



**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

College of Education and Human Sciences
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

Accreditation Council April 2020
Accreditation Application Date: *

*This is the official record of the Educator Preparation Provider's accreditation status.
The Educator Preparation Provider should retain this document for at least two accreditation cycles.*

* This EPP was accredited previously by NCATE or TEAC and the initial application date is not available. CAEP was established July 1, 2013.

ACCREDITATION DECISION

Probationary Accreditation is granted at the initial-licensure level. Standard 5 was found not met by the Accreditation Council. This accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2022. The provider must demonstrate that Standard 5 is met and all stipulations cited have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A probationary accreditation site visit will take place no later than Fall 2021.

Probationary Accreditation is granted at the advanced-level. Standard A.5 was found not met by the Accreditation Council. This accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2022. The provider must demonstrate that Standard A.5 is met and all stipulations cited have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A probationary accreditation site visit will take place no later than Fall 2021.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
STANDARD 1/A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Met
STANDARD 2/A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Met
STANDARD 3/A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity	Met	Met
STANDARD 4/A.4: Program Impact	Met	Met
STANDARD 5/A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Not Met	Not Met
Rationale for Standard 5 at the initial-licensure level being found Not Met:		
The EPP does not have a Quality Assurance System. While there are multiple assessments within programs, the unit does not have a coherent, cohesive system to gather, analyze, or disseminate data for continuous improvement.		
Rationale for Standard 5 at the advanced preparation level being found Not Met:		
The EPP does not have a Quality Assurance System. While there are multiple assessments within programs, the unit does		

not have a coherent, cohesive system to gather, analyze, or disseminate data for continuous improvement.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

Areas for Improvement: Identified areas for improvement are addressed in the provider's annual report.

Stipulations: Stipulations are addressed in the provider's annual report and must be corrected within two years to retain accreditation.

INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates use research and evidence to measure P-12 student progress and their own professional practice. (component 1.2)	Data from the TWS and the Child Study are not reported by element/indicator/component of the assessments. The team could not find sufficient documentation to determine if candidates can use evidence to measure P-12 learning and improve their own professional practice.
2	The EPP provided limited identification and/or discussion of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences between programs. (component 1.3)	Although the State Program Reports present some analysis of data at the program level, there was limited analysis of data at the EPP level, nor comparisons or differences among initial programs.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence to demonstrate that candidates model and apply technology. (component 1.5)	The EPP provided limited data specific to candidates' use of technology for improving the teaching and learning process.

STANDARD 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that the performance of clinical educators is evaluated. (component 2.2)	Data from the EPP's clinical educator evaluation instrument was provided. While the evaluation was given, there is no data to indicate the effectiveness of the instrument or that the instrument establishes, maintain, or retain the criteria for selection and retention of clinical educators.
2	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that candidates have clinical experiences in diverse settings or that the clinical experiences for secondary candidates are of sufficient depth, breadth, coherence, and duration. (component 2.3)	The EPP mentioned field trips to the Huron School District and local reservations however, the field trips are not mandatory. In addition, the team was informed how Secondary education has revised all clinical experiences to include mandatory ELL and special education experiences however only anecdotal data exists to support this information. Finally, Early childhood, according to the EPP has a mandatory special education experience, however, only anecdotal data exists.

STANDARD 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient plan to continually monitor and disaggregated evidence of academic quality for individual preparation programs. (component 3.2)	The EPP provided insufficient evidence of a plan to monitor academic quality. Admissions data are not disaggregated by program so it is not possible to determine if each specialty-area licensure program admitted cohort meets the CAEP requirement for a grade point average of 3.0.
2	The EPP provided an insufficient plan for admitting a pool of diverse candidates. (component 3.1)	The EPP provided plan does not meet CAEP sufficiency standards due to a lack of a timeline or a way to monitor progress of the plan.

