2022 Annual Accreditation Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

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

1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

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

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

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

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

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

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

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

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

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

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

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

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

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

Agree Disagree

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

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

231

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]

86

Total number of program completers 317

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

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

○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

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

○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

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

Accreditation Agency:

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)

Status:

Approved

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

○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

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

○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

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

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

4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.

https://www.boisestate.edu/education-caep/caep-accreditation/

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

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

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)**Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth **AND** (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**
  Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
  Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired** (in positions for which they have prepared.)

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] https://www.boisestate.edu/education-caep/2022-caep-annual-reporting-measures/

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] No Link Provided

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

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

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)   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.

The persistence of the pandemic continued to shine a light on the necessity for supporting language learners in on-line and remote learning environments. As the year progressed and p-12 students returned to distanced hybrid learning in masks, the importance of preparing candidates to promote the learning of English Language Learners continued to be a critical issue. The EPP responded to the ever changing modes of instruction to enhance the preparation of teacher candidates.

The Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC), the governing body for Teacher Education, came together in a dedicated work session to share strategies and document the enhancements to their curriculum aimed at preparing teacher candidates to work with Language Learners. Here are some examples of action taken by programs this year:

a. The English Teaching program course ENGL 301: has added a new text, Teaching the ELL Writer by Christine Ortmeier-Hooper.
b. In ENGL 402: Assessing Readers & Writers, candidates now read about assessing multilingual students' writing (the work of Lucy Spence) and practice giving feedback. They will be adding ED LLC 300: Language Acquisition as a required course.
c. The undergraduate secondary methods course, ED LLC 301, is integrating the levels of language learner descriptors when considering differentiating during lesson planning.
d. KINES 451: Secondary PE Teaching Methods now includes a Unit Plan Assignment that integrates specific plans for supporting ELL students.

The Department of Literacy, Language and Culture completed its work that mapped the alignment of the recently revised WIDA language standards to core undergraduate and advanced program courses. This added more instruction across courses on how to work with language learners across the curriculum.

In addition, they created and updated new professional development materials for liaisons to facilitate seminars for their teacher candidates in their professional year. They also developed online modules to support professional development of all course instructors. This professional development led to enhancements in the preparation for supporting language learners across programs.

It also led to changes in course alignments. For instance, all STEM ED programs expanded their use of WIDA standards. They revised lesson plan templates beginning in STEM ED 310 to align with new standards and added emphasis and direct instruction on STEM language strategies that align to language development routines, such as Talk Moves (e.g. revoicing, restating, and pressing for details) in reasoning to support discourse and STEM language development. Early methods courses now introduce students to commonalities among the practices in Science, Mathematics and English Language Arts https://static.nsta.org/ngss/PracticesVennDiagram.pdf as a lens to think about interdisciplinary practices in lesson planning.

Continuing Professional Development in the The Teacher Education Liaison Group spurred discussion making and planning for the ever-changing instructional modalities caused by the pandemic and their impact on language learners. Liaisons identified several barriers to learning faced by language learners and identified pedagogies to negate some of these barriers. For example:

a. Masks were preventing language learners and those in primary grades from seeing and hearing distinct letter sounds and formation as well as hear the pronunciation of words and sounds. A large number of clear masks were obtained for whole classrooms as well as individual mentors, teacher candidates and language learners.
b. Fewer opportunities were available for p-12 language learners to engage in interactive supports and practice academic language with peers due to social distancing in the classrooms. Liaisons and teacher candidates brainstormed ways during their seminars to arrange the classrooms to hybrid sessions to allow for social interaction including using the chat feature on zoom or frequent break out rooms when teaching hybrid, to table arrangements in set pods to allow for frequent student to student interaction.
c. Liaisons and instructors emphasized the importance of closed-captioning when using video, non verbal representations like pictures and digital manipulatives, and organization tools such as graphic organizers to help language learners organize information. Due to online formats, teacher candidates learned the value of recording lessons and posted them on their districts online platforms for language learners to watch again.

Mentor Teachers and liaisons serving high levels of language learners were increasingly concerned about their inability to construct meaningful hands-on science lessons for their students. A partnership was formed between the Boise State Coordinator of Clinical Practice Partnerships, I Do Teach (STEM Program), Jack's Urban Meeting Place (Simplot) and Title One community schools. We brought together teacher education students, STEM instructors, a mentor teacher with expertise in

working with language learners, and students of poverty and constructed hands-on-science lessons for 7 grade levels in our community schools. Teacher candidates filmed their lessons in a studio and received feedback on their ability to communicate difficult science concepts to K-6 students and their families. These science kits and copies of the videos were delivered to classrooms.

Outcomes from the Standardized Performance Assessment for Teachers (S-PAT) indicate that the efforts described above to prepare candidates to meet the needs of English language learners have been successful. Candidates' unit planning was assessed for the following criteria: Academic language demands of the unit are identified, Language targets are aligned with the content standards and ELA standards, Instructional activities reflect the language targets for whole class, small group and individuals.

