

2020 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 2018-2019 ?

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 313

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 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 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

During the 2019-2020 academic year, all initial programs created curriculum alignments with new Idaho State Specific Requirements for Literacy. These included more stringent requirements for the development of knowledge and practice for teaching language learners and culturally diverse students. The October 2019 focus visit found Boise State is meeting these new standards and of particular importance for this AFI, the following two standards were met:
(2a) The teacher selects and utilizes instructional strategies to promote vocabulary development for all students, including English language learners.

(2b) The teacher understands the reciprocal relationship between reading, writing, speaking, and listening to support a range of writers, including English language learners.

Professional Year seminars on Language Acquisition and Language Targets, and Differentiation and Equity in Lesson Planning were developed in an online format to make them more widely accessible to all teacher candidates, university liaisons (clinical supervisors) and course instructors. (The Professional Year is a two-semester clinical field experience that consists of an intern teaching and student teaching semester for most teacher candidates.) Candidates engage in these seminars with their university liaisons in small groups, and in their coursework, but also can access them as a resource when planning throughout the program. In addition, it provides a standard professional development for new instructors or liaisons that do not have expertise in planning instruction for language learners.

The new ED-LLC 442 "Integrated Disciplinary Literacy in the Social Sciences" course replaces our old content area literacy course for preK-8 and is a combination of content area literacy and social studies methods. The course now includes the development of a unit of study requiring candidates to identify the language demands of their social studies units and to create plans for specific differentiation and scaffolding for the acquisition of academic language. These pilot units are being collected as signature assignments and for joint data analysis across elementary and secondary disciplinary literacy courses.

The ED-LLC 300 "Foundations of Linguistics and Language Acquisition" course, now required of all Elementary, Dual Special Education, Early Childhood and TESOL teacher candidates, has made refinements in signature assignments. New faculty member with expertise in language acquisition collaborates with existing expert faculty. All sections are now taught by full time faculty. Additionally, this collaboration has tightened the alignment between course sections in the teaching and assessment of the course signature assignment.

In ongoing efforts to prepare teacher candidates to gain experience teaching and supporting English Learners, significant revisions were made to secondary disciplinary literacy courses, which now include the development of a unit of study requiring candidates to identify the language demands of their units and to create plans for specific differentiation and scaffolding for the acquisition of academic language. These pilot units are being collected as signature assignments and for joint data analysis across these courses.

World languages teacher preparation programs have developed their own disciplinary content literacy course to create close alignment with their program learning outcomes for language acquisition.

The IDoTeach program (secondary STEM) has created a curriculum map detailing the teaching of academic language acquisition across their program. Faculty and teacher candidates have worked together to develop specific examples of language demands in the STEM field that will require explicit instruction.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

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

In 2019-2020 through the ongoing improvements in our placement processes, multiple efforts have been made to increase clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners by revisiting early diverse field placements, the creation of a new position focused on placements, and through coordination across secondary education programs.

For Elementary, Special Education, Early Childhood, and TESOL/ENL programs, early diverse field placements through the ED-LLC 200 "Cultural Diversity in the School" course have been extended and refined. Extensive collaboration with our Service Learning program and instructors is providing high-quality, hands-on experiences working with students in diverse settings that meet the college's definition of a diverse setting. In these programs candidates interact with, form relationships and teach students from diverse backgrounds. These settings have high populations of English Learners including many refugees and new to country students.

The college created a new position, Coordinator of Clinical Practice and Partnerships, to work closely with school and community partners to provide additional opportunities and extend current diverse placement options in response to ever-changing programming within our partnership schools, service learning, and educator preparation programs. Coordination of placement processes in cooperation with preparation program coordinators continue to seek out purposeful diverse placements for candidates, which has included extending into rural settings when appropriate matches can be made.

Additionally, efforts have been coordinated across secondary education programs located across the university to improve placement processes to increase clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners. First, secondary education programs have become more purposeful in placing candidates in diverse placements by planning for one diverse placement within each program (e.g., history, English, music, STEM, etc.). Second, the new Coordinator of Clinical Practice and Partnerships is helping to facilitate collaboration across programs for more intentional, purposeful placements aligned with program learning outcomes. Starting in 2020-2021, the unit will launch two new Master In Teaching (MIT) programs for elementary and secondary education teacher candidates. The MIT programs have negotiated that all teaching candidates will have a student teaching placement in a diverse junior high or high school. These settings have high populations of English Learners, including many refugees and new to country students. The ED-CIFS 508 "Learning and Development of Students" and ED-CIFS 509 "Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment i

Grades 6-12" courses will include diverse early field placements in junior or high school classrooms.

The K-12 Physical Education Program has developed numerous professional development partnerships with many schools. Our efforts in the past few years have focused on building partnerships with teachers in schools with diverse populations. In the past two years we have done this with Hillside Junior High School and Whitney Elementary both in the Boise School District. We have trained three new teachers to work as adjunct faculty aiding in the supervision of student interns and student teachers in these schools. Both schools are considered Title One schools and Hillside is the Boise Schools magnet for refugee students.

