

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10342	AACTE SID:	424
Institution:	Boise State University		
Unit:	College of Education		

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...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.boisestate.edu/education-caep/>

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 licensure¹

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.)²

Total number of program completers 274

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)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

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.

1

Link: <https://www.boisestate.edu/education-caep/>

Description of data accessible via link: Boise State CAEP Annual Report website

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.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?

With the challenges brought on by the pandemic, Boise State Educator Preparation Programs responded quickly with the intent to provide the best support possible for teacher candidates and their students while maintaining high-quality teaching and learning. Data from initial and advanced programs indicate that the unit overall has successfully continued its work in educator preparation despite the disruptions associated with COVID-19 and the abrupt shift to remote learning. Boise State also continued to study and document completer performance with the completer study, and measured employer and alumni satisfaction through shared and validated surveys across the state of Idaho.

The metrics from the completer study include the Studying Practice and Student Learning (SPSL) unit study, including Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and the Tripod Survey of Student Perceptions (Ferguson, 2012), teacher observations, focus group interviews, SPSL workshops to support teaching and learning, and principal evaluations, interviews, and surveys. Each of these measures has been used in each completer study, allowing for comparisons in data trends over time. These measures and trends from the completer studies are available on the [boisestate.edu/education-caep](https://www.boisestate.edu/education-caep) website, with annual reporting measures reported for each year on separate webpages.

One area to note is that SPSL unit scores from 2019-2020 were not reported as these data were supposed to be collected in April

2020. Participants in the completer study were obviously overwhelmed at that time as schools were shifting to remote learning. The SPSL scores from this current year are still in progress. Previous years for this measurement indicate an average of 75 percent of all SPSL units typically result in effective or highly effective results per the whole class SLO measure. Previous years for the individual SLO measure (three focus students selected for above or below grade level in Attention, Motivation or Academic performance) have also indicated a higher percentage of teachers selecting language learners for differentiation, indicating the recognition of this need and the willingness to work to meet language learner needs. Qualitative data from focus groups and goal setting demonstrated that teachers in this year's Completer Study group were better equipped to plan and validate the impact of differentiation for Language learners. We believe that this is connected to curriculum changes in some programs that now require a course dedicated to planning for language learners and completion of an online language acquisition module. We hope to see this trend in the data become stronger in our new teachers as more candidates enter the field with this course or module. We made improvements to our professional year seminar on language acquisition. This seminar and practice module was made available online last year to candidates in their professional year in order to increase their skills and knowledge in planning for language learners.

This confirmation in the data trend also reinforces the importance of the ongoing programmatic work in both AFI 1 "limited evidence that all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners" and AFI 2 for the unit, "Not all candidates have clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners. (2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences)". Once data from the 2020-2021 study are collected and analyzed, it will be compared against the past four completer studies to continue the analysis of trends. Also, from previous completer studies, teacher reflections and goal setting were analyzed for themes, trends and patterns. A frequency count of focus group comments on SLO unit data found the strongest theme centered around assessment literacy (44% of all comments). Within that context, completers revealed they would like additional support and development in the area of assessment construction (especially around measurement validity), and effective use of formative assessment data. This finding was used to guide revisions to the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 versions of the completer study.

Programs are using this finding on assessment literacy to negotiate changes. The Elementary Programs have restructured their programs, shifting from an online 2 credit assessment course to a face to face combined 4 credit assessment and classroom management course that takes place during candidates' internship. This improvement is providing authentic opportunities for candidates to design, enact and analyze assessment results and assessment quality. Secondary programs meet monthly to discuss coherence across their programs. They have identified assessment as a need. The Secondary English program has added a required assessment course to their program and negotiations in the SAS group are underway for additional curriculum around assessment literacy.

Employer surveys continue to indicate satisfaction with completers at a Proficient or Distinguished level, along with alumni satisfaction (with slightly lower rates than principal satisfaction). This trend has been evident across employer and alumni survey comparisons over time. Response rates for both surveys decreased in 2019-2020 and again in 2020-2021, which is hypothesized to be an effect of the pandemic and the increased stress and responsibilities felt by both principals and teachers. Completer placements also follow trends over time with a vast majority of Boise State completers who certify staying in Idaho, and the majority of those candidates staying in the Treasure Valley (Idaho's Region III) to teach.