STANDARD 4: Program Impact

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not provide a plan to document, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. (component 4.1)	While the EPP administers some assessments there is no plan for how these assessments will demonstrate, using multiple measures, how these assessment will demonstrate completers' impact on P12 student growth.
2	The EPP did not provide a plan to demonstrate completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. (component 4.2)	While the EPP plan for instrumentation, the reliability/validity of instrumentation, data for each assessment, or analyses of actionable data that would demonstrate, through structured and validated observation instrument and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient plan to include the monitoring of operational effectiveness. (component 5.1)	Monitoring operational effectiveness was not addressed in the SSR, SSR-A, evidences, or during the onsite visit.
2	The EPP provided limited data on completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development. (component 5.4)	Data from candidates were provided but limited completer performance data was provided.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that stakeholders are regularly and systematically involved in program evaluation and improvement. (component 5.5)	An Advisory Council of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership, comprised of P-12 partners and community representatives, was appointed approximately one year ago. The agenda for only one meeting was available, and it did not include topics related to program evaluation and assessment.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP does not have a quality assurance system. (component 5.2)	None of the EPP-created assessments meet the CAEP sufficient level on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, including data validity and data reliability. The Campus Labs database system adopted by the university currently is not capable of producing candidate assessment data.
2	The EPP does not have a plan to regularly and systematically	Since there are no common key assessments for all

<p>assesses candidate performance, track results over time, and use data to improve its programs. (component 5.3)</p>	<p>Early Childhood and Secondary programs except the PRAXIS II content exam and PRAXIS Principles of Learning and Teaching exam, comparisons of candidate performance with the overall EPP performance and comparisons of candidate performance with other programs are not possible, and trends are not identified. Assessment retreats had been held in the fall with the most recent retreat held two years ago.</p>
---	---

ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	<p>The EPP provided an insufficient plan to demonstrate candidates' ability to understand and apply knowledge and skills in their field of specialization so that learning and opportunities for all P-12 learners are enhanced through: applications of data literacy, research, data analysis, collaborative activities, technology, and professional dispositions. (component A.1.1)</p>	<p>The revised plan to address all six of the professional skills listed in component A.1.1 or to assess at least three of these skills using multiple indicators/measures does not meet CAEP's guidelines for phase-in plans.</p>
2	<p>The EPP provided limited evidence to ensure that advanced program completers learn and apply specialized content in approved national discipline-specific standards. (component A.1.2)</p>	<p>Program reports provided some evidence that advanced program completers have the opportunity to learn and apply specialized content however, data specific to national discipline-specific standards.</p>

STANDARD A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	<p>The EPP did not provide evidence or a CAEP sufficient plan for documenting partnerships or collaboration at the advanced level. (component A.2.1)</p>	<p>The EPP provided no evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 schools and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of Educational Administration candidates. (component A.2.1)</p>

STANDARD A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	<p>The EPP provided an insufficient plan for admitting a diverse group of Educational Administration candidates that includes specific recruitment goals, as well as the components included in the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (ie., relationship to the standard, data quality). (component A.3.1)</p>	<p>The EPP's recruitment plan did not includes specific recruitment goals for admitting a diverse candidate pool of educational leaders. The plan was missing components included in the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (ie., relationship to the standard, data quality).</p>
2	<p>The EPP provided an insufficient plan to monitor candidate progress from admissions through program completion. (component A.3.3)</p>	<p>While the Advanced Program Curriculum Assessment plan does contain a curriculum map, there is an insufficient plan for monitoring candidate progress from admission to completion.</p>

STANDARD A.4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient plan to demonstrate that employers are satisfied with completer's preparation and that completers reach employment milestones, such as promotion and retention. (component A.4.1)	While personnel were identified, no timelines, evidence-based assessments or actionable data, or resources related to employer satisfaction are presented for the advanced program.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP does not demonstrate that advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective. (component A.4.2)	No timeline, resources, evidence-based assessments or actionable data that measures completer satisfaction were presented for the advanced program.

