessment Handbook, the Dean is responsible to hold External Advisory Committee Meetings twice per year. The committee has representation of external stakeholders from all initial and advanced licensure programs. The advisory committee was re-established by the Dean in October 2020 (The committee was on hiatus in previous years. It was replaced for a short time by a Dean’s luncheon). All programs nominated two external stakeholders for this advisory council which met in October of 2020. The agenda, list of members, and the minutes are housed in the Nuventive School of Education Department folder. Before breaking into division groups to discuss programs and to provide recommendations for changes such as suggesting that graduate programs in Curriculum and Instruction consider more online or hybrid options. The SOE Dean provided the committee with a data report, completed by Sage, concerning the shortages of teacher and other educational professionals in the state and surrounding states. Common “needs” themes from all breakout sessions included suggestions for the EPP to create more hybrid and online programs, and also create reduced tuition for advanced licensure programs. Because of discussions with external partners, the EPP was able to begin work on several new initiatives that include establishing a partnership with a rural co-op to provide schools an opportunity to recruit community high school students to become teachers, partnering with South Dakota Education Association to provide professional development credit for state teachers, and an intent to plan a degree program: Masters’ in Applied Behavior Analysis. The work on the initiatives is a direct result of the input from stakeholders indicating needs of communities and the state. Per the Continuous Improvement Graphic and also the Assessment Handbook, the EPP will hold another Dean’s External Advisory Committee Meeting in Spring 2021.

The EPP is also a member of the South Dakota Education Association and South Dakota’s Education Discipline Council. Through these organizations, the EPP collaborates with the South Dakota Department of Education and the other state and private universities. These meetings are opportunities for the EPP to receive feedback from the state on topics concerning completers, data sharing and requirements for certification to name a few. A recent example of collaboration due to COVID happened during the April 2020 meeting. The state and universities were able to problem solve issues concerning standardized testing while test centers were closed and completion of student teaching when PK-12 schools were closed SD.ACTE April 17 2020 (10.6).

**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)**

The Assessment Handbook and the SOE Bylaws guide each program. These documents direct programs on how to establish benchmarks and formative or summative assessment measures at different points in time to monitor quality of candidates. Both initial and advanced programs follow a similar model of tracking progress of candidates while in the program and also into their first professional years. Below is the overview.
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.

The data reviewed and used by programs to generate the Nuventive program reports are collected through the multiple data collection tools Quality Assurance System that house programs’ formative assessments, key/summative assessments, surveys, and benchmarks that are aligned to CAEP, InTASC, CAEP Advanced (advanced programs only) and SPA standards SPAs and Crosswalks of Key Assessments in each program’s folder. Faculty use the reports to monitor programs’ instructional effectiveness and candidates’ mastery of standards. The Quality Assurance System graphic also provides an overview of how data is shared, with whom it is shared, how feedback is provided and updates made concerning assessments.

**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 SOE Assessment Handbook describe faculty-developed expectations and provide guidance to new faculty concerning assessment issues such as: fairness, accuracy, consistency, and avoidance of bias. Each program has reviewed their assessments, data and rubrics to confirm that its key assessment measures are fair and robust, and that they provide relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable aggregated and disaggregated data concerning the progression of students and their abilities to meet program requirements and benchmarks. All programs, both initial and advanced, use a mixture of proprietary and EPP created assessments at specific points (entrance, during, and completion) in the programs to ensure quality of course content and candidates/completers. The indicators for all key assessments and surveys are aligned with InTASC and/or programs’ national content standards (SPAs) and CAEP Advanced Standards (Advanced Programs only). Programs’ “program overviews” with their corresponding key assessment/survey documents (includes disaggregated data and analysis) provide evidence that they 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. The key assessment documents related to each program provide 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.

**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 has a phase-in plan to survey employers of advanced EPP graduates and will pilot this survey in Spring 2021. The EPP was sending out a survey to employers but was receiving extremely low response rates. All advanced programs have worked together to investigate a better method that perhaps will increase response rates. Topics of discussion include: when is the best time to send the survey, how can the survey be condensed so it takes minimal time to complete and which types of incentives might increase response rates? The EPP is also monitoring if the NExT institutions might start development of an employer survey. The assessment committee will discuss using this instrument if it becomes available.