End of program assessment data, including the Professional Year Assessment (PYA) and the Standard Performance Assessment for Teachers (S-PAT) are summarized and shared with program coordinators at the end of each semester. Both rubrics are aligned to the Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric scale for teacher candidates (unsatisfactory, 1; basic, 2; proficient, 3). Despite the shifts in coursework, learning modalities and teaching responsibilities, teacher candidate scores on the PYA in Spring and Fall 2020 stayed consistent with pre-COVID levels. Student teachers' average scores in Domain 2 continue to trend upward over the last 3 years: 2.7, 2.84, 2.88, and student teachers' average scores in Domain 3 continue to trend upward: 2.77, 2.81, 2.81. Similar trends and patterns are reflected in the S-PAT. In the S-PAT Planning section, student teacher scores have improved steadily for the past 3 years. Fall 2020 showed the highest average score of 2.85. In the S-PAT Assessment section, student teacher scores have fluctuated around 2.7 for the past 3 years. In the S-PAT Reflection section, student teacher scores have improved steadily for the past 3 years. Fall 2020 showed the highest average score of 2.84. Additionally, S-PAT seminar content and resources are revised every semester based on collected data from students' feedback and liaisons' reflection. The seminars have evolved from whole group, broad, theory-based seminars to small group workshops differentiated by student teachers' readiness and experience levels.

Exit survey data is summarized and shared with liaisons and program coordinators through the Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC). Data from these assessments informed a series of improvements across the unit including: (a) increased technology professional development for university liaisons, (b) revisions to the Formative Observation process and the 3 E's version of ISTE standards, (c) initiated revisions to the Professional and Ethical Practice (PEP-R) process to increase focus with InTASC standards 9 and 10 (which also align with revised Idaho Core Standards 9 and 10, and CAEP Standard 1), (d) formation of a group of Candidate Success Team (CST) leaders who meet regularly to support consistent messaging across programs, and adjustments to PY seminars based on candidate feedback from survey data, a continuous improvement process that occurs each year.

Advanced programs were able to clearly define their purpose and identity this year, which led to some changes in group affiliation. Because of the approach each program takes to CAEP advanced standards, their continuous improvement efforts are described in more detail in section 6.

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)

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

There is limited evidence that all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners.

Perhaps more than in past years, the importance of preparing candidates to promote the learning of English Language Learners has emerged as a critical issue with the shift to remote and online learning. The EPP continued its commitment to improving the preparation of candidates through multiple efforts. First, the Department of Literacy, Language and Culture is leading work to map alignment of the recently revised WIDA language standards to core undergraduate courses, along with building resources and online modules to support professional development of all course instructors. Second, Jennifer Snow, interim dean, and Sherry Dismuke, coordinator of clinical practice and partnerships, led a pilot study on equitable practices to better support instructional approaches and strategies for all learners. Third, the secondary education programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels have been collaborating to align learning targets for language learners. Fourth, the online seminar provided to students in their professional year was revisited to ensure content best prepares candidates to promote the learning of English Language Learners.

In collaboration with other EPP faculty, the Department of Literacy, Language, and Culture is leading efforts to curriculum map recently revised WIDA language standards for coursework across elementary education and TESOL programs to better prepare candidates to teach academic language to all pre-K-12 learners as well as to serve the needs of students who are learning an additional language. While this has been a focus in several courses, this work is purposefully designed to help candidates understand and implement academic language in their planning and teaching during their professional year. In addition to this curriculum work, the department will lead efforts to build resources and online modules to support professional development of all course instructors. To address the need to build capacity across faculty who don't have a background in language acquisition theory and practice, the department will build resources and online modules to support professional development. The department will also revise the Language Acquisition website, which was created and built two years ago as a resource repository for both faculty and teacher candidates.

During 2020, two university full time faculty liaisons (clinical supervisors) and two place-based Liaisons in Residence (LiR's) along with 14 professional year teacher candidates engaged in a study of equitable practice and equity based feedback in clinical placements. The study took place in Title I Community Schools where the candidates were placed in student teaching to study the impact of diverse placements on clinical practice. Qualitative survey data indicated that this experience led to a heightened awareness of challenges students and their families face on a daily basis and broadened candidates' definitions and conceptual understanding of equity in this hybrid space between their preservice programs and classroom teaching. There was significant growth noted in implementing culturally responsive pedagogy and implementing equity-based instruction. Based on t-tests completed on pre and post data, two important areas were found to be statistically significant. On average, teacher candidates felt more comfortable implementing culturally responsive pedagogy at the end of the study ($M = 2.13$, $SE = .23$) than before ($M = 3$, $SE = .33$) which represented a medium-sized effect, $d = .678$. Additionally, teacher candidates felt more comfortable implementing equity-based instruction at the end of the study ($M = 1.38$, $SE = .18$) than before ($M = 2$, $SE = .26$) which represented a medium-sized effect, $d = .548$. Other data triangulated these findings. The study uncovered important feedback patterns that we believe bridged the gap from learning about equity based practice in programs to recognizing inequities and becoming more confident with implementing culturally responsive pedagogies in clinical placements. Findings from the study will guide revisions to professional development resources for faculty and liaisons.