When placing teacher candidates the program coordinators strive to ensure each candidate has at least one placement in which they will work with diverse student populations. In the elementary physical education methods class, teacher candidates spend two to three weeks at Whitney Elementary School, a title I school with a large refugee population. Teacher candidates work with students from diverse socioeconomic populations, and they design and teach bilingual physical education lessons to students in English and Spanish. In methods and curriculum development classes, teacher candidates research the personal and emotional health and educational impact for students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, and then develop curriculum and instruction that is sensitive to the needs of diverse populations and English Learners.

Additionally, the IDoTeach program (secondary STEM) has a tiered placement (levels 1-3) approach that ensures candidates begin clinical field work as early as possible in the program. These placements are purposeful to both content and grade 6-12 student diversity.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

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

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

S-PAT rubric

Following the work that was completed in Fall 2018 to improve rater reliability of the S-PAT, Boise State liaisons implemented a revised rating system for pilot use in Spring 2019 and Fall 2019. In the revised rating system, the specificity of ratings has been increased by removing quarter- and half- point options from S-PAT scoring rubrics.

To implement and practice the use of these revised scoring rubrics, liaisons first engaged in rounds of scoring exercises by individually scoring a sample of S-PAT unit plans previously scored by master raters. Interrater reliability scores were reviewed by the group. The data trends from these individual ratings compared against the master ratings showed differences between more experienced raters and new liaisons. This information prompted liaisons to engage in further calibration and professional development activities. In the next round of calibration and professional development activities, liaisons first scored selected S-PATs individually, then met in small groups that had a master rater paired with novice raters to discuss individual scores and come to consensus. Then, all liaisons met as a whole group to discuss until consensus on scoring was reached across selected samples. This activity was repeated for the S-PAT Analysis and S-PAT Concluding Reflection sections. Moving forward, these calibration/scoring sessions are being repeated periodically to maintain interrater agreement, and to ensure new liaisons develop consistency with more experienced raters on the rubric.

Dispositions rubric

In addition to the rater reliability activities liaisons engaged in for S-PAT scoring, teacher education faculty and liaisons were introduced to a new dispositions rubric that was implemented in Fall 2019. The rubric was first used in Fall 2019 teacher education interviews as part of the application process for teacher candidates, as well as in selected courses. The rubric was used again for the Spring 2020 teacher education admission interviews.

Procedures for using the rubric were also introduced to ensure reliability and validity. The process for using the dispositions rubric in candidate interviews for admission to teacher education is as follows:

1. At the conclusion of the interview each team member records their initial score for each category.
2. Discussion among team members with a provided rationale for each score.
3. Team members may decide to adjust initial scores based on discussion. Team members may also opt to keep their initial score.
4. Team leads record discussion points to provide to the candidate; and cross reference with other team leads, watching for trends

Based on analyses of rater agreement from Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 interviews, this revised process for interviewing using the rubric indicates strong rater agreement. Rater agreement analyses will continue to monitor the use and implementation of the dispositions rubric.

Analytic Writing Continuum for use with advanced programs

During Fall 2019, advanced program coordinators continued the work they started in 2018-2019 by addressing some of the content validity concerns using the Analytic Writing Continuum (AWC) rubric across their programs. In addition, advanced program coordinators identified challenges to using a standard rubric for programs with specialized, advanced content.

The resolution for Spring 2020 was to pilot the use of an adapted rubric across the following four programs: MA in Literacy, Graduate Certificate in Mathematical Thinking for Instruction, MEd in Educational Leadership and Ed.S. in Executive Educational Leadership. Program coordinators in these areas are maintaining a list of scores and keeping notes on what works and what is challenging. Our MA in Counseling and Graduate Certificate in K-12 Online Teaching opted to maintain existing systems and enhance alignment with program-specific standards and/or accreditation that best support their programs and candidate success in

the licensure area. Heading into the 2020-2021 academic year, our focus will remain on aligning systems and identifying measurements that are meaningful for program improvement.

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 CA 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 improved?

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, the 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?

In preparation for the October 2019 Focus Visit by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission for our three-year approval cycle, the unit had the opportunity to ensure all initial programs were aligned with the new State Specific Requirements standards in Idaho: Comprehensive Literacy, Technology, and Preservice Student Teaching Experience (Mentor Teacher, Educator Preparation Program Supervisor, Partnership, Student Teacher, and Student Teaching Experience standards). The October 2019 Focus Visit also provided the unit many learning opportunities for both initial and advanced program coordinators to review current data

collection and program improvement practices, and implement changes for continuous improvement, including improving program alignment with standards, improving curriculum and assessment alignment across programs, improving data collection practices and developing a deeper understanding of accreditation standards and processes. Additionally, the focus visit provided the unit with program coordinators with practical experiences related to the preparation for and implementation of a formal accreditation visit.

As mentioned above, the October 2019 focus visit including the new State Specific Requirements standards provided the unit with the opportunity to ensure all initial programs are aligned across literacy, technology and preservice student teaching experiences. The collection of baseline data on programs' progress toward meeting these new or revised standards prompted many programmatic changes as well as changes to our data collection processes. The new State Specific Requirements standards are most aligned with CAEP standards 1 and 2, as well as the technology cross-cutting theme.

