2018 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS 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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`178`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`311`

Total number of program completers   489

---

[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 2016-2017 academic year?

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

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://education.boisestate.edu/caep/caep-annual-reporting-measures/
Description of data accessible via link:	The annual reporting measures are available through a website designed for both EPP and non-EPP audiences. The link provided above includes data and narratives for all eight outcome measures to specifically to support CAEP components 5.4 and A.5.4.

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	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Advanced-Level Programs			✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔

2

Link:	https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/placement-rates/
Description of data accessible via link:	This page provides additional information about initial licensure placements for non-EPP audiences.

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link:	https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/employer-satisfaction/
Description of data accessible via link:	In addition to the evidence provided on CAEP Annual Reporting Measures page, the information provided on this page reports employer satisfaction aggregated by InTASC standards, along with selected testimonials. This page is written in a more user-friendly way for non-EPP audiences regarding employer satisfaction about our programs.

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	☐	☐	✔	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			✔	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4

Link:	https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/alumni-satisfaction/
Description of data accessible via link:	In addition to the evidence provided on CAEP Annual Reporting Measures page, the information provided on this page reports alumni satisfaction aggregated by InTASC standards, along with selected testimonials. This page is written in a more user-friendly way for non-EPP audiences regarding alumni satisfaction about our programs.

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	☐	☐	☐	✔	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	✔	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link:	https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/accredited-programs/
Description of data accessible via link:	The list that appears on this page is intended to help consumers easily locate and find consumer information about our programs, the types of licensure available, and where these licenses are accepted in other states.

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔

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?

Overall, it is difficult to identify trends in annual report data as 2017 will be the first year the reporting system has been designed in its current format. 2017 is also the first year Advanced Programs and Advanced Program Standards are included in the annual reporting process. Boise State looks forward to reviewing data over time for trends across the unit and with an initial look at advanced programs.
Trends in the initial programs are easier to identify as we have been collecting data connected to initial program standards for several years. The numbers of completers have remained relatively stable. The completer number for 2017 is up 10% from prior years, and the advanced program completer number is considerably larger than initial programs.

Working with institutions across the state of Idaho, we are using similar protocols for Title II reports and identifying teaching endorsements earned across the state by each institution. This process has also allowed for more closely tracking retention in the program. Increasing admission standards and analysis of application data have allowed for Boise State teacher education faculty to implement processes for each candidate admitted to have a faculty advocate to support retention and program completion. Faculty advocacy involves navigating educator preparation programs successfully, but its main purpose is supporting professional norms for candidates and developing nonacademic skills. One completer made numerous comments on her exit survey lauding program faculty and her program advisors for their support. For example, she had the program coordinator come and observe her teaching and support the integration of what was taught in coursework and how the candidate would apply such knowledge to secondary students. She said, "...once I started understanding what she was teaching, I internalized the principles of teaching and really starting to get the hang of it ... Probably the greatest thing I did was being a student intern for my favorite Spanish Teacher! Having the opportunity to see her masterful teaching, working alongside her, with students ... was one of THE MOST HELPFUL THINGS in all of my education." This candidate highlights the key aspects of integrating clinical practice and program mission for a

well-rounded new educator. This trend is indirectly connected to annual reporting measures in its focus on alumni satisfaction and attention to program evaluation across the five initial program standards.

Additionally, Boise State has enhanced its placement data over the years to include an exhaustive system of identifying where completers are placed or seek employment post-graduation. Overall, the placement rate is high and sustainable. Out of 178 initial program completers, approximately 161 (90.45%) went on to obtain certification. Of the 17 (8.99%) who chose not to obtain certification, some of the reasons cited included continuing on to graduate studies, obtaining other non-education related employment or moving back to an internationally located home. Of the 133 completers who obtained certification and went into teaching, 109 (81.95%) stayed in Idaho, 16 (12.03%) went out of state, and 8 (6.02%) went into other teaching positions (e.g., teaching internationally). These statistics allow the unit to more closely support induction of new teachers in the state aligned with program mission and practices. Boise State has also reached out to more rural districts to identify needs - both hiring and professional development - for these areas. One initiative along these lines is the Placement Orientation where Boise State surveys incoming professional year candidates to determine their desire for working or being placed in a rural district for their professional year. In order to consider providing incentives for this opportunity, the survey also asks what would encourage candidates to seek such a placement. This data is then shared with rural districts interested in generating partnerships with the university for supporting their teacher pipelines in this manner. A key focus in the state of Idaho involves reaching out to rural districts per the state pipeline report, which identified rural districts as having high numbers of alternatively authorized teachers. Additionally, the high need areas of math, science, and world languages have been a focus for recruitment and support in the profession. The Project REDO grant supporting online programming and scholarships for teachers adding an ENL/Bilingual endorsement will better meet the needs of rural districts and increase numbers of completers in those areas.