During the professional year, candidates attend a series of online seminars designed to strengthen their learning and preparation in specific, critical areas. The Language Acquisition Seminar is presented to teacher candidates during their internship semester, and revisited as needed for planning during the student teaching semester. Its purpose is to support candidates in learning how to address the academic language learning needs of all students while teaching content as well as the differentiation of language supports for multilingual students. The content of the seminar is aligned to the WIDA standards which support ELA and content standards. The seminar is formatted as an online module that liaisons use flexibly, guided by candidates' needs. Also, as mentioned in section 4, professional year seminars are adjusted each semester based on candidate feedback from survey data.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

Not all candidates have clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners.

Despite some of the challenges created by the required, rapid pivot to remote learning, the unit's work for AFI 2 continued to adapt and improve while working together with our partner school districts. Initial programs focused on collaborating and fostering new relationships with district leadership to expand secondary education diverse placements, expanded rural placements, expanded placements in online schools in alignment with revised CAEP initial standards, and utilizing technology whenever possible to accommodate in-person learning experiences. Additionally, in response to the pandemic, our candidates experienced three modalities of instruction: online, face-to-face, and remote instruction.

During 2020, secondary education programs became more purposeful in placing candidates in settings where they can work with diverse learners.

First, secondary education programs defined “diverse field placement” as one that “provides an opportunity for teacher candidates to work in settings that reflect the existing diversity of P-12 students in the surrounding schools and community partnerships. Designating these settings as a diverse placement is part of a shared decision-making process with school and community partners.” According to this definition, diverse placements may include: Educational settings serving students of varied socio-economic levels (e.g., targeted and school-wide Title One schools), educational settings serving students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse (e.g., migrants, refugees, English learners), and educational settings serving students with a range of abilities, exceptionalities and risk factors (e.g., district-designed alternative schools, community schools, and partnerships). Secondary education programs also stipulated that “candidates could work one-on-one, in small groups, or within a whole group setting within a service learning or clinical experience that is supervised and/or evaluated in close collaboration with partners. Candidates will engage in building respect and rapport along with engaging students in growth-oriented experiences. Candidates will be expected to critically reflect on understandings, personal dispositions, and issues of equity with regard to their experiences in these diverse settings.”

Second, secondary education programs surveyed themselves in order to identify which courses their students have field experiences, which of those courses are required and which are electives, and which courses might include “diverse field placements” with the working definition in mind. In addition, secondary education programs surveyed themselves to better understand how each program currently ensures their students have “diverse field placements” and to share what seems to work for each program and what seems to be challenging for each program.

Third, secondary education programs analyzed survey results to look for patterns and gaps. Some program’s students had multiple opportunities for field experiences, including diverse field placements, while other programs’ placement processes needed more consistency and support. During this self-examination process, secondary education programs also developed partnerships with additional schools for more placements. These include two Title I high schools, two Title I middle schools, and one alternative school. These schools also represent a broadening of the local communities in which our students work, including schools in communities considered to be rural.

Two of our rural partner school districts, Nampa and Mountain Home, responded to remote learning so quickly and relatively smoothly that they were able to open up more placements for our candidates. These additional placements provided our candidates with rich opportunities for diverse placements, and also helped strengthen the teacher recruitment and retention pipeline to these districts.

In alignment with revisions to CAEP initial standards, placements in online schools were intentionally opened up to serve two purposes. First, it provides new opportunities for working with online schools. Second, these online schools serve rural populations, providing our candidates more access to diverse placements. These placements span both secondary and elementary programs and provide candidates with mentor teachers who are skilled in a different modality of instruction.

Last, in response to the switch to remote learning, the EPP utilized technology whenever possible to accommodate in-person learning experiences working with diverse students. These responses were planned to be as purposeful and meaningful as possible, working with mentor teachers and school partners. Through a partnership with the Boise School District, Boise State Service Learning and the EPP, a writing buddy program was established using the Flip grid application at a Title I school, which has a large population of refugees and students of poverty. Elementary students and teacher candidates wrote and then recorded their messages to each other, allowing students to develop language and writing skills, while candidates were able to form a positive and supportive relationship with diverse students. Candidates were also provided the opportunity to visit homes to drop off materials, deliver food to families in need, pass out computers and hot spots, and aid in at-home technology difficulties, gaining a first-hand look inside students’ lives.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

There is inconsistent evidence that the EPP has established reliability and validity for EPP assessments.