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

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

The COVID pandemic has provided both challenges and opportunities when it comes to providing a diverse field placement to all teacher candidates. Boise State teacher candidates in their professional year clinical placements responded to the call to become front-line workers and deliver high quality education to all learners. They taught with their mentor teachers in school buildings even when students were at home.

The pivot from face-to-face instruction to remote instruction was the most difficult for our p-12 learners of poverty, language learners, and those in rural settings. Remote instruction put a camera into the homes of p-12 learners and highlighted the inequities in students' home learning environments. While these differences existed before the pandemic, teacher candidates came face to face with the home lives of their students. All placements provided opportunities to gain experiences working with diverse learners and their families and develop a deeper understanding and empathy for diverse family dynamics. Our definition of "diverse" learners changed during the pandemic–all students were marginalized in some way.

Candidates placed in title one schools or those with a high level of new to country students had unique experiences supporting families during the pandemic, bridging some of the inequities and barriers to learning for all students. Candidates assisted passing out hot spots, computers, and visited their students' homes to try and get online learning secured. They passed out lunches, learning packets and gained experience working with parents; this had a wide range of competencies not typically available in former models when it comes to supporting student learning from home.

We also were able to open up partnerships in more title one schools that focus on language learners. We were able to partner with one elementary school that uses a co-teaching model in all grade levels with their ELL teacher. This provided all candidates an opportunity to co-teach with the ELL expert in the building.
In order to expand opportunities in rural areas we created a rural liaison advisor who worked to expand rural clinical placements for their professional year. Dr. Zenkert, the rural liaison advisor, was able to provide all professional year seminars and observe candidates remotely to facilitate a higher number of rural placements.

Some early placement experiences had to be modified to meet the COVID restrictions in schools. Many candidates did serve their communities face to face in critical spaces that allowed front-line workers to continue with their jobs. Our candidates engaged in early field placements in title one afterschool community centers, the Boys and Girls club and piloted a new program to serve as AVID tutors in secondary title one schools. We worked to design remote placements that still allowed candidates to work in diverse settings.

During the Fall 2020 semester we developed a partnership with the Idaho Digital Learning Academy to provide remote early field placements with diverse, rural students at South Middle School in Twin Falls, Idaho. Early field placement students in their cultural diversity class piloted this experience. They spent time learning the CASEL framework for social emotional learning, developing lessons, and working remotely with small groups of diverse middle schoolers to teach these important skills. Data collected from student exit surveys and candidate reflections revealed the pilot was successful in teaching middle schoolers new social emotional skills and teacher candidates in early placements gained new perspectives about planning for and supporting diverse learners. In partnership with IDLA we plan to scale up this field placement for the Fall of 22. Early Literacy placements developed online modules with title one reading specialists to simulate early literacy placements as these candidates were not allowed in schools due to COVID restrictions.

Candidates in their professional year were provided more tools to deal with the social emotional needs of their p-12 students. Our MIT candidates and I Do Teach engaged in learning Trauma-Informed pedagogy in the professional year methods course. Undergraduate students also engaged in a social emotional module during their internship semester as part of their course work. The coordinator of clinical practice and partnerships created a bi-weekly recorded PD session for teacher candidates, called This Week in Professional Year. One session was dedicated to working with students of poverty and teacher self-care. All student teachers engaged in online learning about suicide prevention and were certified through the QPR program.

Given these examples, it is our belief that we have addressed this area of improvement and successfully navigated these unprecedented times; to better prepare our candidates to not only elevate their educational practices, but to elevate the education profession as well.

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.

The unit engaged in continuing activities to ensure reliability and validity for EPP assessments.

During Fall and Spring 20-21 The Teacher Education Liaisons Group (TELG) engaged in calibrating S-PAT scoring. We scored samples individually and then came together in pre-planned small groups that each had an expert scorer. Then we discussed any discrepancies in scoring in first the small groups and then in the whole group calibrating conversations. Although these efforts proved very fruitful, TELG quickly began to acknowledge the impact of the pandemic on our Professional Year evaluation tools.

Our candidates' success leadership team met every other week to help translate the Danielson Framework for teaching observation tool for remote instruction. For instance, liaisons have been trained to look for elements of effective classroom management in face-to-face environments. The Candidate Success Team Leadership (CSTL) group worked to create key elements of classroom management during remote instruction. In the middle of this work, the Danielson company came out with a new guide for remote instruction. We were able to bring this work to our larger group of liaisons. Professional development was provided to liaisons and and we continued our calibrating conversations around remote supervision.

Given adaptations our teacher candidates faced while planning instruction online and for hybrid instruction. The CSTL team established a list of co-constructed adaptations for our S-PAT unit planning rubric during the pandemic. We engaged in consensus making for acceptable and non-acceptable adaptations. The CSTL wanted to find a way to have candidates be successful while still ensuring a standard quality that was agreed upon during the "pivot" year. The guidelines for acceptable adaptations were communicated to liaisons via small group liaison groups called Candidate Success Teams (CST).

During 20-21 data was collected across programs on the interrater reliability of scoring teams on the new dispositions rubric and Case study rubrics.