With a sustained partnership across colleges on campus, the unit has increased program completers in Spanish, French, and German. Likewise the stakeholder committee for science and math programs meets annually. The most recent agenda addressed brainstorming for implementing the NSF funded NOYCE Scholarship to recruit college students into the teaching profession from the fields of math and science. School District personnel from at least seven local school districts brought teams of faculty, counselors and administrators to work with unit faculty and administrators to take concrete steps on recruiting high school students to come to Boise State University and complete a secondary teacher education program in a STEM discipline.

Likewise, with regard to Standard 4, Boise State has engaged in 'completer case studies' each year where trends in overall teaching effectiveness have been highlighted via annual reporting. During 2017 Boise State led a statewide completer study in connection with a federal grant (SAHE) supporting teacher induction. New teachers from different regions were invited to participate in a Studying Practice and Student Learning workshop-based induction where EPP faculty conducted formative observations of their teaching; new teachers constructed unit plans aligned with Student Learning Outcomes; new teachers administered the Tripod Survey of Student Perceptions with their students; new teachers participated in focus group interviews; new teachers shared principal evaluations; and new teachers invited their principals to complete employer surveys and engage in individual interviews with EPP faculty researchers. Formative observation data found that Boise State completers were performing at the Proficient level (3) on the state evaluation framework tool. On this four-point scale, Boise State completers as new teachers demonstrated growth across three formative observations in the year on all 22 components of the framework. After the third observation, the highest mean average across the new teachers was in the area of "managing classroom procedures" with a mean score of 3.42 on a 4.0 scale. The lowest mean score was 2.93 in the area of "questioning and discussion techniques." Twenty-one of the 22 components had a mean score of 3.0 or higher during the third observation. The first formative observation had mean scores across participants at the Basic (2.0) to Proficient level (3.0) with 2.5 (in the area of questioning and discussion) being the lowest. Formative Observation Two had ALL mean scores at 3.0 or higher. Notably the area of "behavior management" was never the lowest mean score in any of the observations. This area had been identified in previous studies as a space for the EPP to focus to better support learner ready teachers during their first year. All data from the SAHE grant-funded SPSL induction project will be added to the website in summer 2018 after full analysis has been completed.

In addition to the completer case studies, Boise State distributes employer and alumni surveys to all initial and advanced program graduates and their employers. Using a similar four-point scale as the observation forms, the alumni survey responses indicated a Unit Mean score of 2.72 or higher across 16 questions. The advanced program alumni had higher mean scores than the initial program alumni on the same questions. Overall, it would appear that the unit's decision to continue working on preparing graduates to "teach in ways that support new English Language Learners" is supported by alumni perspectives (mean = 2.72). We were pleased to note the mean scores had not decreased from past years and believe current efforts for candidates will result in increased mean scores for alumni in this area. Employer survey mean scores for a similar question about supporting English learners was higher with 3.02 average score. Again, 3.02 was the lowest score across 16 questions. Overall employer and alumni surveys indicate graduates are supported at near-proficient to highly proficient levels in their preparation programs.

With the new metrics and formatting in place for CAEP's annual reporting, we will be able to track trends across the eight impact measures and triangulate our focus areas for improvement (e.g., working with language learners). Reviewing surveys, candidate artifacts, completer performance, and results for placement data provide a coherent framework for reviewing improvement efforts and program effectiveness.

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.

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

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)   standards.

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

Boise State teacher education faculty have continued work with a Language Acquisition Subcommittee from the Coherence Task Force. This committee initially met with faculty across campus - in Linguistics - and those faculty in the College of Education who prepare educators for Bilingual Education or English as a New Language endorsements. Initially, this subcommittee conceptualized a Framework for Program-Wide Attention to Teaching English Language Learners (*adapted from Athanases & deOliveira, 2011). CAEP Annual Report Table 5.1 shares parts of the framework.