In previous years, the unit has focused on (re)ensuring reliability and validity for EPP assessments on the S-PAT, interrater agreement on formative observations, and writing assessments for use across the unit. This past year, faculty focused on two important areas for continuous improvement: the dispositions rubric, and implementation of multiple measures of the ethical case study.

In 2019, a committee of teacher educator researchers was formed to create a new dispositions rubric aligned with the measurement of high-quality educators. Based on research (Sockett and others) and content expertise, and prior versions of the dispositions rubric, the committee identified four disposition categories: Character, Care, Pedagogical Stance, and Professional Commitment to create a disposition rubric team. At the first meeting in early June, the team sorted through the examples to identify primary indicators for each disposition category: Character (self-awareness, balance, humility), Care (receptivity, connectivity, inclusivity), Pedagogical Stance (educator identity, adaptability, capacity for change), and Professional Commitment (advocacy, professionalism, dedication). At the second meeting at the end of June, the examples from the initial brainstorm were placed under the appropriate indicator. These examples were examined and narrowed down to four per indicator. At the third meeting in July, a vocabulary guide for disposition rubrics was referenced to develop the language for the rubric. The initial statement in each box was based on the three primary indicators. The rubric was piloted during the Fall 2019 semester and used

by all programs as the evaluation tool for admission into the teacher education program. Each program was also given autonomy to use it in appropriate places in their program (for example, Elementary Education opted to include it in the ED-CIFS 400 course). Revisions to the dispositions rubric to strengthen validity has helped ensure that initial programs are measuring those values and concepts that are important to the mission and vision: preparing high-quality educators. This dispositions rubric was implemented in 2020-2021 and preliminary results indicate this has been a successful and meaningful improvement for the unit.

As another example of the unit's commitment to equity and equitable practices, revisions made to the use and rating of the ethical case study were also a focus. Case studies and a rubric were adopted from the Gorski and Pothini (2018) book "Case Studies on Diversity and Social Justice Education." The ethical case study has been included at three points in the program: in the beginning of the program in the ED-CIFS 201 Foundations of Education class (prerequisite class for teacher education programs), the middle of the program during the application process to teacher education (typically around the junior year), and the end of the program during the finishing foundations ED-CIFS 400 course. The use of the ethical case study across three points in the program was piloted in Fall 2020 in the Elementary Education and TESOL programs. In Spring 2021 it was implemented for all programs during the application process, thus covering two points for most programs. In Fall 2021 it is intended that the special education program will implement the use of the ethical case study at the end of their program, with secondary education programs following step. In efforts to ensure rater reliability, a video was created for raters to review before scoring to standardize scoring processes. Preliminary analyses from Spring 2021 indicate proficient interrater agreement levels, and more formalized work in this area will continue into the 2021-2022 school year.

Also, a group of university liaisons began calibration work using teaching videos on domains 2 and 3 of the Framework for Teaching. This work was interrupted by the pandemic but will resume at a later date. This work will support ongoing efforts for interrater agreement and rater reliability for unit assessments using the Framework for Teaching (Formative Observations and Professional Year Assessments).

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?

'Doing the work' of standard 2 has been incredibly important since Spring 2020 given the challenges our partner schools and

districts have faced with the pandemic. Clinical placements have been adjusted and regularly redefined based on stakeholders' feedback and their input related to decision-making activities. Similarly, based on the unit's ability to adapt and respond to changes additional stakeholders' input and feedback have been included through the intentional inclusion of online school and expanded rural placements. As one faculty member stated, "the pandemic has really tested what it means to be innovative."

The unit's centralized accreditation and assessment program website system to support program data and evidence collection was updated in response to upcoming changes to state program accreditation standards. Driven by the Accreditation and Assessment Team (AAT), each initial program's website was updated with standard evidence description and rationale documents that will be used during the 2023 state and CAEP accreditation reviews. Initial program websites have also been updated with the revised CAEP initial standards, but program coordinators primarily focus on CAEP standard R1. CAEP standards are generally addressed at the unit level through committee work in Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC), Continuous Improvement Team (CIT), Accreditation and Assessment Team (AAT), and Candidate Success Team (CST). Additionally, evidence item descriptions from the professional year for initial programs have been written and standardized by CST and AAT. In addition to program-specific evidence items, the evidence items from professional year will be included across all initial programs. Advanced program accreditation and assessment websites were also updated with their respective state program standards in preparation for the 2023 review, and will be revised again when CAEP advanced program standards are finalized.