STANDARD A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient plan for a quality assurance system. (component A.5.2)	Assessment instruments and rubrics for the 16 assessments identified in the Graduate Program Assessment Development and Implementation Guide were not provided; therefore, it could not be determined if the assessment system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. Therefore, it could also not be determined if the EPP-created assessments meet the CAEP sufficient level on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, including data validity and data reliability.
2	The EPP provided an insufficient plan for regularly and systematically assessing candidate performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracking results over time, and using data to improve program elements and processes. (component A.5.3)	There is no description in the Graduate Program Assessment Development and Implementation Guide regarding the process used to regularly and systematically assess candidate performance, track results over time, test innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and use data to improve its programs; and there is no evidence that this is being done.
3	The EPP provided an insufficient plan to summarize, externally benchmark, analyze, share widely and act upon data for decision-making.(component A.5.4)	While personnel have been identified, and some data exists, there is no description in the Graduate Program Assessment Development and Implementation Guide regarding the process used to summarize, externally benchmark, analyze, share widely and act upon in decision-making.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP does not have a quality assurance system comprised of multiple measures that monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness. (component A.5.1)	In the Graduate Program Assessment Development and Implementation Guide, the EPP identified 16 assessments plus a graduate and an employer survey; but did not provide the assessment instruments and rubrics, and did not describe the process for monitoring candidate progress, completer achievements, and

		operational effectiveness.
2	Stakeholders are not involved in program evaluation and improvement. (component A.5.5)	There is no description of stakeholder involvement in the Graduate Program Assessment Development and Implementation Guide.

AREA(S) FOR IMPROVEMENT OR WEAKNESS(ES) from previous legacy accreditor review (NCATE or TEAC)

Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
1) [NCATE STD1]The unit does not provide sufficient evidence that candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction program demonstrate an in-depth knowledge and expertise in their area of specialization. [ADV]	1) Remove: The C&I program is not within the CAEP scope.
2) [NCATE STD2]The Curriculum and Instruction program is not integrated into the unit's assessment system. [ADV]	2) Remove: The C&I program is not within the CAEP scope.
3) [NCATE STD2]The unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate data for program and unit improvement. [Both]	3) Removed and reflected in stipulations for 5.2 and A.5.2
4) [NCATE STD3]The unit has inconsistently applied field placement policies, resulting in candidates having limited experiences with diverse P-12 students. [Both]	4)Removed and reflected in AFI for 2.3. No longer part of standard A.2 at advanced level.
5) [NCATE STD4]Candidates have limited opportunities to work with peers from diverse backgrounds. [Both]	5) Removed and reflected in Stipulations 3.1 and A.3.1

INFORMATION ABOUT ACCREDITATION STATUSES

Accreditation for seven (7) years is granted if the EPP meets all CAEP Standards and components, even if areas for improvement (AFIs) are identified in the final report of the Accreditation Council.

- **Areas for Improvement (AFIs)** indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next accreditation visit. Progress reports on remediation of AFIs are submitted as part of the Annual Report. AFIs not remediated by a subsequent site visit may become stipulations.

Accreditation with stipulations is granted for 2 years if an EPP meets all standards but receives a stipulation on a component under any standard. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation or probation.

- **Stipulations** describe serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP Standards and/or components and must be brought into compliance in order to continue accreditation. All stipulations and relevant evidence are reviewed by the Accreditation Council. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation results in probation or revocation of accreditation.

Probationary Accreditation is granted for two (2) years when an EPP does not meet one (1) of the CAEP Standards. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation.

SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

The scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of educator preparation providers (EPPs) that offer bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral degrees, post-baccalaureate or other programs leading to certification, licensure, or endorsement in the United States and/or internationally. (2018).

CAEP does not accredit specific degree programs, rather EPPs must include information, data, and other evidence on the following in their submission for CAEP's review:

All licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool through grade 12 settings at the initial-licensure and advanced level that lead to professional licensure, certification, or endorsement as defined by the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates and for which the state, country, or other governing authority has established program approval standards.

Depending on an EPP's submission, accreditation may be awarded at one or both of the following levels: Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level.

1. **Initial-Licensure Level Accreditation** is provided at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial-licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers.
2. **Advanced-Level Accreditation** is provided at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement. Advanced-Level Programs are designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial-licensure program, currently licensed administrators, or other certified (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts. CAEP's Advanced-Level accreditation does not include any advanced-level program not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts; any advanced-level non-licensure programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.); or Educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.

Information on accreditation status, terms, and any conditions provided within this directory is specific to the accreditation level(s) described above. CAEP-accredited EPPs are required to distinguish accurately between programs that are accredited and those that are not.

NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, site visitors, nor other agents of CAEP are empowered to make or modify Accreditation Council decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Council itself.

End of Action Report