Several existing courses (Linguistics 305/310/327) prepare TESOL teachers and have service learning components (e.g., at Borah High School in its "Bridge" program and with adult language learners with community agencies). Other teacher education programs had already begun exploring ESL options for endorsement in English and ENL (e.g., English Education). Science educators have a focus on Science Language Learning with a focus on academic language in science across their programs. An emphasis on College and Career Ready standards also increased the focus on informational and expository text in elementary teacher preparation.

A new course designed to merge language acquisition and linguistic foundations was created in the College of Education. It is now required for all Elementary, ENL, Special Education and Early Childhood teacher candidates.

Additionally, several faculty took a summer professional development course for academic credit (with some undergraduate and graduate students) where the focus was on language acquisition through analyzing text for linguistic demands and writing language targets. The faculty who participated in the course now lead professional year seminars for teacher candidates across all programs. Likewise, the course was designed online and was provided as a module for any teacher education and clinical supervisors who may wish to access the professional development resources. Faculty who took (or taught) this course also have lead bi-monthly professional development sessions for all clinical supervisors/liaisons in the Teacher Education Liaison Group. An example of the professional development activities is provided here.

A focus on field experiences has also been identified. Linguistic courses currently emphasize Service Learning field experiences. Candidates and faculty prioritized the partnerships with school communities and identified a need to support teachers already in the field in learning to think like a language teacher. A junior high partner school teacher also co-taught with a writing methods instructors in elementary education to model the co-teaching occurring in her school with content area and ENL teachers.

Initiatives across COED for teacher education programs to prepare ALL teachers to work with language learners include three areas identified by Linguistic Diversity sub-group of Coherence Task Force:
1. Coursework
2. Professional Development
3. Collaboration

Text resources include The ELL Writer with a focus on individual learners with different needs. Writing as it involves rhetorical and social context. Feedback from faculty professional development experiences included that we, as faculty, would also like to gain more knowledge and understanding of how to "live" things like WIDA standards, frameworks, and instructional supports. Our framing question has become: How can we better understand our pedagogy by looking to learn from our learners, not trying to "fix" them?

Future efforts we would like to include focus on advocacy in second language acquisition and working with multilingual students. Initiatives to rethink systems both on campus and within school systems as we learn more are a possibility. Teacher educators work to honor the language/content balance in pedagogical instruction. Therefore, we have identified some common threads throughout teacher education:

• Use WIDA - native speakers are not all proficient in reading, writing, speaking, listening
• WIDA resources as living documents and tools
• All students enter new discourse communities
• What can we do on campus to support language learners as well as working with/in preK-12 schools? For example, why not pair disciplinary experts with language acquisition experts and provide tutoring to students on campus in such pairs?

Finally, COED faculty have initiated the process for a new Graduate Certificate in Teaching ENL students. This certificate would not lead to an endorsement in TESOL,ENL, or Bilingual education; however, it would provide strategies and support to all teachers for working with language learners.

All of these efforts are geared toward improving candidate preparation to work with language learners. At present, anecdotal feedback demonstrates candidates are aware of the need to differentiate instruction for language learners and design language targets to a greater extent than in 2016. Alumni and Employer surveys will be monitored for trends to document an increase in perceptions of preparation to work with language learners. Once trends may be identified, the unit will be able to more purposefully plan for impactful strategies.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)   2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

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

data into our data management system (ie., Taskstream) across candidates and across sites has allowed for more purposeful tracking of candidate placement. In previous years, teacher candidates were placed in the same school building for both semesters of their professional year. After establishing our tracking system, we now work with stakeholder partner school principal and mentor teacher representatives to move teacher candidates from more affluent buildings in one semester into Title I buildings in the next to ensure diverse learning experiences with established partners.

Early field experiences in a Literacy course in elementary programs and an initial secondary placement for all secondary programs has been redesigned so that each candidate is placed in a school placement serving diverse learners. Early placements in diverse settings help teacher candidates build on these dispositions and skills across their programs and into their professional year.