Much of the work related to continuous improvement for initial programs is documented in the sections above through the data collected in completer studies, PYAs, S-PATS, and exit surveys, along with the multiple efforts across the three AFIs. Given the highly specialized approach to preparation, advanced programs overlap efforts where possible, but take a different approach to data and evidence than initial programs. Advanced programs meet monthly to align their continuous improvement efforts with CAEP and state standards, and individualize their evidence items where it makes the most sense for the preparation of their candidates. For example, at one monthly meeting, advanced program coordinators focused on meeting the specific proficiencies defined in CAEP Standard A1.1. Program coordinators shared how their programs meet these proficiencies through curriculum and specific program content. Based on these curriculum mapping activities completed by advanced programs, AAT will create an evidence matrix aligned with CAEP advanced standards to provide an overview across all programs.

Advanced programs identified areas in which their work overlaps in similar ways: educational leadership and enhanced pedagogies. Defining this overlap has led to stronger alignment across programs like refining processes for employer surveys while respecting the sensitivities of working with education leaders in small communities, and becoming more purposeful in recruitment by centralizing efforts. There are five advanced programs in the unit, but one of these includes the MA in School Counseling which is accredited by CACREP. For the purposes of CAEP accreditation, the unit has identified four programs: the EdS in Executive Educational Leadership (superintendent licensure), the MEd in Educational Leadership (principal licensure), the Online Teaching graduate program (add-on endorsement) and the Graduate Certificate in Literacy Instruction (add-on endorsement).

The EdS in Executive Educational Leadership used enrollment and graduate data to evaluate trends in the types of students they're admitting and graduating. This analysis found that their candidates are predominately White and male, so the program actively worked on recruitment efforts to recruit underserved populations. The program coordinator held meetings with partnership groups around the state (IBE, IASA, IMEN, and Project Leadership) to identify candidates from underserved populations. Additionally, the program coordinator reached out to philanthropic organizations to seek funding support for fellowships for rural and other underserved populations to help offset the cost for students. These discussions are ongoing and will be revisited in Fall 2021.

Using data from class evaluations and program assessments the MEd in Educational Leadership made two curriculum changes. Data from class evaluations reflected the need for more assistance for students in the higher education cohort (the program offers two tracks: one that leads to principal licensure, and one that prepares leaders to work in higher education). As a result of the feedback from the class evaluations, a higher education mentor was hired to support the higher education students with relevant alternate assignments and academic support. Based on data collected from assessments within the course, candidates reflected on limited opportunities to address equity and culturally responsive issues they will face in school leadership roles. As a result, the program is revising curriculum to add additional content that prepares principal candidates as leaders in ensuring equity of educational opportunities and cultural responsiveness in future leadership roles.

The Online Teaching advanced program includes two pathways to licensure, a credit-based approach and a competency-based approach. The competency-based approach is regularly under improvement and revision as this approach allows for flexibility and innovation. In 2019 the program added field experience "orientation and debrief" seminars with partner schools to gather feedback and decision-making input. Based on the feedback provided by partner school staff during these seminars, a "mentor teacher cheat sheet" specific to online teaching placements was created to help support mentor teachers working with candidates. This cheat sheet provides descriptions of experiences online teaching add-on endorsement candidates are expected to participate in the partner school and online classroom placement. Examples of experiences online mentor teachers can be expected to support include hosting open labs, facilitating live lessons, monitoring discussion forums, facilitating interventions for students in online environments either utilizing e-tutoring or office hours, and supporting interns in learning about the LMS or other technologies used in the course.

The Graduate Certificate in Literacy Instruction program reflects significant amounts of work the Department of Literacy, Language and Culture has engaged in program revisions. The graduate certificate provides a streamlined and efficient option for candidates to earn their add-on literacy endorsement, and then they can apply the graduate certificate credits towards a master degree. Previously the add-on endorsement could be earned through the MA in Literacy program which required double the amount of credits than the graduate certificate. Additionally, the program has purposefully reviewed curriculum and coursework to align with revised ILA standards, as well as moving all classes online providing rural students the opportunity to enhance their pedagogy.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s 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: Carrie Semmelroth

Position: Director for Assessment and Communications

Phone: 2084262818

E-mail: carriesemmelroth@boisestate.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