State Specific Requirements for Idaho Comprehensive Literacy

Changes to the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy state specific requirements included the pilot year (2019-2020) of four statewide literacy tests for all initial certification candidates. Additionally, a new state standard for writing is now included for all elementary and secondary programs. Rigorous writing standards triggered revisions to elementary and secondary literacy courses required in most programs, and the addition of writing in the discipline instruction to IDoTeach (secondary STEM), PE, and music programs. The world languages programs have also been motivated by the new standards to create a new standalone literacy course for the teacher candidates. In Fall 2019, students in the literacy courses all took the new test and in Spring 2020, programs offering their own literacy instruction took the new test. Data from the first round of tests in Fall 2019 were analyzed and revisions were made to courses accordingly based on teacher candidate performance. At the conclusion of Spring 2020, the unit will review testing data from all teacher candidates, and make further adjustment to instruction to align with the four revised Idaho Comprehensive Literacy state specific requirements.

Department of Literacy, Language and Culture faculty have served as consultants for teacher education programs implementing their own literacy instruction (e.g., PE) aligned with the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy state specific requirements, and they will continue to support programs wanting to make future changes based on testing outcomes.

State Specific Requirements for Technology

The new State Specific Requirements for Technology standards are now in alignment with the revised ISTE standards, which are connected to the CAEP cross-cutting theme of technology. In 2019-2020, the unit revised initial certification courses, data collection, and observation protocols for candidates in clinical placements to support the new State Specific Requirements for Technology standards. The EDTECH 202 Educational Technology course was revised and realigned with the new ITSE standard. Screenshots of the previous and revised observation protocols from Taskstream are attached for comparison and reference. The new version of the protocol is more descriptive and allows liaisons to evaluate how the use of technology impacted student learning.

To ensure programs have adopted the new State Specific Requirements for Technology, syllabi and student work samples were first collected to determine where (within programs) candidates were gaining knowledge and demonstrating performance of the use of technology. Additionally, teacher candidate performance data from the previous academic year were reviewed and revealed a lack of variety in the use of technology by teacher candidates across the ISTE standards. Through these processes, the unit determined that initial certification program faculty would benefit from supported professional development in technology use and preparing teacher candidate's use of technology in P-12 classrooms.

In response, one of the unit's teacher education faculty members and a technology expert from the Boise State Center for Teaching and Learning collaborated with university liaisons and course instructors to broaden faculty and supervisor knowledge and ability to support candidates in demonstrating use of technology, with particular attention focused on areas for improvement as determined through the review of teacher candidate performance data. Additional data collection procedures on technology have been added to the unit's observation protocol which continued through the Spring 2020 semester. Data from courses will be analyzed during the summer to identify areas for additional improvement in 2020-2021. Data collection on the revised observation protocol will continue throughout this year, including data from remote instruction which began in March due to COVID-19. The unit will begin to analyze data from this academic year over the summer months.

State Specific Requirements for Clinical Placements

The unit was also reviewed during the October 2019 focus visit on the new State Specific Requirements for Mentor Teachers, University Supervisors, Partnerships, Student Teachers, and the Student Teaching Experience standards.

In preparation for the visit, reviews of our placement data related to mentor teacher requirements resulted in additional data collection systems and processes to ensure mentor teacher certification and endorsements aligned with the candidate area of endorsement.

Also, review of data from student surveys showed proficient, but lower performance ratings for new supervisors despite ongoing professional development. In response, the Teacher Education Liaison Group organized the internal structures for new supervisors into Candidate Success Teams (CST). This new team structure includes an experienced liaison as a team lead with 2-3 liaisons with varying levels of experience. Teams conduct candidate seminars and professional development together in "pods". They also problem solve and collaboratively draft plans for candidates in need of improvement. Candidate Success Team leaders attend regular meetings together to develop suggestions for policy and engage in planning for individual pods based on professional development needs and issues that arise across groups.

In addition to the continuous improvement efforts prompted by the October 2019 focus visit, the unit launched a program-level





quality assurance system in summer 2019. All licensure programs in the unit and/or college of education now have accreditation and assessment program websites that centralize accreditation and university reporting. Organizing at the program level as opposed to the program coordinator level ensures data and assessment processes are maintained through leadership and coordinator changes. The accreditation and assessment program websites have been developed over time, informed by feedback from program coordinators asking for one location to centralize all accreditation, university reporting and evidence collection processes. The next phase will include finalizing the standards documents, evidence rationales and evidence items for each program, and disaggregating centralized data at the program level.

Last, all annual reporting data for programs are available on Boise State's CAEP website: boisestate.edu/education-caep.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successful
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 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.

-  **State_Specific_Requirements_Rubric.docx**
-  **Technology_section_observation_protocol_NEW.pdf**
-  **Technology_section_observation_protocol_OLD.pdf**
-  **Frequency_counts_of_focus_group_interviews.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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completion 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 visit 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