In the Elementary and dual (ie., special education k-12 and elementary education k-8) programs meetings were scheduled with principals of several Title 1 schools serving large numbers of language learners and refugee families in order to create a network of purposeful partnership sites. The importance of placing our students with high quality mentors in school communities that embrace this work was established and these sites committed to hosting more teacher candidates in their professional year as well as becoming host sites for all early placement literacy students. Goals included helping teacher candidates to develop skills for working with language learners, but additionally to develop positive dispositions and confidence in their ability to serve students and families from backgrounds different from their own. After our pilot semester in Fall 2017, many teacher candidates placed in diverse early placement settings shared about how the experience had impacted their dispositions and skills and has resulted in their desire to work in similar settings in their future careers during their admission interviews. This anecdotal evidence leads to more requests for Title I placements at the Professional Year Placement Orientation and more moves among candidates so they might spend their professional year in two different schools rather than one as was typically practiced in the past. Additional data from our first Professional Year Placement Orientation documented several requests for candidates to be placed in diverse or rural schools for their professional year.

Boise State was also approached by the Boise School District (BSD) Strategic Partnership Coordinator regarding their Community Schools Initiative. The Community Schools Initiative involves five Title 1 schools strategically located in geographical quadrants of the district to provide services to students and families. These services include assistance with: food, clothing, hygiene, medical care, early childhood resources, English language learning, an after-school soccer club, and parenting support. The Coordinator reached out to us to ask for help from our teacher education students to provide volunteer services to their high need clientele. A meeting with key faculty and program coordinators resulted in a plan to involve all of the early, pre-admission teacher education course, Cultural Diversity in the Schools (a required course for all elementary education students), in the field work/service learning component of this course. This experience provided teacher candidates invaluable insights into the extent of services and needs within the local community Teacher educators also coordinated efforts with Boise State's Service Learning program and the BSD Coordinator to provide an orientation to teacher candidates for serving this population appropriately and respectfully.

Additionally, teacher candidates in early field experience courses in secondary and k-12 programs now require a service learning component, and these sites focus on Title I schools. Service Learning opportunities focus in schools with large refugee populations and through "bridge" programs for students new to the country or the English language high school settings. These candidates have support in the schools and through a course on working with exceptional learners to reflect on their experiences through the DEAL model (Describe, Evaluate, Articulate Learning) and through sharing insights and key moments in class discussions and individual written reflections.

Meetings are underway to create a partnership with Life's Kitchen, a not-for-profit organization that serves high school dropouts who, through the program, develop skills for future employment. The program also supports these at-risk young adults with afternoon tutoring sessions, as one important goal of the program is for the students to attain their GED. Their Director has requested help from our secondary students for tutoring services primarily in math and literacy. This opportunity is being explored to provide an additional site for secondary candidates to serve as an after school tutoring program for at risk students seeking their GED.

In 2017 Boise State Teacher Education hosted its first Professional Year Placement Orientation. Prior to the meeting, each candidate completed a survey identifying where they had prior field experiences and where they expected to be placed. They were also questioned about incentives to work in rural field experiences or other high need areas in the state. Rural, Title I and candidate expectations and needs were the focus of the orientation with the second one being planned for Spring 2018.

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.

During 2017, there were two key focus areas for EPP-created assessments and establishing quality assurance through reliability and validity. The Standard Performance Assessment for Teaching rubrics were revised beginning in early 2017 with focused work over Summer 2017 to pilot the new rubrics in Fall 2017. A team met weekly over the summer to establish content validity for the rubrics and identify key aspects for assessment based on the purpose of the unit and analysis. The rubrics were first implemented in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters, at which time the Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) will review the rubric data and determine reliability among raters.

The second focus area was identifying a writing rubric to use across all programs to support writing capacity among candidates.

After a sub-committee of the CIT met to discuss various rubrics for writing assessment, they reviewed and identified the Analytic Writing Continuum (Smith & Swain, 2017) as a valid and reliable rubric used to assess preK-12 writing (Bang, 2013). CIT then reviewed the AWC rubric and read the textbook and reliability studies and agreed to pilot this measure with the program admission process. It was determined that letters of application would be used as the artifact for the AWC instrument. The rationale and pilot began in Spring 2018.

Background: At the October 16, 2016 TECC meeting: TECC made the decision to waive Praxis I Writing assessment (CORE ACADEMIC SKILLS FOR EDUCATORS - WRITING) moving forward. It will no longer be required for admission to Teacher Education. Written communication had remained a concern of program coordinators throughout 2016-2017. In initial programs, some faculty have written "area of concern forms," and one candidate was conditionally admitted based on written communication skills. Although writing competency has been a concern for program selectivity, program coordinators and TECC agreed a main purpose for a writing assessment would be to provide developmental support for professional educators in writing competencies.