**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)

The EPP has a phase in plan to survey completers one year after graduation to investigate satisfaction of the program and how well it prepared them for employment. This previous survey had low response rates and the EPP advanced programs decided to collaborate and to create a new one to send to all completers. In doing this, response rates may increase and the programs will have data that will provide collaborative analysis of data between programs. The EPP recently learned that its EPP partners in Common Metrics piloted and then performed a statistical analysis to establish validity and reliability on a completer survey for advanced programs. The EPP assessment committee discussed and approved adoption of the survey for advanced completers in January. Working with the other NExT institutions, the goal is that this survey will be sent out to 2019-20 advanced program...
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 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 programs re-established an annual cycle of setting goals and looking for trends in data at the beginning of the academic term during their first division meetings. The data collected from the previous year as well as historical years' data is housed in all programs' Nuventive shells. All programs establish program goals: Learning Outcomes, identify key assessments: Assessment Methods, track results: Results, and establish new priorities or test innovations. Programs' goals are aligned with SPA national standards, InTASC, and/or CAEP Advanced standards and use students' performance on key assessments as indicators of program quality, need for improvement and establishment of new goals. In January 2021, the EPP was informed that the university was updating its Nuventive system and that there will be even more capabilities for programs to house documents, assessments, and surveys. Even more helpful will be that the new system allows more control over changing/adding goals at the program level. As stated previously in 5.1, the EPP is testing an innovation to use Nuventive for collaboration between programs in collecting, reviewing and taking action based on CAEP Annual Reporting Measure data. As the EPP programs become more confident in using the system, the EPP believes that there is a possible use of Nuventive for collaboration and data comparisons of data across programs.

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)

All EPP programs have unique advisory councils as well as specialized partnerships with external partners, and stakeholders and minutes are now being stored in Nuventive in “dept. folders.” The common external advisory group for the divisions is the Dean’s External Advisory group. As seen in the Assessment Handbook, the Dean is responsible to hold External Advisory Committee Meetings twice per year. The committee has representation of external stakeholders from all initial and advanced licensure programs. The advisory committee was re-established by the Dean in October 2020 (The committee was on hiatus in previous years. It was replaced for a short time by a Dean’s luncheon). All programs nominated two external stakeholders for this advisory council which met in October of 2020. The agenda, list of members, and the minutes are housed in the Nuventive School of Education Department folder. Before breaking into division groups to discuss programs and to provide recommendations for changes such as suggesting that graduate programs in Curriculum and Instruction consider more online or hybrid options. The SOE Dean provided the committee with a data report, completed by Sage, concerning the shortages of teacher and other educational professionals in the state and surrounding states. Common “needs” themes from all breakout sessions included suggestions for the EPP to create more hybrid and online programs, and also create reduced tuition for advanced licensure programs. Because of discussions with external partners, the EPP was able to begin work on several new initiatives that include establishing a partnership with a rural co-op to provide schools an opportunity to recruit community high school students to become teachers, partnering with South Dakota Education Association to provide professional development credit for state teachers, and an intent to plan a degree program: Masters’ in Applied Behavior Analysis. The work on the initiatives is a direct result of the input from stakeholders indicating needs of communities and the state. Per the Continuous Improvement Graphic and also the Assessment Handbook, the EPP will hold another Dean’s External Advisory Committee Meeting in Spring 2021.

The SOE Assessment Handbook describe faculty-developed expectations and provide guidance to new faculty concerning assessment issues such as: fairness, accuracy, consistency, and avoidance of bias. Each program has reviewed their assessments, data and rubrics to confirm that its key assessment measures are fair and robust, and that they provide relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable aggregated data concerning the progression of students and their abilities to meet program requirements and benchmarks. All programs, both initial and advanced, use a mixture of proprietary and EPP created assessments at specific points (entrance, during, and completion) in the programs to ensure quality of course content and candidates/completers. The indicators for all key assessments and surveys are aligned with InTASC and/or programs’ national content standards (SPAs) and CAEP Advanced Standards (Advanced Programs only). Programs’ “program overviews” with their corresponding key assessment/survey documents (includes disaggregated data and analysis) provide evidence that they 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. The key assessment documents related to each program provide 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 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 annually reports, analyzes, and sets future direction for the 8 CAEP Outcome Measures on the website https://sites.google.com/USD.edu/usdsoeaccreditationdata/home. These annual reports are linked to the EPP’s university website: https://www.usd.edu/education/accreditation. At the time of this narrative, the EPP has been informed that the university will be updating its website and we are investigating the possibilities of having the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures housed directly on the university website rather than linked to a Google Site. Some of the data (Advanced Programs) are not yet available due to the phase-in process at the time of this writing. It is hoped by the time of the visit that the Advanced Programs will have their first cycle of data and updates on their progress to ensure the surveys meet CAEP Sufficiency. Recently, the advanced programs approved partnering with other EPPs in using the newly created Common Metrics completer survey NExT Advanced Programs Completer Survey. They are continuing their phase-in plans for the EPP created employer survey and will consider using the Common Metric’s employer survey if one is created.