To enter our program, a student must give a teaching demonstration that is evaluated by a panel of three faculty according to a rubric determined by the College. The primary purpose of measuring agreement among faculty is two-fold: to ensure that faculty members are consistently applying our rubric, and to highlight faculty who require additional professional development to consistently apply our rubric.
To measure agreement, we measured a statistical concept known as inter-rater reliability. To measure inter-rater reliability, we calculated a statistical measure called Cohen's Kappa (also called a kappa value). Kappa values ranged between -1 and 1. Unlike some statistical measures, Cohen's Kappa does not have an objective threshold by which to measure success, so we defined agreement among a pairing of faculty to be a pairing with a corresponding kappa value of 0.6 or higher. Twenty-nine faculty participated across all interviews, resulting in a sample of 194 faculty pairings.
Of the 194 pairs, 153 (78.9%) had a kappa value of at least 0.6. Forty-one pairs (21.1%) had a kappa value below 0.6.
To measure how consistently faculty apply our rubric, we defined the agreement rate for a given faculty member to be the proportion of that faculty member's pairings in which that faculty scored a kappa value of 0.6 or higher (our definition of being in agreement) relative to the total number of that faculty's pairings.
Of the 29 faculty who served as evaluators, 15 had an agreement rate of at least 60%. Of the 14 who had an agreement rate below 60%, 8 faculty had fewer than 10 pairings.
Of the 29 faculty who served as evaluators, 17 faculty participated in at least 10 pairings. Of these 17 faculties who participated in at least 10 pairings, 11 (64.7%) had a pass rate of at least 60%.
Based on this preliminary analysis, of the 17 faculty who participated in at least 10 pairings, 6 are highlighted to receive additional professional development to ensure they apply our rubric consistently. Our next steps include extending this analysis from a subsample to our entire population sample to give a more accurate measurement across all faculty.

Outcomes- Faculty with exceptional levels of agreement will lead our professional development training for those faculty identified as needing additional support in applying our rubric consistently. Additionally, these faculty will serve on interdisciplinary rating teams to ensure further consistency across programs.

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

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

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

Pandemic conditions during the 20-21 Academic Year created a unique set of new challenges that required innovations and modifications in order to continue to provide teacher candidates with rigorous, meaningful, learning experiences. We decided to move forward with most planned improvements and adapt and modify current structures to ensure student success.

Planned Improvements

The 20-21 academic year provided two cycles of baseline data for the Equity Case Study. Applicants to Teacher Education responded to one of six case studies describing ethical dilemmas around issues of equity. A team of three faculty evaluated the responses for clarity and cohesiveness in identifying inequities, perspectives, challenges, and possible solutions. Our teacher education team anticipates the opportunity to compare outcomes to this baseline data at the conclusion of this spring semester when candidates will respond to the case studies again. We plan to analyze the growth by rubric criteria, identify patterns and trends, and generate questions about our candidates' preparation to analyze and respond to ethical dilemmas.

Innovations and Modifications

Candidate Success Teams

Teacher Education at both the initial and advanced levels made significant modifications and adaptations in nearly every space due to the pandemic-related changes and restrictions. The Candidate Success Team Leadership Group continued to meet with the purpose of ensuring continuity and adherence to standards, while remaining flexible and innovative in our approaches during unprecedented circumstances. During this time, CSTs implemented new guides, tools, and platforms including the Danielson Group's guide to remote learning, Panopto video capture, Zoom collaborations and others. Entirely remotely, the CSTs facilitated collaboration so that candidates' needs could be met in individualized ways, mentor teachers could receive the support they needed, and school partnerships remained intact and productive.

Remote/Hybrid Seminars

Another significant pivot became necessary when teacher candidates could no longer meet in person for informational and professional development seminars. A foundational part of TE's professional year, these seminars were converted to modules that could be facilitated by liaisons in small remote groups of candidates. Additionally, TE leadership implemented weekly outreach emails that included messages and vital information common to teacher candidates across programs. The weekly emails also featured interviews, blogs, messages and other outreach from p-12 teachers, administrators, and TE faculty.

Summer 21: Technology Platform Courses
In anticipation of a fully online Fall 21 semester for Clinical Placements, Boise State used the summer of 2021 to prepare the incoming teacher candidates for remote instruction by offering training on a variety of platforms being used by local districts. Google Classroom certification was offered and many candidates with placements in districts using Google Classroom gained this certification and were well prepared for the hybrid and fully remote learning environments they entered.
Our advanced program for online K-12 teachers engaged some of its candidates in the construction of Professional Development for a Local K-12 school to aid classrooms teachers in making the pivot to online instruction.

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

◉ Yes   ○ No

6.1.3 Optional Comments

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.3 Selectivity During Preparation

A.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
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
R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers
R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement
R6.3 Faculty Resources
R6.4 Infrastructure
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.

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

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

8.1.1 What semester is your next accreditation visit?
Spring 2023

8.1.2 Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?
Not at this time

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

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Sherry Dismuke

Position: Assistant Dean for Teacher Education

Phone: 208 426-1991

E-mail: cheryledismuke@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.

☑ **Acknowledge**