Purpose: To assess developmental writing levels of initial program teacher candidates and advanced program candidates. Use AWC to support development in written communication as applicable for professional educator communication.

Selection of Analytic Writing Continuum (AWC)

The growth and self-assessment attributes of the AWC made it desirable as a rubric for assessing written communication in the professional educator programs at Boise State. According to Smith & Swain (2017) The AWC "sets up a continuum of growth" and "accommodates all types of writing and writing assignments." With specific foci on content, structure, and stance, the AWC allows for development of communicating ideas through writing as much as it attends to writing conventions, diction, or sentence fluency. This holistic approach makes it a desirable assessment tool for supporting the development of professional written communication by focusing on strengths and empowering writers to use it to participate in their own development in professional written communication.

By using the AWC, program faculty and candidates will build on writing strengths and have a tool and common language for improving communication such that teachers are proficient in writing and score at levels appropriate for a beginning (initial) or professional (advanced) educator by the end of the program. Particular Professional Year Assessment (initial program requirement for certification) scores connected to writing include 4c Communicating with families, 3a Communicating with students, and 1e Designing Coherent Instruction, to name a few specific areas. Advanced programs have emphasized the need for professional and academic writing in graduate programs.

Evidence Sufficiency

According to an analysis by Hee Jin Bang (2013) for the reliability of the National Writing Project's AWC, he found that "Interrater agreement rates, calculated using the raw scores assigned by two scorers, have ranged from 89 - 93% across all attributes: an overall agreement rate of 90% has been achieved" (p. 3). Additionally, correlation coefficients among all attribute scores across years ranged from .73 to .83. Bang found "small variance in observed scores across the years" (p. 3). According to Bang's multiple analyses, "the AWC assessment system has shown a degree of reliability and validity higher than many standardized writing assessments available." (p. 4). Bang also acknowledges this paper's factor analyses indicate "face validity or content validity is observed" (p. 5).

Spring 2018 Pilot at Boise State

As an attempt to determine what types of professional development and AWC training may be necessary for it to be used in the AWC process (along with alterations in the writing sample assessed at admission), teacher education faculty reviewed writing samples from each initial program during Spring 2018. After pre-reading and scoring to norm understandings of the rubric at CIT in February, 30 randomly selected letters of application across all programs were scored by a team of raters. The team included three "expert" raters who read each application letter in the sample and three raters who read a random sample of 10 letters.

Discrepancies were noted for further scoring and the norming from CIT was documented. Presently, scores and reliability are being analyzed and training for all raters will take place for a Fall 2018 implementation across initial and advanced programs. CIT will create master criteria. A need to rewrite the prompt for application letters has also been determined.

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?

Boise State's teacher education unit prioritized the three areas for improvement noted in its 2016 site visit report. A thorough review of Section 5 of the Annual Report highlights focused initiatives of the unit. In particular, the preparation for all educators to work with English Language Learners coincides with focused efforts on providing diverse field experiences and seeking stakeholder/partner school feedback on all educator preparation efforts.

In particular, teacher educators value the IDoTeach Advisory Council meetings that occur each semester. These meetings are initiated through the STEM educator preparation programs and involve principals, district officials, superintendents, teacher candidates, along with teacher education faculty to discuss and respond to educator and school district needs across the state of Idaho. Programs share data from preparation and assessment outcomes, while partners share data about positions and professional development needs.

The Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC) is the governing body for Boise State's unit. Every educator preparation program, initial and advanced, has a representative on the council. TECC holds monthly meetings, making shared decisions based in data analysis (e.g., Professional Year Assessments in initial programs and selectivity and retention/completion/placement trends among all initial and advanced programs). TECC has engaged in professional development around unit "core practices" as well as participation in crafting and adopting a theoretical logic model to guide the unit in creating and validating EPP-created assessments. TECC has several standing committees that generate these professional development opportunities and reports based in unit evidence for review at the monthly meetings. The executive committee of CIT oversees the multiple projects and initiatives, The Clinical Field Experience Committee (made up largely of teacher education liaisons and partner school representatives) is also known as the Teacher Education Liaison Group (TELG). This committee leads the initiatives surrounding performance assessment implementation and clinical field experience placements. Likewise, a majority of this group are the key participants in teacher education interviews and admission decisions. Admission decisions also include partner school principals and teachers who are not everyday members of the TELG. These participants serve in an advisory board role for selection, placement, and completion decisions. The Assessment and Accreditation Team (AAT) guides all validation and reliability testing for the unit Its main focus in 2017 has been reviewing the S-PAT rubrics, alumni and employer surveys, and then the Analytic Writing Continuum work. The Director of Assessment and Communication leads this committee. Stakeholders also participate in mock interview panels before program completion as well as important assessment events for the unit, like the Differentiation Fair and Inquiry Roundtable sessions in initial programs. In advanced programs, stakeholders serve as guest lecturers, faculty instructional liaisons, and thinking partners for program improvements. Likewise the student group, Teacher Education Association, serves as an organizing group for all welcome and recruitment events on campus along with community initiatives like the national Spelling Bee hosted on Boise State's campus.

Stakeholders at every level are consulted along the way for all decisions considered for program improvements. Evidence from candidate work, artifacts, placement needs, retention and selection trends, performance assessments and shared community needs are considered at the multiple committee levels and guided by TECC with input from all interested parties.

Some key examples of work from the unit in 2017 include:

Lesson Design Video Training Series: Adapted the Boise State college-wide lesson plan template for use for all pre-acceptance, mid-program, and Professional Year teacher candidates across programs
a. Aligned lesson plan template and components with FfT

b. Organized and video-recorded faculty across programs that contributed to the description, explanation, and example of the individual lesson design component
c. Scaffolded video series into pre-acceptance, mid-program, and professional year sections for viewing by teacher candidates throughout the program
d. Disseminated finalized video training series to all liaisons, COED faculty, and mentor teachers
e. Video training series utilized in COED courses, college-wide professional year seminars, and training for university liaisons
Core Practices
Cross walked Boise State identified core practices with Danielson Framework for Teaching
a. created SMART card
b. PD for TELG and TECC
Secondary Alignment and Support Subcommittee:
a. Established Secondary Alignment and Support SubCommittee
b. Built a culture of collaboration with ALL secondary methods/dept chair participation
c. Beginning work to align pathways, processes for interview, and systems of candidate support
Language and Linguistic Diversity:
a. Designed, distributed, and analyzed a survey to evaluate faculty knowledge about language and linguistic diversity
b. Margaret Mulhern designed a one-credit course on Academic Language Acquisition (ED-LLC 597), in which many faculty enrolled.
c. Margaret Mulhern, Katherine Wright, Sherry Dismuke, and Jennifer Snow collaborated to develop instructional materials for teaching academic language targets
d. Established co-teaching between public school mentor teachers and Boise State University faculty.
e. Professional development on language demands and targets for TELG
f. Continued facilitation of professional year seminars (for all interns and student teachers) for language acquisition, identifying language demands, and writing language targets

2018 Goals:
o Language Acquisition
♣ Map where components of language acquisition pedagogy are happening in coursework, seminars, and workshops in all teacher education programs
♣ Adding 'language demand' as an intermediate step prior to 'language target' on the lesson plan template
♣ Getting more people to teach language acquisition courses now that more faculty have been prepared to do so
♣ Loop in Secondary Content Area Literacy courses in Language Demands & Targets as a focus
o Core Practices
♣ Lead PD for TECC
♣ Revise the Taskstream formative observation form so it's better aligned with Core Practices
♣ Take further steps towards curriculum alignment within and across all programs, as applicable
• El Ed Math Alignment
♣ Documented curriculum alignment 157,257, 331
♣ Alignment with new elementary state standards
♣ Add a field experience (math intervention in a diverse placement) in Math 331
o Core Practices Video Training Series
♣ Capture in-practice Master Teachers demonstrating Core Practices within K12 classrooms, across grade levels and content areas
♣ Capture COED faculty providing explanation, clarification, and examples of individual Core Practices in alignment with FfT, across programs and content areas
♣ Create scaffolded video training series for COED students and teacher candidates
♣ Provide PD for University Liaisons who support Professional Year candidates, COED faculty who can implement into early to mid program coursework
♣ Disseminate college-wide to students, teacher candidates, and university liaisons and mentor teachers
o Pathway Poster for shared programs.
♣ Review application and interview process
♣ S-PAT training for evaluators
♣ Review lesson plan template
♣ Open a conversation about establishing early field experience in methods courses. Lesson study.
♣ Add lesson plan enactment in 301 field experience

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

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 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 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

    ☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Dr. Jennifer Snow
Position:	Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Phone:	2084261991
E-mail:	jennifersnow@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 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 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 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