**Section 6. Continuous Improvement**

**CAEP Standard 5**

*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

**CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3**

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

### 6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs

**How was stakeholders’ feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?**

The EPP reviewed the CAEP 8 Annual Reporting measures during a data retreat during a School of Education meeting on March 26, 2021. The retreat was led by the assessment committee chair. Faculty were divided up into 8 groups with the task of analyzing a measure’s data and reporting. After completing this, the data and analysis was combined into a Nuventive report (Attached). The pilot of this activity went well, but there are improvements to consider for next year. One change will be to request groups state more specifically what the data is indicating about programs. Faculty were able to identify limitations of the data and areas of improvement.

During the 2020-21 academic year, the advanced programs focused on the CAEP Advanced Standards to ensure that they were all embedded into programs. Through this, the EPP noticed similarities between how programs assess A1.1.1, A1.1.4 and A1.1.6 standards. Because of the similarity, the EPP was able to compare its advanced programs’ CAEP Advanced Standards data. All advanced programs introduce all of the CAEP Advanced Standards in coursework, scaffold the content learned through application in the field and then require candidates to synthesize learning of content through producing an original product such as an artifact, demonstration or writing. This data and analysis can be found on the attachment- CAEP Advanced Standards Review of Data.

An example of programs using Nuventive to establish goals, review and track changes in data, test innovations, and identify...
patterns is in PK-12 Principal Program. The Learning Outcome is the NELP (PK-12 Administration’s National Standards) 1.4 Standard: Engage staff and school community to develop, implement and evaluate a continuous, responsive, sustainable, data-based school improvement process to achieve the mission of the school. Assessment Method is the leadership improvement-activities, and discussion posts. The Criteria for Success was established that 80% of candidates would meet expectation. In the fall of 2017, 58% of candidates met target. Use of Results were documented in Nuventive that the director of internship would develop a plan to be more explicit about the connections between the project requirements and the internship requirements to ensure that graduate students apply the project design to the internship context. In 2018 spring, 78% of candidates met expectations. Use of Results the faculty will continue to refine instructions. In 2018 fall, 93% of candidates met the target for NELP 1.4 See PK-12 Masters Nuventive Report attachment.

An example of a program using data to make program modifications can be seen in the initial licensure program- TRE. In August of 2020, faculty triangulated field experience (ELED/PE/SEED/SPED 296) and internship (ELED/PE/SEED/SPED 394) evaluations, residency evaluations, employer survey results, and first year teacher survey (TTS) results for 2019-20 academic year TRE Minutes 082120 (10.4). Faculty split into groups and answered the questions: What are the trends? What differences are noted across programs? Are there areas of noticeable strength? Areas where improvement is needed? As a division, the faculty reviewed the groups’ work and found that improvements may be needed concerning candidates’ abilities in assessing students. Faculty decided that they would look closer at the assessment elements, define specific need areas, review course work to see where/what is covered and review the quality of the evaluations completed in the field focused on assessment. When reviewing results of the Completer Survey (One year of employment) initial licensure faculty in TRE noticed that completers were scoring themselves slightly lower on their abilities aligned to InTASC Standard 6 (The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teachers’ and learners’ decision making) than other standards. Discussion and faculties’ analysis and next step decisions can be seen in TRE Minutes 082120.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

| 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures |
| 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used |
| 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making |
| A.5.3 Continuous Improvement |
| A.5.4 Continuous Improvement |
| A.5.5 Continuous Improvement |
| x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses |

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

- CAEP_Advanced_Standards_Review_of_Data.pdf
- PK12_Masters_Nuventive_Report.pdf
- TRE_Minutes_082120.docx
- 2021_CAEP_Annual_Measures.pdf

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

☐ Yes  ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

**Section 8: Preparer's Authorization**

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.
I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Robin Wiebers
Position: Associate Dean
Phone: 605 658 6608
E-mail: 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.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site review report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge