Self-Study Report

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION &
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Education Building Suite 102
231 Centennial Drive Stop 7189
Grand Forks, ND 58202
November 6, 2022

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Form Version: 3.0

CAEP Self-Study Report

I. Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The University of North Dakota (UND) is in Grand Forks, a college town on the Red River of the North separating North Dakota and Minnesota. UND is the state's oldest and largest university. "Founded by the Dakota Territorial Assembly in 1883, six years before statehood, UND was intended to be, and has remained, a university with a strong liberal arts foundation surrounded by a variety of professional and specialized programs". UND's mission is to provide transformative learning, discovery and community engagement opportunities for developing tomorrow's leaders. The university also identifies 6 Core Values to guide our reach in fulfilling the mission: Community, Discovery, Inclusivity, Liberal Arts, and Lifelong Learning.

Accredited by the Higher Learning Commissions, UND has 9 Academic Colleges/Schools: Aerospace, Arts & Sciences, Business & Public Administration, Education and Human Development, Engineering and Mines, Graduate School, Law, Medicine & Health Science and Nursing and Professional Disciplines. According to Edsmart, as the Top Midwest College, UND is #5 as the best Online University in the nation, and most importantly is #4 in most military friendly school. With a student enrollment of 13,772 these heart of the university hail from all 50 states and 86 countries. UND boasts 15 NCAA Division 1 Athletic teams with over 250 student clubs and organization. There are slightly more men (51%) than women and 15% of the students live in residence halls. For the first time in the 137-year history, UND's freshman class has 463 Presidential Scholars. With 64% attending as full-time students and 36% part time, UND encourages students to make informed choices, to communicate effectively, to be intellectually curious and creative, to commit themselves to lifelong learning and the service of others, and to share responsibility both for their own communities and for the world. The University promotes cultural diversity among its students, staff, and faculty.

Notable for Town and Gown relations, UND and Grand Forks share over 62,000 people where we enjoy a friendlier and safer living community, have smarter schools providing educational opportunities for students of all ages and needs, promote job opportunities, have healthier people and engage in livelier events. "With prairies to the west and lakes to the east, Grand Forks is one of the most livable cities!"

b. Description of Organizational Structure

University Level
President
Provost

College Level
Dean
Office of the Dean staff:

. Assistant to the Dean
. College Business Officer
. HR Manager
. HR Specialist
. Director of Communications, Outreach, and Recruitment
. Graduate Assessment Manager
. Scheduling Manager
. Development Officer

Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development
Associate Dean for Student Services and Assessment
. Assistant to the Associate Deans

Director of Teacher Education
. Placement Manager
. Undergraduate Assessment Manager
. Licensure officer and Advisor
. 2 Advisors - Teacher Education Candidates
. Administrative Staff

Department Level - Teaching Learning and Professional Practice
Chair, Teaching Learning and Professional Practice
. Administrative Assistant
Early Childhood Education
1 Program Director
3 faculty
Educational Leadership
1 Program Director
3 faculty
Elementary Education
1 Program Director
4.5 faculty
0.5 Postdoc (Shared with Engineering)
Indigenous Education
1 Program Director/ faculty
Middle/Secondary
1 Program Director
4.5 faculty
Special Education
1 Program Director
10 faculty
1 Director of Resident Teacher Program
1 support staff - Online Admissions Specialist
TESOL
1 Program Director/FTE faculty

Department of Education, Health and Behavior Studies
Chair, Education, Health & Behavior Studies
. Administrative Assistant

Physical Education
1 faculty

School Counseling
1 Program Director
2 faculty
1 internship coordinator/licensure specialist
1 support staff - Online Admissions Specialist

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

College Mission: The College of Education and Human Development through collaborative partnerships and scholarship, engages in inquiry and innovation to influence inclusive development and learning for all.

Vision Statement: The College of Education and Human Development advances research, teaching, and learning through an intentional focus on problem solving and integration of theory and practice to develop equitable outcomes which foster local and global impacts on a diverse and complex society.

Diversity and Inclusion Statement: To create a safe, welcoming, and inclusive learning and work environment, the College of Education and Human Development focuses on fostering greater diversity, equity, inclusion and accountability. The college embraces a culture of inclusion where all individuals feel respected, are treated fairly, provided work-life and school-life balance, and have an opportunity to excel in their chosen fields. These efforts will be intentionally integrated into the goal and efforts of the College.
Equity and Justice: The College of Education and Human Development is taking the current steps as action items to address the principles of equity and justice.

In CEHD, we promote the principles of equity and justice.
. We strive to reduce the barriers to equitable access to education.
. We challenge ourselves to recognize our own biases and privileges, and then change our own behaviors to increase equity and inclusion.
. We critically examine our admissions, hiring, and curriculum processes to improve education for every student and to increase representation from diverse communities.
. We are committed to making systemic changes that promote equal educational, economic, and social rights for every individual.
UND Land Acknowledgment

Today, the University of North Dakota rests on the ancestral lands of the Pembina and Red Lake Bands of Ojibwe and the Dakota Oyate - presently existing as composite parts of the Red Lake, Turtle Mountain, White Earth Bands, and the Dakota Tribes of Minnesota and North Dakota. We acknowledge the people who resided here for generations and recognize that the spirit of the Ojibwe and Oyate people permeates this land. As a university community, we will continue to build upon our relations with the First Nations of the State of North Dakota - the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Nation, Spirit Lake Nation,

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, and Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

OUR BELIEFS ABOUT TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION: IT'S ALL ABOUT LEARNING
At UND, our teacher education programs are structured around a conceptual framework in which educators play three crucial and intersecting roles.
*Educators as Learners *Educators as Practitioners *Educators as Advocates
Educators as Learners addresses our goal of developing educators who are committed and passionate about the continuing process of learning about many things, especially the process of teaching, and who will in turn guide their students in becoming life-long learners.

Educators as Practitioners focuses on developing educators who are able to take an active role in promoting the learning of all students. In our programs, you will learn about educational settings and the diverse learner while engaging in multiple authentic experiences in schools that challenge you to apply your growing knowledge and skill.

Educators as Advocates is directed at the development of educators who will advocate with and for students. We expect our graduates to be committed to meeting the educational needs of all of their students in a caring, non-discriminatory and equitable manner. Additionally, we help our educators recognize the existing inequities in schools and society and adopt a proactive stance that will challenge such inequities and improve the educational opportunities.

EPP Accreditation Status

Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

e. Is the EPP nationally or regionally accredited (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC, MSCHE) at the institutional level?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

National/Regional Accreditation Documentation

Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

a. If your institution/EPP is nationally or regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of accreditation here.

UND HLC Affirmation.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 2. Program Characteristics

a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP's academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. The Evaluation Team will reference this list in AIMS during the accreditation review process.
Note: EPP is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the data imported into this table.

Name of Program/specialty area	Enrollment in current fall cycle	Enrollment in last fall cycle	Degree level	Certificate or licensure level	Method of Delivery	State(s) in which program is approved	Date of state approval(s)	Selected Program Review Option
Early Childhood Special Education	20	25	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
Learning Disabilities	36	42	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
Emotional Disturbance	18	30	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
Developmental/Cognitive Disabilities	25	14	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
English Language Learners	26	22	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
Art Education	4	5	Baccalaureate	Initial				
English	11	15	Baccalaureate	Initial				
French	2	1	Baccalaureate	Initial				
German	0	0	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Mathematics	14	13	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Music	1	1	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Biology	2	4	Baccalaureate	Initial				
History	12	10	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Early Childhood Education	31	35	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Elementary Education	25	22	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Middle Level Education	4	9	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Composite Science	9	8	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Composite Social Studies	37	40	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Physical Education	11	2	Baccalaureate	Initial				
Educational Leadership	16	19	Master's	Advanced	Off-Campus;			
School Counseling	70	69	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			
Reading Education Advanced	37	40	Master's	Advanced	Distance Learning;			

NOTE FOR IMPORTING SPECIALTY AREA PROGRAM INFORMATION
Appending: Will add the selected program(s) to the table
Replacing: Will clear out all information currently entered in the table and will repopulate the table with the selected program(s)

Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete this table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. This AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

Control of Institution	Public
Student Body	Coed
Carnegie Class	
Location	Other Comment:The University is located within a small city with a population of approximately 62,000 people. The entire state of North Dakota has a population of only about 765,000 and so within this very rural state, Grand Forks might easily be considered an urban center. RU H (Research Universities - High Activity)

Teacher Preparation Levels	Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs Currently offering advanced educator preparation programs
EPP Type	Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional Research Institution
Religious Affiliations	Undenominational
Language of Instruction	English
Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations)	Higher Learning Commission

Table 4. Qualification Table for EPP-based Clinical Educators

a. The clinical educator (EPP-based clinical faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

Name	Highest degree earned	Field or specialty area of highest degree	Program Assignment(s)	Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)	P-12 certificates or licensures held	P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles, last five years

If EPP is not using Table 4a, upload the clinical educator qualifications table being used below.

#41 Univ Sprvsr Qual.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 5. Capacity Table

a. The capacity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP. This chart is an example of a chart that the EPP can complete.

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities			
Fiscal Support			
Administrative support			

Upload your self-developed capacity table below

UND.CEHD Capacity Table

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 6. Off Campus, Satellite, Branch

a. The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP's accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and evaluation team lead to plan the site review, including the sites that will be visited by the evaluation team.

Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP	Program offered at each site	Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N)	Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required)	Notes/Comments

Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Are you using CAEP accreditation to access Title IV funds?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Title IV Funds

Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Please upload documentation.

Please provide a narrative.

II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

This page is intended to be blank

Standard R.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1 #1 Disag Trans PhaseIn.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

2 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3 #3 CS Tech Pkt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning

4 #4 LP Tech Pkt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

5 #5 STOT Tech Pkt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

6 #6 TWS Tech Pkt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning

R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

7 #7 InTASC Algnmt.doc

R1.1 The Learner and Learning

8 #8 LP Data.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice

9 #9 TWS Data.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice

10 #10 STOT Data.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice

11 #11 Praxis Scores.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content

12 #12 Init Prgms Handbks.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

13 #13 Init ESPB.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

14 #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

15 #15 Init Disp Data.pdf

R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

16 #16 InTASC ESPB Rpt.docx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.3 Instructional Practice

17 #17 InTASC ESPB Met.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

18 #53 Action Plans.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning

19 #81 ILAC Mnts.pdf

R1.4 Professional Responsibility

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

R.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial Programs) -Introduction
Candidates across all initial licensure programs demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions through a variety of assessment measures aligned to CAEP, state, InTASC, ISTE, and discipline-specific standards. The EPP has a robust system of assessment at key points across the program of study to support candidate growth and progress through targeted feedback and to determine program effectiveness in cultivating future teacher leaders and life-long learners. The assessments provide candidates targeted feedback as they develop the necessary understanding of the concepts and principles of their discipline and the ability to work effectively with diverse P-12 learners and their families. The aggregated results provide valuable information to the EPP and stakeholders on the efficacy of programming, while disaggregated data by specialty area provides opportunities for continuous improvements at all levels. Presently, data is collected but not disaggregated by race/ethnicity, rural/urban, or First-Generation College Student; the EPP presents a transition plan to address any disparities moving forward (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn).

The EPP analyzes and addresses individual candidate needs and trends across the unit and within specialty areas over time. EPP unit wide and specialty area (disaggregated) are reviewed annually, resulting in action plans (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans).

In accordance with state approval processes, this EPP successfully completed a state approval review by ND Educational Standards and Practices Board (ESPB). This is conducted by content experts and the Director of ESPB prior to the CAEP SSR filing. Through this state approval process, EPPs demonstrate the addressing of all applicable standards, through syllabi review, analyses of assessment data showing candidate preparedness and quality assurance processes. Syllabi review demonstrates standard-based curriculum, while assessment measures both specific to areas of study and common assessment measures across the EPP document candidate performance and preparation. The EPP received a rating of "met" in all areas across all programs and specializations, using a scale of "met, met with

weakness, or did not meet" requirements/standards. This process ensures completers can be licensed and credentialed in the state of ND. It also demonstrates that the EPP prepares candidates in accordance with all applicable state standards, including those specific to the specialization/discipline (#13 Init ESPB).

Key Assessment Technical Packets provide information about each assessment, detailing information about the validity and inter-rater reliability, the explanation given to candidates and evaluators, and the rubric used.

R.1.1 The Learner and Learning
The EPP implements a blend of EPP created, state developed, and proprietary assessments to monitor and assess candidate progression and competency in the 10 InTASC standards and the application of key concepts and principles in working with diverse P12 students (#7 InTASC Algnmt). Data sources used to demonstrate preparedness include: Child Study, Lesson Plan, Teacher Work Sample, STOT (State created, formally known as the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool), Disposition Evaluations, and Content Praxis (Proprietary). The EPP created assessments use a 4-point scale: does not meet standard, progressing toward standard, fulfills/meets standard, and exceeds standard. Within the Technical Packets and data tables files referenced below, each item of the assessment is listed and linked to the specific InTASC standard for increased clarity and ease in review.

A state review of the integration and assessment of all InTASC standards was completed Nov 2021 (#16 InTASC ESPB Rpt; #17 InTASC ESPB Met). The EPP received a rating of "met" in all areas as a result, indicative of a sufficient plan for both addressing/teaching and assessing candidate ability to apply knowledge of learning differences. The assessments that specifically assess InTASC standards related to cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical differences include the Lesson Plan (LP), Teacher Work Sample (TWS), STOT, and Disposition Evaluations which are addressed in greater detail below (#3 CS Tech Pkt; #4 LP Tech Pkt; #5 STOT Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt).

The Lesson Plan (LP) Assessment evaluates candidate performance on each of the 10 InTASC and ISTE (Technology) standards following development and implementation of a lesson plan using the adopted Understanding by Design (UbD) lesson plan template (#4 LP Tech Pkt). The LP assesses performance on InTASC standards 1-9 using a 4-point scale. The assessment data in the (#8 LP Data) demonstrates average means ranging from 2.65 - 3.27 for the first 5 items. Ratings at or above 2.0 are expected at that time (early to mid-program). The mean ratings of items 1-5 align with InTASC standards 1-3 and assess application of the standards related to learning differences & the ability to plan instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. Items 18 & 19 (standard 9) assess candidate reflections on personal biases. Mean ratings on those items range from 2.70-2.95, indicative of candidates who are learning how to deepen their understanding of their own frames of reference and how those affect their teaching.

The Teacher Work Sample Assessment (TWS) evaluates candidate performance in the capstone field experience through the completion and implementation of 4-6 lesson plans using the same process previously described for the LP (#6 TWS Tech

Pkt). The TWS is evaluated by an EPP faculty member with expertise in the corresponding specialization. As part of a capstone experience, the expectations for both quantity and quality of the lesson plans using the same UbD template as the LP are higher, with the expectation being that candidates are mostly performing at the "fulfills/meets standard" level as they near program completion and seek initial licensure as teachers. In review of the TWS data (#9 TWS Data), candidate performance indicates slightly higher means than the scores on the LP. This is to be expected in a program with increasing responsibility as candidates near graduation. The average unit means have less variability, increased numbers of "meets" or "exceeds" ratings, and overall means much closer to a minimum of "meets"/3 across the EPP. The TWS has very close ties to the LP assessment, with increased expectations for more lessons and greater depth in applying knowledge of learning differences, work with diverse students, and deeper reflection on personal biases in teaching. In the data tables for all items aligned to InTASC standards 1-3, candidate scores ranged from 2.87-3.5, indicating that most students demonstrate proficiency in applying and reflecting upon the knowledge of learning differences, altering instructional methods to meet the needs of diverse P12 learners.

Data from the LP and TWS assessments show that most students are meeting or are progressing towards meeting the criteria established in demonstrating competency in well differentiated, effective lesson planning for diverse P12 learners early to mid-program, with increased competencies demonstrated in the Capstone TWS. This is further corroborated by data collected through the Child Study Assessment with mean scores very close to or at 3.0, indicative of "meeting" expectations (#3 Tech Pkt).

With a rating of 4/"Exceeds" expectations and a rating/score of 0/ "Does Not Meet" expectations, the means in each item demonstrate that candidates, overall, are progressing toward meeting the expectations early to mid-program. This is evidenced through mean scores ranging from 2.65-3.16 across all items within the assessment. The TWS is completed in the capstone field experience and uses the same rubric to describe performance on more/4-6 lesson plans. Candidates performed slightly higher on the TWS, with mean scores ranging from 1.75-3.34 with only a few students still scoring in the "does not meet" expectations range on any indicator. The few students with significantly lower scores are clear outliers as evidenced in the total occurrences by score/rating in the supplied data tables. The lowest unit mean reported was in the first cycle of data and for using "ISTE standards in designing instruction that engages students and improves learning." By the next cycle of data, the unit mean for that area increased to 2.42, and 2.95 by the third cycle of data. This is attributed to increased coverage of technology standards (ISTE) through responsive, data-driven curricular changes made because of the EPP's continuous improvement efforts, annual assessment retreats, and resulting action plans (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans).

The STOT is a state-wide, observation-based assessment tool used in ND. It is administered in the capstone field experience by the on-site supervising, licensed teacher/clinical educator based on field-based observations. A training video on administration with fidelity is shared with the clinical educators and can be accessed using the link provided in the technical packet (#5 STOT Tech Pkt). The STOT is used

to evaluate candidate performance in teaching P12 students and demonstration of all 10 InTASC standards. The STOT provides both formative and summative feedback to candidates in the Capstone Field Experience. The STOT is completed mid-semester, and again at the end of the semester by the clinical educator and EPP employed student teaching supervisor in Student Teaching. In the graduate level program leading to initial licensure, it is completed once, by the onsite clinical educator, at the end of the field experience (internship). The STOT assesses the performance of the candidate in an active teaching role through observations. Results demonstrate candidates are well-prepared for their capstone experience and implement effective teaching practices with P12 students and their families and other stakeholders (#10 STOT Data). Each item is assessed using a 4-point scale with 4 being the highest and 0 being the lowest. The average means across all items and cycles of data range from 2.99-3.59 with little variability across specialization areas. This indicates that most candidates are performing at the "meets" expectations with a positive skew toward "exceeding" expectations, as rated by an appropriately licensed teacher following live observations in a classroom. This demonstrates proficiency in the skills necessary to engage diverse P12 students and their families, and other stakeholders.

Finally, all candidates complete the Content area Praxis (sometimes called the Praxis II), a proprietary instrument, demonstrating knowledge applicable to the discipline of teaching and content area. The Content Praxis pass-rates demonstrate teacher preparedness and eligibility for initial teacher licensure (#11 Praxis Scores). The EPP's pass-rates range from 85-89% compared to a statewide pass rate range of 82-84%. The EPP's pass-rates are slightly higher than the average range for the state.

The moment candidates enter the EPP, themes of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are at the cornerstone. From the Mission statement on the Departmental page of the EPP's website, to the handbooks provided to candidates (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, pp.1-7) to the content of courses (#13 Init ESPB); DEI forms the foundation for learning. The EPP envisions these core principles as integral to the individualization of P12 learning as key indicators of ethical practice (InTASC standard 10). These tenets are assessed using the Child Study Assessment mid-program and STOT at the end of the program. Within the Child Study assessment, the mean scores throughout are at or very close to "3" (meets expectations) (#3 CS Tech Pkt, pp.8-9). The STOT data demonstrates that candidates "integrate culturally relevant content to build on learners' background knowledge" and "uses knowledge of student's socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic differences to meet learning needs" at the "meets" level or better (#10 STOT Data). Increasing DEI competence is an ongoing area for continuous improvement for the EPP in response to emerging global and regional issues.

R.1.2 Content
All specialty areas in the EPP were approved by ESPB (#13 Init ESPB). This process demonstrates assurances of candidate content proficiency in and application of knowledge of central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of discipline specific to content.

With a developmental release of responsibility throughout program progression, candidates apply key concepts, principles in their discipline, and content specific

knowledge in teaching diverse P12 students with increasing levels of independence as they progress through the program. Several assessments measure candidate application of content specific, equitable, and inclusive teaching practices. As a culminating assessment, the STOT assesses demonstration of connecting concepts, using different perspectives, engaging learners in critical thinking, creative and collaborative problem solving, and encouraging learner exploration, discovery, and expression across content areas (#5 STOT Tech Pkt). The data demonstrates that candidates are performing at or above the rating level of "meets" expectations, with a positive skew on most items towards the "exceeds" rating (#10 STOT Data). Demonstration of these concepts across the curriculum are documented and evaluated through the state approval process. Through that process, syllabi documented clinical and classroom experiences addressing equitable and inclusive practices with P12 learners (#13 Init ESPB). The learning progressions demonstrated increasing complexity in the application of knowledge as candidates near degree completion.

Data from the LP and TWS assessments document candidate proficiency in lesson planning, delivery, and progress monitoring for diverse P12 students (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #8 LP Data; #9 TWS Data). Candidates demonstrate the ability to align lessons to state-based standards, identify and implement methods to anticipate and support cultural, linguistic, and learning differences, and plan for assessing and monitoring P12 student learning several times across their program of study. Through the Content Praxis, the EPP demonstrates that candidates know the central concepts of the content area through pass-rates that are slightly higher than those reported across the state (#11 Praxis Scores).

The EPP embeds principles supporting equity, diversity, and inclusion across the entire unit from the moment a candidate first explores the program's webpage, all the way through to course assignments assessed using the key assessments. The EPP's webpage identifies core values using the following statement: ...to create a safe, welcoming, and inclusive learning and work environment, the College of Education and Human Development focuses on fostering greater diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability. The college embraces a culture of inclusion where all individuals feel respected, are treated fairly, provided work-life and school-life balance, and have an opportunity to excel in their chosen fields. These efforts will be intentionally integrated into the goal and efforts of the College. Within special Methods coursework, DEI content knowledge is used to frame all instructional planning as a cross-cutting theme in all instructional planning by candidates, even in general coursework serving multiple majors. The LP and TWS' use of the UbD template prompts candidates to make connections between content knowledge and addressing needs of diverse students since all assessment data is housed in Watermark (formerly LiveText and Via) with candidates having immediate access to feedback (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt). Candidates are provided information on all assessments used and can view the ratings/scores assessed on each measure for use as a formative assessment, further guiding their practice.

As a rural state with a large Indigenous population, the state's legislative statutes require that EPPs must address the learning needs of this group specifically. Through the state review, the EPP demonstrated this satisfactorily. This is in addition to

embedding strategies for meeting the needs of other populations of diverse P12 learners across the program curriculum (#13 Init ESPB). It is most notably demonstrated by candidates in the LP and TWS assessments through lesson plans specifically identifying plans for differentiation with diverse P12 students and further demonstrated through non-faculty assessments via Disposition 4 and the STOT.

The EPP implements four Disposition Evaluations to further assess candidate demonstration of applying knowledge of content specific pedagogy with increasing complexity. These are completed at admission, early to mid-program (candidate progression in coursework so far), a 3rd during methods for Undergraduates (prior to student teaching), and a 4th at the end of the Capstone Field Experience (#14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt). As common assessments across the EPP addressing candidate preparation, disposition 2 and 4 will be the focus. Within the data for Disposition 2, two areas align to the EPP's core values: attitudes and behavior when relating to others, and ethical practice/professional conduct. In these two areas, the average means ranged from 3.04-3.84 (#15 Init Disp Data). This indicates most candidates "meet" expectations and that the data skews in the positive direction towards "exceeds" expectations. Disposition 2 is completed by a content area faculty member with expertise in the specialization area. At the undergraduate level, Disposition 4 is completed by both the onsite and EPP employed clinical educators, and by the onsite clinical educator at the graduate level. Data from Disposition 4 is included above. Using the same scales as indicated previously, candidates are evaluated on statements aligned to CAEP and InTASC standards. Average mean scores for the unit range from 2.93-3.84 indicating most candidates are performing at the meets or exceeds expectations level on this assessment by the end of their program.

R.1.3 Instructional Practice

Within the LP and TWS, candidates demonstrate high leverage practices as they: align lessons to state standards; identify teaching methods to anticipate and support cultural, linguistic, and learning differences in P12 students; plan and implement appropriate technology to enhance learning; plan for assessing and monitoring student learning; and reflect on both candidate and P12 student learning. Data from these assessments reveal increased capacities as candidates move through the program, with most candidates performing at the "meets" or "exceeds expectations" range on the TWS by the end of their capstone field experience (#8 LP Data; #9 TWS Data). The UbD lesson planning template used in the LP and TWS sets the stage for candidates to thoroughly plan for the key concepts of assessment, planning, instructional strategies, DEI, and technology integration (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt).

Candidates have multiple experiences learning about and practicing data-based decision making, altering lesson plans accordingly. The learning progression and coverage of skills was reviewed and approved for all 10 InTASC standards by ND ESPB (#16 InTASC ESPB Rpt; #17 InTASC ESPB Met). The ability to demonstrate InTASC standards 6-8 is assessed using the LP and TWS assessment (#4 LP Tech Pkt, rubric and UbD Template; #6 TWS Tech Pkt, rubric and UbD Template).

Candidate performance in the TWS shows most candidates performing at a proficient

level (meeting or exceeding expectations) in fully implementing the UbD lesson planning process from envisioning, to implementing, to re-evaluating, and planning for future improvements (#9 TWS Data). The UbD lesson plan used in both assessments also specifically addresses candidate implementation of technology in teaching and the linking of teaching practices to ISTE and state specific technology standards (#4 LP Tech Pkt, UbD Lesson Plan Template; #6 TWS Tech Pkt, UbD Lesson Plan Template).

The UbD lesson plan used in the LP and TWS requires candidates to describe plans for educating diverse P12 students and is aligned with InTASC standards 1-9. Candidates link lesson planning to multiple standards including state P12 standards, Technology standards/ISTE, ELL/WIDA, students with disabilities, and contextual factors of the candidate's specific P12 setting. Post implementation, candidates reflect on the UbD lesson plan at both the LP and TWS level, identifying any potential biases related to their instructional practices. Formative and summative feedback on the UbD lesson planning is provided in coursework by content expert faculty early to mid-program and is assessed within the LP, and again at the end in the form of more summative feedback in the capstone experience/internship using TWS.

Using the same protocol as with Disposition 4, clinical educators (both onsite and EPP employed) provide candidates with evaluative feedback on teaching performance in the Capstone Field Experience using the observation-based assessment, the STOT and Disposition 4 (#5 STOT Tech Pkt; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt). Clinical educators evaluate candidate ability to apply effective teaching practices and to adapt instructional materials to create culturally responsive, equitable learning opportunities for diverse P12 students using data-based decision making. Within the data, results indicate that candidates are performing at the meets expectations level almost universally in all items measured by the STOT and Disposition 4 Assessments (#10 STOT Data; #15 Init Disp Data, Disposition 4 Data).

R.1.4 Professional Responsibility
As candidates enter the EPP, they are provided a handbook detailing program expectations, processes, and procedures; including introductory information about ethical practices (#12 Init Prgms Handbks). Adequate application of each InTASC standard is a requirement for approval by the state's licensure board (ND ESPB), including application of InTASC standards relating to professional learning and ethical practice. These are demonstrated and approved through the State Review Process with the EPP receiving a rating of "met" on a scale of met, met with weakness, or does not meet (#13 Init ESPB; #17 InTASC ESPB Met).

Through course content, candidates specifically examine their own biases while learning about professional ethics in coursework (#13 Init ESPB, curriculum progressions). Across coursework, candidates are provided feedback as they demonstrate increasing proficiency for professional standards of practice, relevant laws and policies, and adherence to applicable codes of ethics throughout their programs; culminating in guided, yet increasingly independent application within the Capstone Field Experience. Assessment of this self-reflection in examining potential biases is demonstrated in the LP and TWS (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt). The final questions within the UbD lesson planning template demonstrate self-reflection.

This is also assessed by faculty and clinical educator assessment through observations, interactions, and candidate performance using Dispositions 2 and 4 specifically (#14 Init Prg Tech Pkt).

Candidates are provided formative feedback regarding professional learning and ethical practice at several checkpoints during their program using Disposition Evaluations (#14 Init Prg Tech Pkt). Disposition 2 is completed early to mid-program by content area faculty and Disposition 4 is completed at the conclusion of the Capstone Field Experience. The data are reported by question, semester, and program/specialization area, with means provided at the specialization and unit levels (#15 Init Disp Data, Dispositions 1 and 2). Data from both Disposition Evaluation checkpoints demonstrate that candidates are overwhelmingly "meeting" program expectations. For those candidates who receive ratings of "does not meet" expectations, procedures are in place for guidance from program faculty to assess candidate fit and provide additional support and mentoring (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, p. 20). By the end of the program in Disposition 4, candidate performance demonstrates readiness for practice with most candidates meeting or exceeding expectations with unit means on the measure ranging from 3.02-4.0 on a 4-point Likert scale with a rating of 4 indicating "exceeds expectations." The expectation as entry level teachers is to be at or approaching the rating of "meets" expectations (rating of 3.0). Candidates have multiple Disposition assessments completed during their program with formative feedback provided throughout by instructors, advisors, and if needed, the Director of Teacher Education.

Standards 9 and 10 are specifically assessed using the STOT (#5 STOT Tech Pkt, pp 11-12). The STOT scores on the 4 items related to professional learning and ethics (Standard 9) yielded means between 3.42-3.59, with most candidates performing at the meets or exceeds range for the evaluation of their performance. A rating of 3 aligns with "meets expectations" and a 4 indicative of "exceeds expectations." This demonstrates that candidates are prepared to apply the InTASC standards relating to professional learning and upholding ethical and legal responsibilities. The STOT also assesses candidate ability to take responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others (Standard 10) in their work with diverse P12 students and their families. On the two questions related to this aspect, mean candidate performance ranged from 3.22-3.54. This indicates that candidates are performing at the "meets" expectations range or better.

From the EPP's public mission statements to student handbooks, to course content that embeds a commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion (DEI) across the curriculum; the EPP demonstrates a strong commitment to DEI. Following review of data during twice yearly Assessment Retreats, the EPP determined that there was a need for increased intentionality in the areas of using technology and educating English language learners (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, Spring and Fall 2019 minutes). A syllabus review for all courses was conducted in Spring 2019 by the Initial Standards Assessment Committee to identify the degree to which each course syllabus demonstrated explicit instruction in diversity, equity, inclusion, and use of technology (#81 ILAC Mnts). As a result, faculty engaged in curriculum development to increase the intentionality of addressing this across courses reflective of explicit instruction aimed at addressing these concepts throughout (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, Fall 2019

minutes).

Standard R.A.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the Standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

1 #1 Disag Trans PhaseIn.docx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

2 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

3 #18 Adv ESPB.pdf

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

4 #19 Adv Assmt Plan.xlsx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

5 #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt.docx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

6 #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt.docx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

7 #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt.docx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

8 #23 Adv Disp Data.xlsx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

9 #24 Adv Resrch Data.xlsx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

10 #25 Adv ClinExp Data.xlsx

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

11 #53 Action Plans.pdf

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

A.1.1. Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Candidates are assessed on all six components of RA1.1 regardless of specialization. All key assessments are aligned to CAEP standards, with flexible language such as "appropriate to their field of specialization" where applicable. To further ensure being "appropriate to the field of specialization," assessments are completed by content/specialization area faculty experts versed in both the CEAP standards assessed and the applicable laws, policies, and codes of ethics specific to the area of specialization. Alignment of CAEP standards to each assessment administered has been provided in both the Assessment Plan and Technical Packets documents tagged here.

The EPP presents evidence that most advanced preparation program candidates can identify different proficiencies in understanding and applying knowledge and skills appropriate to the professional field of specialization using three EPP-created common/key assessments: Research Project, Clinical Experience Portfolio, and Disposition Assessment (performed twice). Five of the six specific skills in RA1.1 are each assessed twice or more by the three EPP-developed assessments, with the remaining component being assessed once: the use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies. This skillset was determined by the Advanced Assessment Committee (AAC) to be the least relevant to the professions/specializations represented within this EPP. Through the evidence provided and data analyzed, the EPP demonstrates that on most items in the assessments, candidates perform adequately or better on at least three of the six professional knowledge and skill abilities most relevant for the professional specialty fields. This meets the requirements set forth in the CAEP handbook indicating that most candidates perform adequately or better on at least three of the six of the knowledge and skills abilities most relevant for the professional specialty field. The EPP has demonstrated more than the minimal requirement.

Please refer to the Advanced Programs Assessment Plan document listing the common/key assessments, courses where each are administered, and a CAEP standard/component alignment (#19 Adv Assmt Plan). Sheet 1 of the plan lists the individuals serving on the AAC demonstrating input from each specialization area in the EPP. Advanced-level specializations include Educational Leadership (EDL); School Counseling (SC): degree and certificate; Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), degree and certificate; Reading (RED); and Special Education (SPED). Sheet 2 details the three common key assessments used across all specializations, standards alignment, the discipline specific standards addressed in curriculum, the course where the assessment is completed, and the frequency with which the assessment is administered. Sheet 3 summarizes specialization specific standards that guide curriculum for each specialization area and collaborative relationships with other stakeholders.

The assessments and processes in place demonstrate and assess candidate ability to apply their skills effectively to enhance learning and development for all P12 students. The EPP ensures that candidates demonstrate understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their respective specialization through three assessments. These common/key assessment measures were developed by faculty representatives

from each area of specialization using a consensus (Lawshe) model to develop assessments aligned to CAEP Advanced Standards while connecting the exemplars to discipline specific standards; achieving adequate levels of content validity. Across specialization areas, candidates are challenged within course-based assignments to reflect on and challenge personal biases as applicable to the specialization area, increasing their understanding of equity, diversity, and inclusion. This is modeled across the EPP, inclusive of university and EPP-led initiatives in adherence with specialization area professional standards further guiding the curriculum. These are demonstrated throughout course syllabi previously reviewed through state approval processes and are further assessed using the key assessments detailed throughout. Demonstration of course alignments for coverage and progression of knowledge and skill acquisition was demonstrated and evaluated by ND Educational Practices and Standards Board (ESPB) prior to this SSR. A full review of syllabi, course sequencing, assignments, and results of specialization specific assessments were reviewed by state officials and content experts from other universities within the state of ND. The EPP received a rating of "met" in all areas using a scale of "met, met with weakness, and did not meet" requirements (#18 Adv ESPB).

The three identified assessments, in order of implementation across the EPP are: Disposition #1 (early to mid-program) (#22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt), Research Project Assessment (mid-program) (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt), Disposition #2 (same disposition administered again at the end of program), and Clinical Experience Assessment (end of program) (#21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt). The strategic, developmental placement of assessments at key points within candidates' programs facilitates progress monitoring and early intervention in supporting candidate program completion. Support comes from both instructors and academic advisors if concerns are raised through formative as well as summative feedback. Candidate specific data is housed in Watermark (previously known as LiveText and Via), making it accessible immediately to candidates for their review upon completion of an assessment. The key assessments evaluate candidate performance of the six skills identified in A1.1 and are delineated on Sheet 2 of the Assessment Plan document (#19 Adv Assmt Plan).

After development, the assessments were piloted by the five specialization areas, then re-evaluated by the same AAC for identification of revisions. The revisions consisted of reducing the degrees of scoring within the assessments, with the general wording and flow of the assessment remaining the same. The assessments were then reviewed by the Director of University Assessment and Accreditation to further establish content validity with adequate levels attained. Inter-rater reliability training was conducted on the Research and Clinical Experience Assessment during an Annual Assessment Retreat with all faculty in attendance, with sufficient levels of inter-rater reliability reported (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt; #2 Assm Retreat Mins).

Data presented in the tables referenced throughout are organized by specialization area, by question, by cycles of data, and by construct with average means generated at the unit and specialization area levels for comparison. This manner of reporting data is consistent across all key assessment data reported. Frequency counts for each item are also provided, grouped by specialization, and further broken down by

semester/cycle of data. This enables monitoring of specific frequencies by each item for deeper comparison and analyses during annual assessment retreats scheduled each spring.

Candidate ability to identify and analyze/synthesize several types of data to make decisions within P12 schools are assessed through the implementation of two assessments: Research Project Key Assessment and Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment. Please refer to the technical packets and data files described below (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #24 Adv Resrch Data; #25 Adv ClinExp Data). Each specialization area determined the course where each assessment would be conducted. Within the Research Project and the Clinical Experience Portfolio, the application of data literacy is addressed through multiple items aligned with CAEP language relative to application of data literacy, the use of multiple methodologies of research, and the employment of data analysis to improve teaching and learning. Candidate ability to identify problems and employ one or more research methodologies to develop solutions or understandings is assessed using the Research Project Assessment (mid-program) and the Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment (end of program). The Research Project assessment data, reported in a comparable manner to all other assessments, demonstrates most candidates performing at the "meets standard" level, with some variability by program on the items related to data literacy, use of research, and employment of data to improve learning environments (#24 Adv Resrch Data, items labeled A1.a, A1.b, A1.c). The mean scores skew positively towards the level of "exceeds standard" with most students performing in the "meets standard" range on the related questions. This is expected at the Graduate level and demonstrated adequate preparation of the candidate for demonstrating proficiency. In reviewing the questions related to data literacy in the Portfolio assessment (#25 Adv ClinExp Data, items labeled A1.a, A1.b, A1.c), the mean scores demonstrate that most candidates are performing at the "meets standard" level or better. This again demonstrates that candidates are proficient in analyzing/synthesizing diverse types of data, understanding diverse types of data, and making data-based decisions to improve learning for diverse P12 learners.

Candidates demonstrate the use of data and research to identify problems and improve teaching and learning of P12 students. In review of the data, candidate performance remained primarily in the range of "meeting expectations" with some variability in levels of performance by specialization area as evidenced in the data tables provided (#25 Adv ClinExp Data). In the process of phasing in this assessment, it has not yet been determined if this is due to increased expectations by certain specialization faculty on specific items, indicating a need for greater inter-rater reliability; or if this is due to other factors. Subsequent cycles of data will be analyzed during annual assessment retreats and in AAC meetings as part of continuous improvement efforts by the EPP. Previous minutes of EPP-wide assessment retreats demonstrate an established pattern of reviewing EPP-wide and specialization-specific data annually resulting in generation of Action Plans (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans). If the data reviewed during the Spring 2022 annual assessment retreat continues to indicate discrepant data across specializations, the EPP will consider repeating inter-rater reliability training in Fall 2022.

Candidate ability to lead and/or participate in collaborative activities with others is assessed across all specializations using the Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment and the Disposition Assessments (administered twice during the program). The increased frequency of this component being assessed demonstrates the EPP's priority on candidate ability to effectively collaborate with all stakeholders in a P12 setting. During the capstone Clinical Experience, candidates demonstrate the full range of essential duties of a practicing professional applicable to the field of specialization. They complete a portfolio using artifacts generated during that capstone experience. The resulting portfolio has different names across specialization areas (Internship or Practicum) as delineated in Sheet 2 of the Assessment Plan (#19 Adv Assmt Plan). Candidate performance is evaluated by a content expert faculty member. Ratings are based on the evidence items, connections made, reflections, and explanations provided by the candidate (#21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt). The AAC determined the portfolio to be essential in measuring higher order thinking and achievement of demonstrating professional standards. This was determined through specialization specific methods in connecting with practicing professionals and on-site supervisors/mentors/clinical partners (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, sheet 3). The manner of determining essential duties and skills through collaborative efforts differs by area of specialization. This conceptualization and the artifacts frequently used as exemplars of such is provided in sheet 3 of the Assessment Plan (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, sheet 3). The manner of determining essential duties and skills through collaborative efforts differs by. In review of the Portfolio data, most candidates are performing at a level of "meets standard" with a positive skew of mean scores towards the level of "exceeds standards" on items labeled A1.d (#25 Adv ClinExp Data). The data provided includes frequency of each rating across all programs for a more detailed view of candidate performance.

In addition to the use of the Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment, candidate ability to lead and/or participate in collaborative activities is also assessed using the Disposition Assessment, which is administered twice with each candidate (#22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt; #19 Adv Asmt Plan). One to three cycles of data are reported by specialization and for the EPP overall (#23 Adv Disp Data). One program (EDL) with one cycle of data reported placed admissions on hold to re-structure the curriculum, resulting in no data. While data is provided for each specialization area item by item, and by cycle of data/semester; the summary table on the first sheet in the Disposition Assessment Data Tables file groups reports scores by construct. Detailed descriptive information, including frequencies of each rating by item are provided. Analysis reveals that most candidates are performing at the "meets standard" level, again with a positive skew toward "exceeds standard" relative to the reported means. Subsequent cycles of data will be analyzed in Annual Spring Assessment Retreats and in AAC meetings as part of continuous improvement efforts by the EPP. Previous minutes of EPP-wide Assessment Retreats demonstrate an established pattern of reviewing EPP-wide and specialization-specific data annually resulting in Action Plans by specialization area. If the data reviewed during the Spring 2022 annual assessment retreat indicates discrepant data across specializations, the EPP will consider repeating inter-rater reliability training in Fall 2022.

Candidate ability to use appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization is assessed using the Research Project Assessment and the Clinical

Experience Portfolio Assessment, labeled as item A1.e Use of Technology in each assessment (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt). Data reported for items labeled A1.e demonstrate that most candidates are performing at the "meets standard" level with a positive skew towards "exceeds" (#24 Adv Resrch Data; #25 Adv ClinExp Data). The integration of technology more explicitly across the EPP was a result of previous analyses of data at annual assessment retreats, resulting in greater emphasis across the EPP (#2 Assm Retreat Mins).

Candidate performance in demonstrating the application of professional standards of practice, relevant laws, and policies, and codes of ethics is evaluated using two administrations of a Disposition assessment: once early to mid-program, and again at the end of program; all in addition to using the Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment referenced above. While there are multiple exemplars within the Disposition Assessment tool developed, the constructs assess candidate demonstration of collaborative activities with a range of stakeholders in P12 schools, and the application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics, and professional standards appropriate to the field of specialization. Detailed expansion of exemplars of each construct are provided within the technical packets (#22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt). Disposition 1 is completed early to mid-program by a consistent specialization area faculty member during a core/required course (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, sheet 2). Disposition 2 is completed at the end of each program by faculty members of either the culminating capstone course (Scholarly Project/Thesis option) or capstone Clinical Experience. Data are provided here (#23 Adv Disp Data). Mean scores by specialization and EPP unit are provided, as are frequencies of each rating delineated by specialization. Sheet 1 (Summary table of results) summarizes the means by specialization area for each item in comparison to an EPP mean. The other sheets in the data tables file provide more detailed information including frequencies of each rating organized by semester/cycle of data, presented item by item. Analysis of the data reveal average means at both the unit and specialization level commensurate with candidate performance at the "meets standard" level with a positive skew towards "exceeds standard" level in the evaluation results. Mean scores associated with Disposition 2 are slightly higher than those reported in Disposition 1. This is expected as candidates are nearing the end of their program when Disposition 2 is administered. The EPP presents two to four cycles of data for each specialization and will have additional cycles of data reviewed during the EPP-wide Annual Assessment Retreat in Spring 2022.

Annually, EPP faculty review and analyze assessment results disaggregated by specialization area, resulting in action plans for continuous improvement (#2 Assm Retreat Mins). At present, the EPP collects but is not disaggregating data based on race/ethnicity due to limitations experienced by current data collection systems. The EPP presents a Phase-In plan for disaggregation of candidate demographics to identify potential disparities based on this factor going forward (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn).

As noted above, the Educational Leadership/EDL specialization reports reduced cycles of data due to a pause in admissions while the curriculum was significantly revised. However, like all other specializations, it underwent the same state approval process

as all other areas of specialization in the EPP and maintains approval by ND ESPB to offer degrees for licensure in the state (#18 Adv ESPB).

A.1.2 Provider Responsibilities

In accordance with state approval requirements, this EPP successfully completed a State Approval Review. As part of this recent review by ND ESPB, copies of syllabi for all required courses for degree completion were included and linked within the ESPB self-study reports for review as part of that process. Syllabi review further documented through that process demonstrated all applicable standards were addressed in coursework, while assessment measures both specific to areas of study and common across the entire EPP unit demonstrated sufficient candidate performance and preparation. Content experts and the Director of ESPB reviewed the ESPB self-study reports and determined this EPP "met," on a scale of "met, met with weakness, or did not meet" state requirements/standards. This EPP received a rating of "met" in all areas across all specializations. This state approval process ensures graduates can be licensed and credentialed in the state of ND and is the first step in preparation for the CAEP SSR. It also demonstrates that the EPP prepares candidates in accordance with all applicable state standards, including specialization specific standards (#18 Adv ESPB).

Evidence provided in the state reports documented candidate understanding and application of accessible and meaningful learning opportunities to ensure content proficiency (#18 Adv ESPB). Course sequencing is determined by specialization area based on professional standards associated with discipline specific and ESPB/state standards. Uniformly, there is a developmental sequencing and gradual release of responsibility in all coursework, across all areas of specialization. As demonstrated in ESPB self-study reports, curriculum is aligned to state and professional standards specific to the area of specialization as well as CAEP standards. Specialization area alignments/curriculum mapping are completed and updated by faculty within the coordinating specialization area to ensure that all applicable content standards are addressed/taught in courses. This demonstrates candidates are provided with the information needed to understand critical concepts and principles for their specialized field of study documented through the state approval processes.

Specialization specific data demonstrating candidate knowledge of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline specific content are presented in the ND ESPB Reports (#18 Adv ESPB). Syllabi were reviewed through the process. Data were presented and analyzed to document content specific pedagogy with the analyses reviewed by the reviewers. The EPP "met" the requirements in demonstrating these tenets on a scale of met, met with weakness, and does not meet. Each specialization area used exemplars specific to the specialization to demonstrate proficiency in the materials and principles of practice.

Through the state approval process, the EPP was examined to ensure it addresses diversity and equity in content knowledge as it pertains to the area of specialization. As practicing professionals working in P12 schools seeking advanced degrees, the diversity of P12 student experiences is limited by the location of candidates' current employment. Course materials address equity, diversity, and inclusion as they are embedded throughout coursework and through interactions between candidates and

faculty as a core value of the EPP. The evidence reviewed through that process demonstrates both covering/teaching and assessing each standard. These are delineated within the ESPB reports previously evaluated in preparation for this SSR.

While candidates are challenged within coursework throughout their program of study to engage in self-reflection and action planning in addressing diversity and equity, this is formally evaluated EPP-wide using the two Disposition Assessments, the Research Project Assessment, and the Clinical Experience Portfolio Assessment (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #20 Adv Resrch Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt). In each of these common key assessments, some element of evaluation of this construct is evaluated by EPP faculty working within the aligned specialization area. Specific questions relating to this construct include: Draw conclusions from your findings on improving educational outcomes for diverse populations (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt); Diversity: Interpretations/conclusions enhance the learning and development opportunities for all P12 learners (#21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt, Clinical Experience Portfolio Rubric, A.1.c Employment of data analysis to develop supportive school environments), and multiple questions within the twice administered Disposition Assessments (refer to rubric under headings: Professional Competence, Responsibility to Students, and Responsibility to School Community). These can be reviewed in the Technical Packets referenced above. In review of the data on these three assessments, there are no apparent areas of need where candidates are not performing at the "meets" rating level or higher on average (#23 Adv Disp Data; #24 Adv Resrch Data; #25 Adv ClinExp Data). All candidates are expected to attain a minimum of "progressing toward standard" in all areas, with the majority of ratings falling in the "meets standard" level of competency on each measure for each assessment used by the EPP. Those who are not meeting expectations or performing below this level of competency are provided support by faculty and/or their advisor. This provides further evidence of the EPP addressing this component in the preparation of candidates engaging in effective practice with diverse P12 students.

Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)

- ☐ CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- ☐ CAEP Evidence Review of Standard R.1/R.A.1
- ☑ State Program Review (State-selected Standards)

Upload State Program Reports below

ESPB Reports2022..pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Upload other National Accreditation Agency Documentation below (e.g. NASM, CACREP, NASAD)

Standard R.2: Clinical Partnership and Practice (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.)

1	#2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf	R2.3 Clinical Experiences
2	#5 STOT Tech Pkt.docx	R2.2 Clinical Educators R2.3 Clinical Experiences
3	#6 TWS Tech Pkt.docx	R2.3 Clinical Experiences
4	#9 TWS Data.docx	R2.2 Clinical Educators R2.3 Clinical Experiences
5	#10 STOT Data.docx	R2.2 Clinical Educators
6	#12 Init Prgms Handbks.pdf	R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.3 Clinical Experiences
7	#13 Init ESPB.pdf	R2.3 Clinical Experiences
8	#14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt.docx	R2.3 Clinical Experiences
9	#15 Init Disp Data.pdf	R2.2 Clinical Educators
10	#26 Feedback Survey.pdf	R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.2 Clinical Educators
11	#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf	R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.3 Clinical Experiences
12	#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt.pdf	R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.2 Clinical Educators

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

13 #29 SprvsrCoff Tech Pkt.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

14 #30 CoopTchr Roles.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

15 #31 Elem Data Rtrt.docx

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

16 #32 Aff Agrmts.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

17 #33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

18 #34 Exit Surv Data.xlsx

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

19 #35 FE CT Vol Survey.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

20 #36 ST Early Obs Rpt.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

21 #37 SprvsrRole Expctns.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

22 #38 TEAM FE Coord.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

23 #39 All Progs Lssn Plans.xlsx

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

2 #40 SPED Internships.pdf

4 R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

25 #41 Univ Sprvsr Qual.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

26 #42 Transition R2.3.docx

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

27 #43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

28 #44 Syllabi.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

29 #45 Fld Plcmnt Collab.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators

30 #46 Orientation Mdls.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

31 #49 ST Handbook.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

32 #53 Action Plans.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

33 #56 Conceptual Frmwk.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

34 #63 TE Progression.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

35 #85 SPED Alt Clin Exp.docx

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard 2- Initial

The EPP works collaboratively with P12 clinical partners towards the common goal of preparing highly effective teachers. Clinical practice takes the form of interactive classroom observation, field experience, practicum, student teaching, and internships across all EPP programs and using various modalities. A table of all field experiences within the program, leading up to student teaching, can be found in the EPP's Teacher Education Handbook (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, pp. 9-10).

R2.1
The Office of Teacher Education (OTE) is the main liaison between candidates, clinical educators, and other stakeholders for clinical placements. The OTE uses the guidelines provided in state licensing requirements and in Affiliation Agreements in coordination with faculty to ensure all clinical experiences meet the depth and breadth of course requirements. In collaboration with P12 classroom teachers and administrators, the EPP develops objectives for field experiences, establishes key assessments to measure candidate progress throughout courses, and determines roles of P12 partners in approving hours and completing applicable key assessments.

The EPP formally documents P12 partnerships (#32 Aff Agrmts). The EPP has established and maintained mutually beneficial partnerships with 240 school districts in 25 states. Affiliation Agreements are developed collaboratively with P12 partners to establish mutually agreeable and legally binding expectations for teacher candidates, the OTE, and P12 partners. An example of shared responsibility during clinical experiences includes: "The University and the School Agree: To collaborate in identifying specific experience objectives, the student assignments, and learning activities for each student placed in the school," (#32 Aff Agrmts, p. 12). Affiliation Agreements are required for all sites that have shown interest in hosting an undergraduate teacher candidate for field experience hours, and student teaching experiences. They are not always required in graduate internships. Many undergraduate candidates are placed in Grand Forks Public Schools (GFPS) for clinical experiences. At the graduate level, the EPP partners with ND Dept of Public Instruction for the Special Education Resident Teacher Program (SERTP) in preparing future special education teachers. Those candidates that are not in the resident teacher program often use their own place of employment for placements where they are employed as paraprofessionals or as having a "plan on file" with the state licensing entity.

Teacher candidates enrolled in courses requiring placements in P12 schools work with the Field Placement Coordinator (FPC) to consider personal circumstances for their school placement (e.g., current employment, transportation, availability, disabilities). An example of the information collected to begin the process is provided (#38 TEAM FE Coord). The FPC follows up with candidates in making placements, generally through email or phone calls (#45 Fld Plcmnt Collab, p. 3).

Teacher Talk and Teacher & School Professionals Education Committee (TSPEC) are two ways co-construction is shared and supported between internal and external stakeholders. Through discussion, all stakeholders collaborate to identify potential gaps (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, pp. 11-20; #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, pp. 14-15). As a

result, revisions to Teacher Education admission requirements went into effect Fall 2021. The EPP's clinical partners eagerly invest time and knowledge to enhance continuous improvement. By aiding in identifying gaps in coursework and field experiences, P12 partners assist in better preparing candidates. As an example, during a recent Teacher Talk, P12 identified a need for increased focus on classroom management, use of data-based decision making, and increasing differentiation prior to Capstone Field Experiences (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, pp. 18 -19). Based on collaborative discussions, the EPP temporarily moved the Praxis CORE exam requirement from admissions to a later point in the program (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 11; #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, p, 11). Another example of a mutually discussed change resulted in removing the Volunteering in Teaching and Learning (VITAL) requirement (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, pp. 7-8).

Partners are active participants in the on-going, collaborative, continuous improvement process. During TSPEC and Teacher Talk, data is reviewed, input sought, and ideas are shared by both groups of stakeholders. This is achieved through: semi-annual TSPEC meetings consisting of representatives from both initial and advanced programs, and through the cooperating teacher and supervisor feedback surveys (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, p. 1; #26 Feedback Survey). The EPP facilitates discussion around the data received as each group (P12 clinical educators and EPP clinical educators) provide feedback to one another (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, pp. 6- 7). The EPP analyzes Exit Survey data on completers (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 18) and facilitates discussion with stakeholders to identify areas for continuous improvement. Exit Survey data is provided (#33 Exit Surv tech Pkt; #34 Exit Surv Data). Throughout the semester, the Director of Teacher Education and the FPC engage in informal conversations with P12 stakeholders (#45 Fld Plcmnt Collab).

The EPP and stakeholders collaborate to support clinical educators in demonstrating a positive impact on candidates' development, and ultimately on P12 student learning and development. The partnership facilitates meaningful and mutually beneficial experiences that are purposeful, coherent, and data-informed. Through ongoing conversations (phone calls and emails) with P12 partners, paraprofessional and substitute teacher shortages were illuminated (#45 Fld Plcmnt Collab, pp. 2, 5, 13). This led to important changes (in conjunction with our stakeholder groups) in field experience arrangements enabling candidates' accrual of field experience hours through employment as paraprofessionals and/or substitute teachers. The EPP and P12 partners frequently work to develop creative solutions to facilitate mutually beneficial experiences.

Benefits to the EPP and candidates include opportunities for data collection and research, program evaluation with input from stakeholders, rich experiences for candidates to observe different types of effective teaching as they put theory to practice, exposure to different modes of field experience both online and face-to-face, opportunities for candidates to have experiences providing academic support, enrichment activities, and social-emotional learning activities to P12 students. Some graduate candidates, not already employed in schools, are eligible to get a teaching contract as a "plan on file special educator" through ND ESPB, filling special education teacher shortages (#85 SPED Alt Clin Exp).

P12 students, educators, and administration benefit from the EPP's partnerships through additional classroom support and gaining access to student teachers and recent graduates as a "pipeline" to fill vacancies. The EPP sends out announcements to candidates upon receiving phone calls, emails, and letters with education job vacancies. Candidates help fill needs in the state through mentoring and tutoring roles both face-to-face and online and substitute teaching. Finally, stipends are awarded to P12 teachers for hosting undergraduate student teachers.

R2.2
The EPP follows state regulations for clinical educators: requiring at least three years of teaching experience, one year of teaching within their current role, appropriate certification, and principal recommendation. The FPC sends out a survey to over 700 P12 teachers in a 60-mile radius of Grand Forks to ask for volunteers to host candidates for various field experiences and student teaching placements (#35 FE CT Vol Survey). Any placements made outside of this are coordinated on a case-by-case basis. When P12 teachers express interest in hosting candidates, the following information informs placements: identification of years of teaching along with interest in hosting. Then, the FPC creates a grid of the P12 teachers from each school and sends that grid to the building administrator for discussion (#45 Fld Plcmnt Collab, pp. 17-18). Together, the FPC and P12 building principals determine which teachers in their buildings demonstrate readiness and the best fit in mentoring candidates (#45 Fld Plcmnt Collab, pp. 11-15). The EPP and P12 partners identify effective teachers as having the following: receives positive evaluations from their principals, are confident in the grade levels and content areas they are currently teaching, and demonstrate readiness to provide mentoring.

The EPP works collaboratively with P12 partners to ensure high quality clinical education teams who work together to design varied and developmental clinical experiences. Each team consists of a P12 teacher, university supervisor, and/or course instructor who all work collaboratively to support candidates. To ensure clinical educators are prepared for their role and responsibilities in working with candidates, we have three main strategies. They include communicating the roles and responsibilities of P12 teachers, University Supervisors Handbook, and the Cooperating Teacher and Student Teaching Supervisor online training models (#30 CoopTchr Roles; #37 SprvsRole Expctns, 21-22). The training modules were co-constructed during a Teacher Talk session on November 19, 2019 (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 9). Anyone completing the modules is invited to complete the feedback survey further supporting continuous improvements (#46 Orientation Mdls). Clinical educators (both EPP and P12) review the roles and responsibility handbooks, student teaching handbook, and online training modules prior to the start of the semester (#49 ST Handbook). The EPP sends out access to a Blackboard Community Site that is shared with all P12 and university clinical educators prior to the start of the semester. This site has a wide variety of materials including: the training modules explained above, timelines for progressions of responsibilities across the semester, lesson plan templates, co-teaching resources, copies of the four student teaching evaluations that are completed on candidates, and sample letters of recommendation for candidates. Clinical educators (P12 teachers and university supervisors) are also required to complete the STOT interrater reliability training, prior to using the STOT to evaluate candidates (#5 STOT Tech Pkt). The STOT is an observation-based

assessment validated and adopted by the state.

The P12 clinical educators are typically classroom teachers in public or private schools, but may also be special education teachers, certified teachers in childcare centers, or other school-based personnel. During most field experiences early in the program, candidates are paired with a P12 classroom teacher by certification/grade area, with diversity of placements being a priority. Also considered are candidates' interests, daily schedule, and opportunities for the application of course content and strategies. Faculty/course instructors oversee the development and continuous improvement of clinical experiences in courses from the first field experience, all the way up until the semester prior to the Capstone Field Experience. For the final student teaching/internship, candidates must be placed in classrooms in the exact grade level and content area required for licensure. During the student teaching and internship experiences, candidates are supervised by university supervisors who work alongside the P12 clinical educators who supervise and mentor candidates throughout the semester (#41 Univ Sprvsr Qual; #30 CoopTchr Roles, pp 5-7; #37 SprvsRole Expctns, pp 4-7; S#40 SPED Internships, pp 2-4).

Candidates are well prepared for the teaching profession and demonstrate a positive impact on P12 learning and development as evidenced through assessments in the capstone experience (#15 Init Disp Data, #10 STOT Data; #9 TWS Data). Data reveals most candidates scored in the "Meets Expectations" category or above for almost every component on the Level 4 Disposition, STOT, and TWS. The scores and feedback are especially powerful since there are ratings from all Clinical Educators, including P12 partners.

The EPP collaborates with stakeholders to develop, review, and revise support to clinical educators. The EPP and P12 partners collaborate on the evaluation of clinical educators. The data from both the Exit Surveys completed by candidates at graduation, along with the feedback surveys completed by both clinical educators, are shared at Teacher Talk and TSPEC meetings for continuous improvement efforts and retention of clinical educators (#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt; #34 Exit Surv Data; #26 Feedback Survey). Information shared through Teacher Talk and TSPEC meetings have all identifying information removed. The Director is the only one who sees the surveys and addresses concerns discreetly.

Teacher Talk is another way the EPP collaborates with P12 partners to develop, review, and revise support for clinical educators (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 1). Teacher Talk provides a space for current P12 partners and university supervisors to talk about strengths and weaknesses of the student teaching experience facilitating continuous improvement. Evidence on teacher candidate enrollment data, performance data, and reflective feedback is analyzed. Surveys used were co-constructed to evaluate both roles and ensure retention of cooperating teachers and supervisors, including remediation when necessary (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 4 & 5). Not only is feedback between clinical educators reciprocal, but candidates also provide feedback on the clinical educators during the Exit Survey (#26 Feedback Survey; #33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt, pp. 16-20; #34 Exit Surv Data, Sheet: Student Teaching). Results are analyzed by the EPP and shared with external stakeholders to assist with continuous improvement in making a positive impact on candidates'

development (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 18).

The EPP prepares and supports high-quality clinical educators through ongoing dialogue between P12 teachers and university supervisors. An example that resulted from Teacher Talk on 11/19/19 resulted in the identification of key points that should be included when designing orientation trainings, as well as the frequency with which it should be completed (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 9; #46 Orientation Mdls). Stakeholders are now alerted a few weeks before each Teacher Talk to solicit agenda items for discussion. After each Teacher Talk, attendees complete a feedback survey to provide strengths, weaknesses, and ideas for future agenda items. Examples of feedback surveys following Teacher Talks are provided (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, pp. 22-24). This collaboration space has also been a place where stakeholders are able to co-select new university supervisors. Often, administrators and teachers nearing retirement are sought for this role due to their expertise.

The EPP further facilitates opportunities to support high-quality clinical educators at the university level through Supervisor Coffee. Co-constructed agendas may be developed ahead of time or may be more informal, depending on the needs at the time. This may include troubleshooting issues or celebrating successes, identifying and co-selecting new university supervisors as needed (#29 SprvsrCoff Tech Pkt).

The EPP defines equity, diversity, and inclusion in relation to professional responsibility through our college Diversity and Inclusion Statement: To create a safe, welcoming, and inclusive learning and work environment, the College of Education and Human Development focuses on fostering greater diversity, equity, inclusion and accountability. The college embraces a culture of inclusion where all individuals feel respected, are treated fairly, provided work-life and school-life balance, and have an opportunity to excel in their chosen fields. These efforts will be intentionally integrated into the goal and efforts of the College. This statement can be found posted throughout the college, on websites, and in syllabi, for ongoing reference for all students, staff, and faculty as they engage in learning experiences throughout our program (#56 Conceptual Frmwk; #44 Syllabi, p. 3 & 30).

R2.3
The EPP works with both internal and external stakeholders to design and implement clinical experiences of various modalities, of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity coherence, and duration. Prior to student teaching, candidates accrue over 100 hours of guided, hands-on field experience opportunities as they apply the principles, theories, and teaching strategies from their courses while they continuously reflect on their own effectiveness on P12 student learning and development. Each field experience builds upon the last. At the very start of the undergraduate program, candidates engage in exploratory observations in a P12 classroom in TL250, Intro to Education. Then, candidates move into introductory experiences of lesson planning and student support, progressing all the way through methods, where candidates are engaged in increased duties for teaching assessment, and management (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, pp. 9 & 10; #63 TE Progression). Specific objectives of each field experience are stated in course syllabi (#44 Syllabi, pp. 45-54, 55-67).

At the Undergraduate level, candidates are placed in a variety of grade level and

content area classrooms to provide them exposure to different modalities of teaching. In SPED, candidate field experiences are embedded in coursework leading up the Capstone Experience/Internship in accordance with ND ESPB requirements for field experiences for future Special Educators (#63 TE Progression; #13 Init ESPB, SPED MEd). Faculty implement opportunities for candidates to practice face-to-face teaching, technology-enhanced online or hybrid teaching, individual, and group instruction opportunities to prepare them for a range of future teaching experiences (#44 Syllabi, pp. 8-9: River of Dreams Unit Plan, Peer Teaching Lesson Plan, and Reading Lesson #2, p. 71 technology integration within lesson plans, p. 72 Microteaching).

The length of candidate capstone experiences spans a full semester (16 weeks), which exceeds the state requirement of 10 weeks. This decision was determined through stakeholder input including research of other state requirements across the nation (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 8).

Using the Watermark online assessment system, all placements are tracked and monitored by the EPP. The placement information can then be accessed in the future to confirm experiences when graduates apply for teaching licenses. Placement details include the academic program, current course(s) with a key assessment, school placement addresses, and all applicable names and contact information. Reports on candidates can be generated to track the scope and sequence of experiences and the associated outcomes. The new Placement Management System in Watermark, which is connected to the National Center for Educational Statistics database, can be used to generate reports on the diversity of placements for teacher candidates beginning with Spring 2022 semester. This database is updated yearly and includes demographic details and Title 1 status of each school. This continuous improvement effort will result in increasingly diverse placements (#42 Transition R2.3).

Presently, the EPP actively seeks out and monitors diverse placements in terms of school context (e.g., urban v. rural), race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, and (dis)ability), but this is anticipated to further enhance the diversity of placements. Clinical placements are intended to purposefully provide exposure to a wide range of students, families, and communities. Even though schools in ND are predominately ethnically homogeneous, the EPP works diligently to provide a variety of placements in multiple school settings. Evidence sampling the diversity of P12 placements for clinical experiences is provided (#43 Diverse clin Plcmnts). The most frequent examples of diversity relate to socioeconomic status, as evidenced through percentage rates of free and reduced lunches, Title I resources, and ELL Programs.

As evidenced in the Exit Survey, most candidates endorsed statements that their clinical experiences have effectively prepared them to teach P12 students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities and to differentiate to meet the needs of all students coming from various backgrounds and ability levels (#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt; #34 Exit Surv Data, Sheet: Prep for Teaching). Multiple field experience opportunities embedded in coursework and in early to mid-program field work contribute to candidate knowledge of diversity, equity, and inclusion issues and their readiness to use that knowledge in teaching situations (#44 Syllabi, pp. 60-62).

The EPP collaborates with clinical partners to design and implement clinical experiences to ensure candidates effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Throughout the clinical experience, candidates are assessed using performance-based criteria using disposition assessments, scheduled evaluations, and ongoing dialogue. To ensure clinical experiences are being implemented as described in syllabi, the EPP documents clinical experience outcomes and review these data at the program level to identify any possible areas for improvement (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans). In addition, input from cooperating teachers, EPP faculty, and University supervisors indicate that the overwhelming majority of candidates meet the standards and expectations of capstone field experiences. However, there are still some areas where faculty or stakeholders help identify room for improvement. Through collaborative work at the Spring 2021 Assessment Retreat, elementary faculty reviewed data on the Lesson Plan Key Assessment and noticed that elementary TEAM teacher candidates could improve on their ability to make modifications for EL students and at incorporating modifications for EL students (#39 All Progs Lssn Plans). These were two areas where faculty set goals to change the guidelines teacher candidates would follow when developing lessons, and analyzing their K-6 students' assessment data during clinical experiences (#31 Elem Data Rtrt).

Clinical educators (both P12 and EPP) monitor and support candidate progression through multiple means and are a vital component in helping to evaluate the proficiency of teacher candidates. This is accomplished through a series of performance-based assessments: Dispositions 1-4 and the STOT (#14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt). In beginning field experience opportunities, the P12 clinical educators provide feedback on dispositional items (Level 1 Disposition). Faculty complete the Level 2 Disposition on candidates during a specified course early in the course sequence. During the methods semester, cooperating teachers work with candidates on developing a series of lesson plans and then ultimately the cooperating teacher provides feedback on the candidates' performance using the Level 3 Disposition at the Undergraduate level. Level 3 disposition is not completed with Special Education candidates. Finally, throughout the student teaching and internship experiences, both P12 and EPP Clinical Educators support and evaluate proficiency throughout the semester using the four student teaching evaluations (#5 STOT Tech Pkt, Early Obs Report, & Final Evaluation; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt: Level 4 Disposition p. 27). Throughout each clinical experience, faculty, in conjunction with clinical partners, share accountability for candidate outcomes and for monitoring their progress (#30 CoopTchr Roles, pp. 5-7; #37 SprvsrRole Expctns, pp. 4-7; #40 SPED Internships, pp. 2-4).

To demonstrate and monitor candidate progression during capstone clinical experiences, candidates complete daily lesson plans, weekly reflections, and are formally evaluated at strategic points throughout the semester. Candidates also construct a Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (#6 TWS Tech Pkt) which requires them to design 4-6 lessons while considering technology implementation, the diverse needs and ability levels of students and several other components. Prior to Fall 2021, the lesson plan requirement was 8-10 but was changed after ongoing conversations with both internal and external stakeholders (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt, p. 20; #27 TSPEC

Tech Pkt, p. 15). The candidates teach the lessons during their final weeks of student teaching. They provide pre- and post- assessments for their P12 students and collect data to construct an in-depth analysis of learning. Data demonstrates candidates are positively impacting P12 learner outcomes (#9 TWS Data). All candidates enrolled in each program area (early childhood, elementary, middle level, English, math, science, social studies, art, music, PE, SPED) scored in the "meets" or "exceeds" category for the component of: "Demonstrates the skills necessary to have a positive impact on all students learning/development." Finally, candidates produce a reflection of the entire experience before submitting their TWS in Watermark (#6 TWS Tech Pkt, p. 18).

There are slightly different expectations at the undergraduate and graduate initial licensure levels relative to student teaching or internship experiences. At both levels, candidates plan and lead instruction and demonstrate the core skills needed for their specific content area or grade level. However, evaluations and key assessments are a bit different for graduate SPED initial programs (#40 SPED Internships). Candidates complete exemplars critical to the profession with many already employed within a school setting as paraprofessionals or having a "plan on file" (#44 Syllabi, pp. 78-87; #85 SPED Alt Clin Exp). SPED candidates demonstrate proficiency in conducting a Functional Behavioral Assessment, developing and implementing a Behavior Intervention Plan, writing up and presenting a comprehensive Assessment Report, and leading (or co-leading) an Individualized Education Plan meeting in addition to the TWS (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, pp. 61-62). The onsite supervisors/mentors (P12 Clinical Educators) are the ones who observe and complete the evaluations for the candidate, while the EPP Clinical supervisors provide day to day guidance and complete one/final STOT and Disposition 4. Reflective journals demonstrate implementation of Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards, which are those adopted by the State licensure board. At the completion of their internship experience, SPED candidates still complete the same Exit Survey as all undergraduate majors which helps with continuous improvement efforts (#34 Exit Surv Data, scroll all the way down on each sheet to see SPED initial).

Standard R.A.2. Clinical Partnership and Practice (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

2 #18 Adv ESPB.pdf

RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

3 #19 Adv Assmt Plan.xlsx

RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

4 #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt.docx

	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
5	#21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt.docx
	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
6	#23 Adv Disp Data.xlsx
	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
7	#24 Adv Resrch Data.xlsx
	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
8	#25 Adv ClinExp Data.xlsx
	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
9	#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
10	#32 Aff Agrmts.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
11	#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt
	RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
12	#43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation RA2.2 Clinical Experiences
13	#47 Faculty State Comm.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
14	#48 SPED RTP.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
15	#50 PhaseIn A2.1.docx
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
16	#51 Adv Std Hndbks.pdf
	RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

R2 Advanced Programs

RA 2.1
The EPP establishes and maintains partnerships with schools and school districts, as

well
as other appropriate organizations to positively impact advanced specialization candidates and P12 school partners (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, Sheet 3: Demonstration of Clinical Partnerships beyond EPP wide TSPEC).

The EPP's advanced specializations include Educational Leadership (EDL), School Counseling, Special Education (SPED), Reading and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) (#51 Adv Std Hndbks).

To document partnerships, some of the EPP advanced standards programs use Memoranda of Understandings (MOU), some use Affiliation Agreements (AA), and others use customized letters from P12 administrators documenting the support of candidates' placement in the site for the capstone clinical experience/internship. Due to the nature of advanced standards EPP programs, candidates are usually working in the schools in which they complete their clinical experiences and internships, thereby reducing the need for MOUs and AAs that are commonly required in initial programs. The exception is School Counseling, which requires video review of P12 student sessions, necessitating the need for more formal agreements.

Due to the nature of requirements for School Counselors, formalized legal agreements for the School Counseling specialization are required. This has resulted in the specialization having a designated Field Placement Coordinator. As a national program, candidates seek out internship placements where they live, initiating contact with school sites to explain the process required for the internship. The process includes a program orientation, group advising, and disclosure statements. Sample Affiliation Agreements are provided (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 15-17). Candidates self-select and/or apply to internship placements in their local geographical areas and initiate the process of getting their Internship Affiliation Paperwork completed. Affiliation Agreements are completed in conjunction with school administrators and clinical educators (supervisor) for the placements and the EPP. Throughout this process, the School Counseling Field Placement Coordinator assists and supports candidates, consulting as needed with local school staff. Sample language is provided for school districts that require a separate and more detailed affiliation agreement form (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 18-25).

Candidates within SPED typically use their current role within a P12 school as their placement with a memo of support from their administrator identifying an onsite mentor (clinical educator) for the intern. Most find their own placements within the school in which they are currently employed. When needed, Affiliation Agreements are used to establish and maintain partnerships with P12 schools and districts and are drafted by the EPP's Office of Teacher Education. A sample is provided (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 33-35). As candidates in Advanced programs, candidates are already licensed educators, but are earning an advanced degree for additional expertise and/or additional credentials or endorsements. Interns must apply for an internship through a formalized process and at the beginning of the internship, candidates complete a form providing key information (setting, schedule, contact information, supervisor contact information), prompting the instructor to send out a collaboration email at the beginning of the course. Syllabi and Guidelines documents are shared with the clinical educator and candidate from the start.

Most Reading specialization candidates are classroom teachers who complete clinical experiences within their own classroom. Those who are not in a classroom that fits the needs of the clinical experience typically work with their current administrator to match them up with an onsite mentor who can provide support in completing the requisite demonstrators of the experience in another classroom. Those who are not in a school that accommodate the needs of the candidate, initiate contact with a neighboring administrator to identify an onsite mentor and gain entry through a memo of support or Affiliation Agreements (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 28-32).

Candidates within the TESOL specialization typically find their own placements for the practicum experience. This does not pose an issue as most candidates complete the requirements within their current teaching setting. If a candidate has difficulty finding a placement, the instructor helps the candidate find one. At the beginning of the practicum, candidates complete a pre-practicum form that includes the practicum information (setting, schedule, focal student information, supervisor contact information), prompting the instructor to send out a collaboration email at the beginning of the course (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 26-27).

EDL candidates connect with local administrators to arrange partnerships for internships. The requirements for the mentor principal are shared through email correspondence (#51 Adv Std Hndbks). EDL faculty must also approve the mentor principal prior to the start of candidates' internships.

Within every specialization area, the internship instructor of record is available to problem solve with the candidate and if a candidate absolutely cannot locate a site, arrangements can be made to complete the clinical experience in ND where the EPP has well established relationships. To date, this has not been needed.

All P-12 school district specific practicum and internship Affiliation Agreement forms are reviewed, continually revised, and approved by EPP university legal counsel. By reviewing these agreements regularly, and having contact with whom schools connect and negotiate, we can ensure that clinical experiences are co-constructed and mutually beneficial experiences for all parties.

EPP faculty engage in state level committees and organizations by collaborating with stakeholders who impact policy, candidate preparation, and licensing (#47 Faculty State Comm). The EPP uses this data to impact program improvement at the EPP through reporting back to the Advanced Assessment Committee and specialization areas. It is beneficial to have faculty from the EPP engaged in important committee work across the state in preparing future educational leaders. These state level committees are comprised of Special Education Directors, State licensing leaders, Department of Public Instruction, Social Services, P12 teachers, School Counselors, and Principals, Superintendents, Legislators, Disability Advocacy groups, and parents of P12 students from across the state. Appointments to the state level committees are made by the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

P12 schools, community partners, and the EPP have all benefited from the partnerships within the advanced standards specialization areas. Many of the

candidates within the specializations are already employed in school districts and are continuing their education to become teacher leaders. This is beneficial for both the candidates and their school districts as it will result in more highly trained professionals serving P12 students. Lane changes resulting in increased pay scales for completers following completion of graduate degrees serve as further impetus. Candidates develop more depth in professional competencies, and in leading others in data-driven decision making within their current roles in P12 schools. Moreover, the EPP addresses the current teacher shortages by helping to fill vacancies and shortages within P12 schools. The EPP routinely sends job vacancy information through established list-serves and social media forums to candidates, informing them of openings shared by P12 schools.

The EPP prepares candidates regionally, across the state, and at a national and international level. This is a strength of the EPP in addressing the effective education of highly diverse P12 students. Even at the state and regional level, schools range from rural-urban to very remote. In the more "urban" parts of the state, there is great diversity based on socioeconomic factors and the prevalence rates of ELL students (#43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts). Because most candidates are already employed in a school and complete their clinical experiences through the course of their employment, the diversity of P12 students is highly correlated to the school and community in which they are already working. As referenced in the narrative for R2, the EPP anticipates having more data to analyze and disaggregate on the diversity of placements of candidates once the EPP has staff trained in on using the new Placement Management System in Watermark (#50 PhaseIn A2.1).

Syllabi guidelines are shared with candidates and onsite clinical educators at the beginning of the clinical experience. Handbooks detailing the expectations are provided for reference. The pages in the handbooks demonstrate expected roles for leading applicable instructional activities benefiting P12 students and the schools in which candidates are placed/employed
(#51 Adv Std Hndbks: EDL Student Handbook p.3-10, Reading Advanced Student Handbook, pp. 2-5, Reading, p. 28-31, School Counseling, pp. 15-17, SPED, internship guidelines pp. 29-41, & TESOL, pp. 26).

The EPP's clinical partnerships benefit P12 partners through a variety of ways, dependent upon area of specialization. School Counseling site supervisors (clinical educators) provide multiple evaluations of candidates and provide feedback to the program. The EPP uses a program, "Supervision Assist," for recording counseling sessions. This is a state (ESPB) requirement. As a function of the EPP's contract with Supervision Assist, all site supervisors have access to free Continuing Education webinars. The EPP has received extensive positive feedback from site supervisors due to this benefit to them, which is another way P12 clinical educators benefit from clinical partnerships. TESOL and SPED candidates provide technical, professional services in fields with well documented teacher shortages. Having candidates who have been professionally and academically trained to teach in these specialty areas enhances the quality of instruction at the site, which is mutually beneficial.

The Special Education Resident Teacher Program (SPED RTP) is a specialized program supported by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction whereby

candidates are provided intensive supervision, mentoring, and support while placed in clinical experiences throughout the entire program of study. These intensive support and collaborative efforts with administrators and teachers serve to further strengthen partnerships with P-12 schools for both Resident Teachers and those enrolled in the MS degree program only. This ongoing dialogue and collaboration with P12 administrators and teachers guide continuous improvement efforts in benefiting all stakeholders (#48 SPED RTP, pp. 4-5).

Above, the EPP provides evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P12 clinical experiences, preparation, and shared responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Collaborative partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions depending on the needs aligned with the specialization area.

The EPP leverages mechanisms and committees already in place across the state to co-construct candidate preparation and clinical experiences based on the feedback of multiple stakeholder groups represented on those committees. Much of the work occurs through interactions with others on legislatively established state-wide committees and advisory boards. Through service on regional and state advisory boards, the EPP faculty collaborate with stakeholders to learn about new strategies, practices, and trends occurring in P12 schools to further shape and plan for mutually beneficial clinical experiences for candidate preparation. These collaborations assist in identifying any gaps in knowledge, further shaping continuous improvement efforts (#47 Faculty State Comm).

Co-construction is evident from the beginning of clinical placements. Site-based clinical educators are provided the syllabi and guidelines at the beginning of each clinical experience and indicate the willingness to serve as an onsite mentor/supervisor/clinical educator before the candidate even applies for a clinical experience. Discussion between the candidate, the clinical educator, and the EPP identify a plan for demonstrating the requirements, dependent upon the specialization area employment status within the school. The EPP's P12 partners are also engaged in ongoing collaborations on a routine basis throughout the clinical experiences. Sometimes P12 partners have questions about why key assessments are being collected or what changes can be made to assignments to ensure they are mutually beneficial for everyone involved. When this occurs, it is managed through a phone or Zoom call to resolve any questions or concerns.

Further facilitating the co-construction process, the EPP includes a wide representation of the various specializations within advanced programs in TSPEC conversations (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, p. 1). The EPP currently has both internal and external stakeholders from advanced specialization areas and their P12 partner schools serving on this committee. During the Fall 2022 semester TSPEC meeting, EPP faculty will ask stakeholders for input on identifying potential committee members serving in the following roles to better represent advanced specialization collaborations: SPED Director in ND, P12 School Counselor, P12 ELL teacher, P12 Reading teacher. During TSPEC meetings, P12 stakeholders share what their needs are in, and EPP faculty take it back to specialization areas to support continuous improvements in candidate preparation (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, P12 SPED partner

contributions p. 10, School Counseling faculty discuss alternate practicum experiences p. 11).

School Counseling hosts informational meetings, where all practicum and internship site-supervisors are invited to attend; during which the requirements of practicum and/or internship are reviewed and there are opportunities for discussion. In addition to information dissemination, these meetings also serve as outreach and relationship building with P12 partners. The EPP has clear processes in place leading up to and throughout the clinical experiences (#51 Adv Std Hndbks, School Counseling Student Handbook, pp. 12-21).

The Educational Leadership (EDL) program partners with several school administrators from across the state for its annual, culminating assessment of all EDL Master's students. Students perform a variety of tasks relevant to school principalship, and the P12 administrators provide valuable one-on-one, expert feedback on candidate performance. This partnership ensures that candidates are prepared to apply for positions within the assessors' schools and assist and coach new principals in demonstrating quality leadership skills.

RA2.2
Candidates, in most cases, are already employed and licensed teachers, so varied and developmental clinical experiences are supported throughout coursework where they are provided guidance on key tasks relative to the requisite skills sets of their specialization area. The assignments are constructed as real-world applications of specialized content whereby candidates get formative feedback from content experts. There is a heavy reliance on self-reflection to further support candidates' professional growth.

Faculty representation from the various specializations on the TSPEC committee allows for another avenue by which the EPP's faculty collaborate with P12 partners to develop varied and developmental clinical experiences that foster candidate opportunities to practice and apply content knowledge and skills aligned to their specialization emphasizes (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt, p. 1).

The EPP was evaluated through the state approval process by ND ESPB, resulting in ratings of "met" across all areas of specialization on a scale of "met, met with weakness, and did not meet" (#18 Adv ESPB). The EPP has an established pattern of engaging in annual data during bi-annual assessment retreats, resulting in Action Plans. At that time, review of exit survey data completed by candidates following completion of the degree and capstone clinical experience is reviewed (#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt, pp. 16-21; #2 Assm Retreat Mins, see Spring 2021 Assessment Retreat).

As part of the state approval process, the EPP delineated field-based components and hours demonstrating the practical application of skills commensurate with an advanced degree (#18 Adv ESPB: Reports from EDL, SPED, Red, TESOL, and SC). Syllabi reviewed through this process documented sample assignments and opportunities for candidates to practice skills specific to their specialization area through field-based hours across the curriculum. Content experts for each specialization and the ESPB Executive Director reviewed this information to ensure

varied, developmental clinical experiences were planned, purposeful, and sequential.

Clinical (field and course-based) experiences enhance candidates' understanding of diversity and equity issues, demonstrating readiness to demonstrate the skills in employment situations. The way this occurs depends upon the specialization area. Candidates work with diverse P12 students during their clinical experiences as evidenced by the global focus of the EPP program and the dialogue that occurs throughout coursework. Within the state of ND, schools range from rural-urban to very remote. Within the most "urban" city in our rather homogeneous state, there is great diversity based on socioeconomic factors and the prevalence rates of ELL students (#43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts). Because candidates are already employed in a school and complete their clinical experiences through the course of their employment, the diversity of P12 students, along with candidate's exposure to understanding diversity and equity issues is highly correlated to the school and community in which they are already working. Through the Exit Survey at the point of graduation, the candidates provide feedback on their comfort level with understanding of diversity and equity issues and how prepared they are to navigate them (#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt, pp. 10-12).

Assignments within the advanced specialization courses are based on tasks that facilitate candidates' skill enhancement and deepening of their knowledge base. The result is highly qualified educational leaders in diverse P12 schools. In an effort for high-quality, embedded field-based components, practical application is built into many of the courses. For example, within the Reading program, candidates design, implement, and reflect on professional learning experiences ranging from classroom instructional activities, parent and school-level advocacy, assessment of literacy learning and development, and collegial coaching and leadership. These experiences have been carefully designed by faculty with particular attention to the research-based needs and recommendations from professional organizations, school partners, and accrediting bodies (#32 Aff Agrmts, pp. 28-32).

Candidates demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks and/or research, specific to their professional area within their clinical experiences. All candidates demonstrate their understanding of several types of research, how to employ a research design, and the ability to evaluate relevant research using the Research Project Key Assessment about halfway through their program of study (#24 Adv Resrch Data, Summary table of results, A.1.b; #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt). Specialization area faculty identified courses that would be most representative to demonstrate competencies related to problem-based tasks or research characteristics of each specialization for the Research Project Key Assessment (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, Sheet 2).

In addition to completing the required practicum hours, TESOL candidates are expected to complete field-oriented and problem-based tasks. The assignments within the TESOL specialization are interconnected and culminating and prove as ways these practicum experiences are mutually beneficial for everyone involved. For example, during their capstone practicum, candidates create their target EL students' profiles (e.g., family, language and cultural backgrounds, language skills, social skills), conduct a range of assessments to clearly identify their needs and strengths,

develop content-integrated language lessons that have both content and language objectives, reflect on their teaching practices and approaches as well as on their students' progress, write their teaching philosophy and reflection papers, and then create a portfolio with all of the assignments at the end.

Clinical experiences are effective in preparing candidates to engage in problem-based, culminating activities where they demonstrate their proficiencies identified in RA1.1 to improve school environments for P12 students. The Clinical Experience Portfolio is assessed in the capstone clinical experience and each specialization uses the evidence that is most applicable to their program area to complete this assessment (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, Sheet 2). Candidates are evaluated on their Portfolio using a common rubric (#21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt, Appendix A). Evidence is provided (#25 Adv ClinExp Data). Analysis of the data demonstrates that most candidates are scoring in the "Meets" or "Exceeds" category for RA1.1 components a, b, c, d, f, indicating they are demonstrating their proficiencies by the completion of their program.

The EPP's Disposition evaluations are also CAEP-aligned and are assessed twice: once early to mid-program and again at the end of the program. This assessment measures competencies, but also growth in the professional competencies, responsibility to the P12 student, responsibility to the school community, and responsibility to the external community (#19 Adv Assmt Plan, Sheet 2; #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt). Evidence is provided by mean scores and construct (#23 Adv Disp Data). Analysis of the data demonstrates that candidates, overall, show growth on these competencies from Disposition 1 to Disposition 2, across all specialization areas. This, combined with the other evidence demonstrates candidates are having a positive impact on the P12 school environments in which they work.

Standard R.3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

2 #4 LP Tech Pkt.docx

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

3 #5 STOT Tech Pkt.docx

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

4 #6 TWS Tech Pkt.docx

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

5 #8 LP Data.docx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

6 #9 TWS Data.docx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

7 #10 STOT Data.docx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

8 #11 Praxis Scores.docx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

9 #12 Init Prgms Handbks.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

10 #13 Init ESPB.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

11 #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt.docx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

12 #15 Init Disp Data.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

13 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment

14 #52 Init Assmt Plan.xlsx
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

15 #53 Action Plans.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

16 #54 Demographic Data.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment

17 #55 DEI.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment

18 #56 Conceptual Frmwk.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment	
19	#57 Recruit Goals.xlsx
R3.1 Recruitment	
20	#58 Admissions.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment	
21	#59 Teach Grant.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment	
22	#60 Recruitment.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment	
23	#61 Enrollment Data.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment	
24	#62 Retention.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	
25	#63 TE Progression.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	
26	#64 NCATE 2015.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	
27	#65 220 Disc w History.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	
28	#66 Policies.pdf
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	
29	#80 Admissions Total.xlsx
R3.1 Recruitment	
30	#84 Trans Rpt.pdf
R3.1 Recruitment	

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard R3 Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

3.1 Recruitment

Situated in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), the EPP programs span three colleges and 17 different departments offering undergraduate, master, and doctoral degrees for educators pursuing advanced study, including Educational Leadership. As the state's largest teacher education program, this EPP offers coursework leading to 28 different areas of teacher licensure or credentialing. Through a wide range of opportunities, candidates are provided real-world experiences in P-12 schools and classrooms, preparing them to teach and advocate for diverse learners.

Being familiar with North Dakota (ND) assists in understanding EPP context, teacher candidates, recruitment, and programs. As reported through census data, demographics of the state, university, and teacher educator program, the unit draws from a small instate population, with a large portion from Minnesota (30%). ND cities are considered rural with 50,000 as the marker for urban identification, leaving only three as urban. ND is estimated to be the most rural US state with over 90% of the land used for farming. Comparatively, CEHD has 135 men and 404 women representing 3.91% of the entire student population. Specific to the EPP, there are 61 males and 248 females. Race/ethnicity self-identification yields: 3 America Indian, 3 Asian, 13 Hispanic, and 278 White candidates with 5 indicating two or more races, and 5 declining disclosures (#54 Demographic Data).

The EPP currently disaggregates data by major for undergraduate programs; with plans to disaggregate further by other demographics to monitor for disparities and further support retention going forward. This demonstrates continuous improvement efforts. Aligned with the mission and vision, the EPP continues to expand current faculty demographics to reflect greater diversity through grants, recruitment, and hiring practices, with increased diversification since the last reporting cycle. Diversity reflected in EPP faculty is critical to attracting a diverse student body. Currently, self-identification includes a population of Asian faculty at 10.34%; Black/African American at 10.34% and a white population of 79.31% (#54 Demographic Data). In meeting the unique needs of Indigenous candidates in ND and SD, the EPP obtained a grant supporting Indigenous candidates in the Indigenous Language program. The CEHD seeks to recognize and respect Indigenous candidates through our Land Acknowledgement Statement that the university rests upon the ancestral lands of the Ojibwe and Dakota Oyate (#55 DEI). This linkage is evident in our Teacher and School Professionals Education Committee (TSPEC) partnership with the local school district as the Grand Forks Public School Indigenous Liaison serves as a TSPEC member (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt). Additionally, the Liaison recently completed the teacher education Indigenous Language program in the college, so they can bring in multiple perspectives within TSPEC conversations.

The EPP considers educators in three crucial and intersecting roles: Educators as Learners; Educators as Practitioners; and Educators as Advocates (#55 DEI; #56 Conceptual Frmwk). Additionally, the college Diversity statement posits a welcoming environment for all candidates while programs and the college take actionable behaviors to evidence the concept. As part of the mission, recruitment is grounded in Constructivist Deweyan perspective with candidate-centered, experiential, collaborative, and holistic education. This EPP set multiple goals toward admitting high quality candidates with a broad range of backgrounds and diverse population. These recruitment goals apply to undergraduate and graduate alike (#57 Recruit Goals). They include various modifications with objectives and a timeline: 1) increase

links to local/rural schools with EPP, faculty, staff, and administration evaluating the recruitment efforts of the Pilot Ambassador Program through and in conjunction with Admissions every 6 months (#58 Admissions); 2) increase collaboration with the Admissions Team and CEHD Administration, update and review communication, survey, and on-campus visits recruitment efforts yearly, including an analysis and critique of ideas and additional resources needed to reaching highly qualified, diverse candidates (#58 Admissions); 3) faculty will serve as program contacts on the institution website for graduate inquiries, and evaluate structures in place to encourage more participation in bi-monthly graduate events (#60 Recruitment); 4) generate more graduate focused correspondence and analyze for efficacy using feedback to prioritize more effective strategies for campus events (#60 Recruitment); 5) initiate steps in increasing collaborations with other institutions for transfer credits across the state and region, including identifying and supporting communication strategies with rural P12 Administrators to evaluate and respond to identified needs (#60 Recruitment); and 6) continue collaborative efforts with local school projects that support schools, teachers and professional development opportunities, including "anytime enrollment" course offerings. All recruitment goals link to Mission and Vision Statements highlighting collaboration, partnerships, and inquiry and advancing learning as realized from the conceptual framework undergirding the structure as an EPP (#60 Recruitment).

Routinely monitoring the employment landscape, this EPP reviews local and national forecasts for teacher demand; ND is higher than others for early childhood, elementary, and middle school teachers. As noted by the Federal Teach Grant-Eligible Programs, high-need fields include mathematics; science, including, but not limited to, computer science; foreign language; reading specialist; bilingual education; English language acquisition; special education; or any other field that has been identified as high-need in the annual year according to Department of Education. In addition, ND Licensing Board (ESPB) has declared all content areas as shortage areas (#59 Teach Grant). The demand for high school teachers is highest in math and science. Some completers find there are even more job opportunities if they are licensed or endorsed in two or more areas (i.e., Elementary and SPED). In partnership with the local P-12 school district through the Assistant Superintendents the JET (Junior Educator Training) Program and a Lab School are currently under development (#60 Recruitment). Important to filling the employment gap in ND, emphasis on the importance of quality educators and advanced education remains a priority. Collaborating to forecast, prepare, and provide more candidates with undergraduate degrees can not only meet our local, state, and regional demands, but also meet demands nationally.

Supporting recruitment strategies, the EPP identifies specific actions to increase enrollment as indicated in the EPP enrollment information. More than three cycles of data (2010 to 2021) are analyzed for longitudinal patterns (#61 Enrollment Data). Documenting, reviewing, and analyzing data relative to timelines and expected outcomes inform action planning for the upcoming academic year. Revisions based on progress made on admission goals and benchmarks remains an area for continuous improvement efforts. As noted above, the EPP allocates time and resources to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion in recruitment efforts for both candidates and faculty alike.

Initially, the EPP brought forth curriculum changes to address current educational trends and to appeal to candidate interest in online coursework in both Early

Childhood Education and Elementary Education. Through constructive and collaborative planning prior to implementation, enrollment has grown.
Secondly, collaborative efforts between Admissions, Marketing, and CEHD Leadership focus has resulted in recruitment efforts on gaining more undergraduates in the college. Through this collaboration, an untapped recruitment source was found, that being transfer students. The EPP now works more directly with community colleges to recruit transfer students through Affiliated Agreements. The university gathers data based upon applied students, admitted candidates, and enrolled candidates at the institutional level (#84 Transfer Report). Data can be disaggregated to illuminate trends longitudinally. Transfer candidates are facilitated by the University's Registrar's office as they work to eliminate barriers for candidates transferring into the university.
This is the third year the EPP has specifically worked with University Admissions to document progress with recruitment goals. They too have limited data relative to colleges (such as CEHD, where the EPP is housed) until now, as their previous consideration was for the university at large. Thus, the EPP has limited data, but as part collaboration with Admissions, there are dedicated efforts in obtaining sound measurements going forward. From Analytics and Planning, Admissions integrates the same theoretical model to set target numbers for recruitment in the college as for the university. With more data available, modifications and adjustments will continue as processes are refined and action plans ensue.
Each of these goals link to our mission/vision and conceptual framework undergirding our structure as an EPP. Reviewing and analyzing differences at the specific timeline intervals, provide strategy modifications and revisions of goals. Evidence of discussions, planning, analyzing, and modifying recruitment goals are generated by every specialization with sample provided (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans). With stakeholder investment, the EPP's recruitment goals consist of constructing, revising, and modifying when and where appropriate through processes driven by insight, action plans, and innovation as aligned with EPP Vision (#57 Recruit Goals). The remaining Recruitment Goals focus on 7) discovering more ways to support Faculty Outreach into schools; 8) being the difference without breaking the bank - new ideas with minimum cost are important to rural P-12 schools with limited resources; 9) broaden a listing of employment agencies - making connections in support of career employment for teacher candidates; and 10) create a strong stakeholder network with P-12 schools seeking support through related projects associated with social emotional expertise, mental health expertise, and other resources a University can provide through partnerships.
Through CEHD and the EPP's mission, vision, diversity/inclusion, and equity and justice statements, a strong educational foundation for innovative, collaborative, interactive, and experiential learning occurs in this institution. The EPP utilizes a multi-phase approach in recruiting highly qualified, diverse candidates from a broad range of backgrounds who are racially/ethnically diverse, Indigenous, rural, urban, and first-generation candidates. First, we focus our efforts on local P-12 schools and our ND rural P-12 schools. Through Admissions the EPP works through the pilot program, "Town Ambassadors." Candidates who graduated from a rural high school return to their former high schools to recruit for Teacher Education. This links past to future and fosters relationships between the EPP and towns across the state. North Dakota is holistically, a rural state with only a few "cities" of notable size and is considered "frontier urban." With P-12 students represented across ND, the EPP

defines "rural" as any area, housing, or population outside of an urban city (#54 Demographic Data). All cities and towns across ND have high need areas.
Second, in conjunction with the Admissions Office, we participate in Fall Open House and other "Open House" Saturdays where candidates/families visit campus, hear about UND, and visit their college of interest. Candidates/families tour CEHD and visit various classrooms where collaborative, experiential, and interactive learning are highlighted. Advisors talk specifically about programs, completing academic programs to align with career goals, and highlighting accelerated programs where candidates enter the program, and by third year apply for admission to the Graduate School where they graduate courses as they finish preparing to student teach. Accelerated programs have increased online and transfer candidate enrollment numbers over the last year (#61 Enrollment Data).
Third, this EPP deliberately seeks to provide rural and urban P-12 school districts with graduates to fill needed positions. Increased specialization numbers denote successful recruitment efforts across the state and region. Principals across the state often call and request information about completers as they seek to fill job openings. Recently, a Recruitment Fair for candidates and invited schools was held, where candidates had an opportunity to interview for jobs (#60 Recruitment).
Fourth, collaborative recruitment with UND Admissions Orientation and the combining of resources with other colleges have led to success as has participation in high school College Fairs (#60 Recruitment). Through collaboration with high school counselors, Admissions officers, and Advisors provide detailed information and overview about the EPP and University. These connections to Admissions Recruitment open doors with an eight-person team specifically working to recruit for CEHD when visiting with all new incoming first-year candidates. In Admissions, the EPP has one person designated to support recruiting efforts with a team of four admission specialists. Further, this EPP has four Professional Advisors, one of which is an Academic Core advisor supported by the Provost's Office. This has led to Advisor professional development; particularly new software and other tools used in supporting advisement.
Data/Feedback from Admissions Open House indicates candidates enjoy their visits to campus and with faculty. While the feedback includes all programs across campus, identification of a Kinesiology candidate's comments included how much the campus was enjoyed and how much the Student Ambassadors were helpful and welcoming. The EPP worked with Admissions to include specific education-oriented survey questions in Qualtrics to gain more EPP specific feedback, as linked to the recruitment goals (#60 Recruitment).
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
This EPP's candidate progression is traced through a 4-Phase process: 1) application and admission; 2) completing coursework up to Methods; 3) completion of Methods coursework; 4) capstone field experience/student teaching/internship. Even though the MEd in Special Education is a graduate program, it leads to initial licensure and uses different terms for the same processes (#63 TE Progression; #13 Init ESPB, MEd SPED Report; #52 Init Assmt Plan). During a Methods course term, more teacher education personnel review progress through, and up to, the Capstone Field Experience/Student teaching/Internship, including verification of Praxis requirements. During capstone experience, candidates spend many hours in a P-12 classroom with both a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor. Undergraduate candidates enter with a minimum 2.75 GPA and must maintain a 3.0 average in teacher

education coursework to remain in compliance with the program, with graduate candidates having similar requirements (#12 Init Prgms Handbks). Formative and summative feedback occurs throughout, supportive of direct access to personnel and faculty for ongoing support.

The progressing infrastructure identified in the Student Teaching Handbook provides the candidate with a clear understanding of expected development and performance. There are four levels of performance on each evaluation: Does not meet expectations" "Progressing Towards Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations. Scores of "progressing," "meets" and "exceeds" reflect acceptable performance levels. The only exception is the Final STOT where the candidate must demonstrate teaching ability at the "meets expectations" level or higher to receive an acceptable overall rating. If the candidate receives scores of "progressing" on an evaluation, they meet with the instructor or advisor to discuss how to improve performance. If a rating of "does not meet expectations" is received on any portion of an evaluation, the overall score is automatically identified as "unacceptable," and the candidate works with the advisor and/or the Director of Teacher Education on an improvement plan. Failure to demonstrate improvement or having a pattern of unacceptable evaluations impacts program progress and can result in not being allowed to progress to student teaching/internship or dismissal from the program.

Data are reflective across specializations. Except for the Praxis, the STOT, Lesson Plan, Teacher Work Sample, and Dispositions are based upon a Likert scale ranging from 1 through 4 with 4 being the highest (#5 STOT Tech Pkt; #4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt). All data reported include a range of lowest to highest scores. The STOT can be viewed as a competency assessment for all six areas and is designed to verify candidate progression from start to finish. Candidates are aware of their progress in each phase and are monitored and supported in their progression throughout the program. The EPP integrates the 6 highlighted areas into the teacher education progression to clearly indicate where and how each assessment is used to measure competencies and when they are administered (#63 TE Progression).

Criteria shared with candidates are highlighted here as there is a checkpoint during each phase of candidate progression (#63 TE Progression). The Dispositions were originally developed collaboratively using a consensus model to establish Content Validity in 2014 prior to the previous Self-Study (#64 NCATE 2015). The tool provides feedback to candidates in field experiences with supervisors, cooperating teachers or faculty and is not tied to grades. As there are 4 phases and dispositions, this provides opportunities for candidates to determine if Teacher Education is the correct career fit. Specifically with every Disposition (1-4), candidates are aware of their progress and as needed support is offered through faculty, advisors, and the Director of Teacher Education. Dispositions are identified as characteristics of a teacher's professionalism. This EPP notes Dispositions should include Professional Attitude (collaboration, values learning,) and Professional Ethics (#12 Init Prgms Handbks).

In the Introduction to Education course, or upon SPED admission, Disposition 1 is the first to be collected during the 30-hour field experience. Data indicates a range of scores from 2.33 (Progressing) to 4.0 (Exceeds) which is quite good (#14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt; #15 Init Disp Data).

Level 2: Disposition 2 data obtained through a course where faculty engage in generating candidate dispositional data indicates a range of 2.50 (progression +) to

4.0 (Exceeding). Attendance was noted several times across several programs as an area for improvement, but even within the second semester, data indicates an increase in candidate "knowing" of what it means to be a professional and scores were elevated.

Level 3: Disposition 3 data collected during the Methods Field Experience reveals a continued elevation in scores as candidates are progressing in understanding the importance of taking on the role of a teacher candidate. Across specializations, scores range 2.64 (Progressing) to 3.67 (Meets nearing Exceeds). Notably, one area challenging several programs was integrating innovative technologies.

Level 4: Final Disposition data collected during student teaching (or SPED Internship) through the university supervisor and the P-12 Clinical Educator/Cooperating teacher provides robust evidence of critical dispositions for the teacher candidate. Scores range from 2.25/2.67 to 4.0 across the programs. The lowest scores were across two programs (Middle/Secondary respectively) with all others scoring 3.00 and above.

The STOT, Lesson Plan (LP), and Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assessments provide clear indicators for the effective integration of Technology, Pedagogical Skills, and Professional Responsibilities. While the Lesson Plan data is collected during the Methods, the STOT specifically reflects competency data as does professional responsibilities recognized in the final student teaching (or SPED internship) semester (#5 STOT Tech Pkt; #4 LP Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #8 LP Data; #9 TWS Data; #10 STOT Data).

The STOT data indicates Middle Level candidates find teaching or linking global awareness a challenge with a score of 2.88 (progressing). The remaining scores range from 3.05 to 4.0 (meets to exceeds). It should be noted 2.88 (progressing) is near a score of "meets" and representative of an outlier in one of the 3 data sets. There are 2 larger candidate groups and one smaller group where the lower score emerged. Triangulating other pieces of data provides a holistic view of this unit.

The Lesson Plan data obtained during the Methods experience and prior to student teaching indicate candidate's score ranged from 2.33 progressing to 3.83 meets. Analyzing data, modifying lessons for English Language Learners, and integrating digital technologies were challenges noted in multiple programs. The Lesson Plan is one of the first and most important formative feedback pieces in the candidate's program. While candidates are integrating all the teaching components into their cognition, it is in the planning of teaching and learning that "withitness" begins to emerge. For some candidates it takes more time to hold the pieces conceptually together in understanding teaching and learning.

Regarding Lesson Plan validity, this tool was developed prior to the previous 2015 NCATE visit by the Initial Licensure Committee and analyzed for Content Validity using the Lawshe method to achieve high levels of agreement (#64 NCATE 2015). The Associate Dean of Assessment for the EPP explained the role of faculty as experts determining Content Validity. Adequate levels of Content Validity were determined as faculty in attendance were asked to make rankings of essential, useful but not essential, or not necessary for the revised Lesson Plan Assessment Rubric. Items with elevated levels of agreement were kept while those deemed "not necessary" were eliminated.

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) generated during student teaching (or SPED internship), offers more evidence of lesson planning to demonstrate developing pedagogical skills, professional responsibilities, and the integration of technology. Across specializations, scores range from 2.7 (progressing) to 3 (meets). The

integration of the ISTE standards and digital technology seems to be the only challenge candidates face in the lesson plans. As specialization areas address this in Actions Plans, increasing scores will be evident.

Candidates complete the Praxis II test, a proprietary assessment, to demonstrate competency and knowledge in pedagogical content and principles of learning and teaching. Three cycles of data, disaggregated by specialization, are provided (#11 Praxis Scores). Candidates score well on the Praxis II (content Praxis). While each discipline has a required raw score, all programs have passing scores for the Pedagogical Content knowledge found in the PLT; scores ranging from 75 to 100. Various programs in all 3 data sets include candidates who score 100 on the PLT. Coursework from the College of Arts and Sciences provides disciplines for candidates who then apply (GPA 2.75 minimum) to the education program. The first two years are grounded in a Liberal Arts foundation. Many associated professional colleagues in A&S and BPA took the Praxis Content test just to determine what adjustments needed to be made in their courses. Extended Faculty are invested in providing content that meets the candidate curriculum needs (#65 220 Disc w History).

During the Fall 2018 Assessment Retreat, Inter-Rater Reliability training was conducted with all faculty responsible for implementing the Lesson Plan assessment. There were two trials, with comparable results, with increased inter-rater reliability after discussion and a repeated trial (#2 Assm Retreat Mins).

In Spring and Fall 2020, a training video for faculty and extended faculty was produced and viewed by all those administering the Lesson Plan to increase Inter-Rater Reliability. The videos were uploaded to the EPP Assessment site. In March 2021, training on all key assessments was provided during the Annual Assessment Retreat to further improve consistency in implementation. The training video on this assessment was distributed and shared with clinical faculty in Spring 2021.

For this reporting cycle, the EPP disaggregated data based upon specialization areas. However, any candidate identified as needing assistance by an Advisor, Faculty/Instructors, Supervisors, and/or the Director of Teacher education automatically receives a communication (email/call/text) offering support and/or mentoring support. All advisors use Starfish and Degree Map as technological assistance to directly support candidates. Advisors and faculty can contact candidates directly in their account to address concerns, raise Kudo/Great Work flags, or make a referral for university support services. Candidates can also schedule with advisors using Starfish (#62 Retention).

This EPP has a defined academic grievance process and policy (#12 Init Prgms Handbks). The Grievance Policy exists to assure candidates of an orderly set of procedures when there is a possibility of prejudice, capricious evaluation, or other perceived unfair treatment on the part of members of the CEHD. According to the UND Code of Student Life, an academic grievance is "A statement expressing a complaint, resentment, or accusation lodged by a student about an academic circumstance (such as grading, testing, or quality of instruction) which is thought by the student to be unfair" (#66 Policies). Protecting candidates and faculty or staff members who might be involved, if a dispute arises which cannot be resolved through routine interactions, has an established due process procedure. The steps include: 1) Initial Meeting between the student and the faculty or staff member to try to resolve differences; 2) Second Level Meeting includes intervention by the department chair to assist the student and the faculty or staff member in arriving at a solution; 3) Formal Hearing where a CEHD Grievance Committee is convened to

hear both sides of the dispute and to decide on a solution to the problem; 4) Appeals beyond the College made to the Academic Standards Committee of the University.
Component R3.3 Competency at Completion
Data are disaggregated to assess candidate quality in teaching diverse P-12 students. Two assessments are used to monitor candidate quality at program completion: STOT and Disposition 4. Data is disaggregated by specialization areas with analysis of the past three cycles of data showing clear maturation points in the results (#5 STOT Tech Pkt; #10 STOT Data; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt; #15 Init Disp Data; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #9 TWS Data).
Candidates are monitored to ensure proficiency levels at completion in all the following areas: content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical skills, critical dispositions, professional responsibilities, and ability to integrate technology effectively. As stated above, end-of-program assessments include the STOT and TWS. These provide a comprehensive view of candidates' proficiencies as they are about to enter the teaching profession.
The STOT data indicate: ECE: 3.17-3.79 (Meets); ELEM: 3.06-3.60 (Meets); Middle: 2.88-4.0(Progressing to Exceeds); Secondary: 3.06-3.60(Meets); Special Education: 3.31-4.0(Meets to Exceeds); and K12 Specials: 3.11-3.88 (Meets). Without exception, scores indicate candidates are doing well and demonstrate competency at completion.
Additionally, in a review of the above specialization categories using Disposition assessments, the data clearly affirm candidate preparation in the critical dispositions. This is further substantiated when combined with data from the STOT, Lesson Plan, and TWS which all support affirmative findings for competency in Pedagogical Skills, Professional Responsibilities, and Integration of Technology. Lastly, the Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Content knowledge are supported through the Praxis II Content and Teaching and Principles of Teaching and Learning exam pass-rates.
EPP findings from triangulating data based upon recognized standards can support the claim of producing competent teachers. Results strongly indicate candidates are knowledgeable, skilled, demonstrate critical dispositions, are professional, and prepared to address the fundamentals of teaching in a diverse P-12 classroom.

Standard R.A.3 Candidate Quality and Selectivity (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #1 Disag Trans PhaseIn.docx

RA3.1 Recruitment

2 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

3 #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

4 #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

5 #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

6 #23 Adv Disp Data.xlsx

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

7 #24 Adv Resrch Data.xlsx

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

8 #25 Adv ClinExp Data.xlsx

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

9 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

10 #51 Adv Std Hndbks.pdf

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

11 #53 Action Plans.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.4 Competency at Completion

12 #54 Demographic Data.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

13 #55 DEI.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

14 #56 Conceptual Frmwk.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

15 #57 Recruit Goals.xlsx

RA3.1 Recruitment

16 #58 Admissions.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

17 #59 Teach Grant.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

18 #60 Recruitment.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

19 #61 Enrollment Data.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

20 #62 Retention.pdf

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

21 #67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

22 #68 Adv Alumni Survey.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

23 #69 AdvCompleterSrvy.docx

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Advanced 3. Candidate Quality and Selectivity
Educating teachers since the University organized in 1884, this EPP is an accredited unit (ND ESPB & NCATE [at present]), and currently graduates 200-250 master candidates yearly. Situated in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), our EPP unit spans three colleges and 17 different departments offering Undergraduate, Master's, and Doctoral degrees for educators pursuing advanced study, including Educational Leadership. As the state's largest teacher education program, this EPP offers coursework leading to 28 different areas of teacher licensure or credentialing. Through a wide range of opportunities, programs provide real-world experiences in P-12 schools and classrooms preparing teacher education candidates to teach and advocate for a diversity of learners.
As a state, becoming familiar with North Dakota (ND) assists in understanding the context of our EPP, teacher candidates, recruitment, and programs (#54 Demographic Data). North Dakota's population is approximately 774,008 and is the 19th largest state in the country. Fargo is the largest city (118,523), with Bismarck, the state capital, second (74,429), and Grand Forks third (53,445) leaving the remaining ND cities to be considered rural as 50,000 is the marker for urban identification. ND is estimated to be the most rural US state in the United States as over 90% of the land is used for farming. The remaining top 7 "cities or towns" range in population from 47,000 to 10,000 with approximately 17 communities ranging from 7,500 to 2000. Of the remaining 297 towns, populations exist between 975 and three. Most of ND's population is white (87%) with Native Americans (5%), Black/African Americans (3%), Asians (2%) and two or more races (3%). In comparison, UND data indicates there are 51% men and 49% women for a total student population of 13,772. Comparatively, the College of Education and Human Development has 135 men and 404 women for a total of 3.91% of the entire student population. Additionally, the UND student population self identifies as American Indian (1.29%), Asian (2.21%), Black (2.64%), Hispanic (4.54%), White (75.3%), two or more races (4.3%), and Non-Resident Alien (6.78%).

3.1 Recruitment

While the EPP currently collects a variety of demographic data based upon gender, diversity, ethnicity, etc., disaggregating based on programs, we are presently making the transition to aligning diversity with assessment outcomes; examining more closely any deviations that should be addressed. The EPP evidence shows continuous improvement efforts by transitioning to processes for identifying demographics when analyzing specific assessments. There are also intentional efforts dedicated to expanding the current faculty demographic dynamics through grants, recruitment, and hiring. From the last reporting cycle to the present, this EPP greatly diversified the faculty. The college focuses on diversity and inclusion in the hiring of new faculty and for candidates; self-identification reflected in EPP faculty is critical. Currently, self-identification includes a population of Asian faculty at 10.34%; Black/African American at 10.34% and a white population of 79.31% (#54 Demographic Data). Another effort includes a grant supporting Indigenous candidates in the Language program. The grant program includes multiple Indigenous candidates from across North and South Dakota. Our college takes earnest effort to recognize and respect Indigenous candidates in our programs just as we recognize, through our Land Acknowledgement Statement, the university rests upon the ancestral lands of the Ojibwe and Dakota Oyate (#55 DEI). This linkage is evident in our Teacher and School Professionals Education Committee (TSPEC) partnership with the local school district as the Grand Forks Public School Indigenous Liaison serves as a TSPEC member (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt). Additionally, the Liaison recently completed the teacher education Indigenous Language program in the college, so they are able to bring in multiple perspectives within TSPEC conversations.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is an integral part of our core values with the theoretical premise of Constructivism as the structure for the Conceptual Framework. The EPP considers educators in three crucial and intersecting roles: Educators as Learners; Educators as Practitioners; and Educators as Advocates (#55 DEI, #56 Conceptual Framework). Additionally, the college Diversity statement posits a welcoming environment for all candidates while programs and the college take action to evidence the concept regularly. As part of the mission, recruitment is grounded in Constructivist Deweyan perspective with candidate-centered, experiential, collaborative, and holistic education. The EPP has set multiple goals toward admitting high quality candidates with a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. These recruitment goals apply to undergraduate and graduate alike (#57 Recruit Goals). They include various modifications with objectives and a timeline: 1) increase links to local/rural schools with EPP, faculty, staff, and Administration evaluating the recruitment efforts of the Pilot Ambassador Program through and in conjunction with Admissions every 6 months (#58 Admissions); 2) increase collaboration with the Admissions Team and CEHD Administration, update and review communication, survey, and on-campus visits recruitment efforts yearly, including an analysis and critique of ideas and additional resources needed to reach highly qualified, diverse candidates (#58 Admissions); 3) faculty will serve as Program Contacts on the institution website for graduate inquiries, and evaluate structures in place to encourage more participation in bi-monthly graduate events (#60 Recruitment); 4) generate more graduate-focused correspondence and analyze for efficacy using feedback to prioritize more effective strategies for campus events (#60 Recruitment); 5) initiate steps in increasing collaborations with other institutions for transfer credits across the state and region, including identifying and supporting

communication strategies with rural P12 Administrators to evaluate and respond to identified needs (#60 Recruitment); and 6) continue collaborative efforts with local school projects that support schools, teachers and professional development opportunities, including "anytime enrollment" course offerings. All recruitment goals link to Mission and Vision Statements highlighting collaboration, partnerships, and inquiry and advancing learning as realized from the conceptual framework undergirding the structure as an EPP (#60 Recruitment).

Routinely monitoring the employment landscape, the EPP reviews the local and national forecasts for teacher/principal, school counselor, and Special Education (SPED) demands. Shortages of applicants within these fields in the state of North Dakota are higher than usual for many disciplines and teachers with advanced degrees are no exception. As noted by the Federal Teach Grant-Eligible Programs, high-need fields include mathematics; science, including, but not limited to, computer science; foreign language; reading specialist; bilingual education; English language acquisition; special education; or any other field that has been identified as high-need in the annual year according to Department of Education (#59 Teach Grant). In addition, ND Education Standards and Practices Board (ESBP) also declared all content areas as shortage areas. The demand for high school teachers is highest in math and science. Some of the EPP's completers find there are even more job opportunities available if they are licensed or endorsed in two or more areas (i.e., Elementary and SPED Master's). In partnership with the local school district through the Assistant Superintendents the JET (Junior Educator Training) Program and a Lab School are currently under development (#60 Recruitment). Important to filling the employment gap in ND, emphasis on the importance of quality educators and advanced education remains a priority. Collaborating in the forecasting, preparing, and providing more candidates with advanced degrees can not only meet our local, state, and regional demands, but also meet demands nationally.

Supporting recruitment strategies, the EPP identified specific actions to advance graduate enrollment as noted in the Power BI, EPP Headcount. With three terms of data, this provides valuable information in analyzing longitudinal patterns (#61 Enrollment Data). Documenting, reviewing, and analyzing with a timeline of expected outcomes are in alignment with an intent to adjust programmatic Action Plans for the upcoming academic year. This remains an area of EPP continuous improvement efforts. Revisions to graduate goals based upon progress is critical to yearly development and further achieving said benchmarks based upon priority admission goals and needs. Currently, the Associate Director of Recruitment (position vacant) is focused solely on graduate Education. Because of the absence, Admissions is conducting a search to fill the position as quickly as possible so as not to lose momentum (#60 Recruitment). As noted above, the EPP allocates time and resources to promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in recruitment efforts. Additional work to actively recruit more diverse graduate candidates is ongoing. This is a priority and continuous effort is invested in this goal.

Initially, the EPP brought forth curriculum changes to address current educational trends intended to appeal to candidates: online programs with flexibility in attending face to face or online. Many of the graduate programs were already online, but more programs moved online (TESOL and more of Educational Leadership). With constructive and collaborative program planning two to three years earlier, growth in some areas climbed and decreased in others (#61 Enrollment Data). Specifically, SPED is experiencing lower enrolment and efforts are focused on addressing this

trend. The SPED specialization has long been online and with increasing job demand there is greater attention specifically recruiting more graduate candidates to enter this field.

Secondly, specific recruiting meetings engaging admissions, marketing, and CEHD leadership focus on gaining more graduate candidates in the college (#58 Admissions). The EPP currently works more directly with community colleges to recruit transfer students through Affiliated Agreements. As noted by the institutional data, the University gathers data based upon applied students, admitted students, and enrolled students (#60 Recruitment). By disaggregating by "transfers" only, the system can identify the current trend and how many are enrolled as compared to previous years. This is facilitated by the University's Registrar's office as they work to eliminate barriers for students transferring into the university.

This is the third year the EPP has specifically worked with the University Admissions to document progress with recruitment goals. They too have limited data relative to colleges (such as CEHD, where the EPP is housed) until now, as their previous consideration was for the University at large. Thus, the EPP has limited data, but as part of our collaboration with Admissions there are dedicated efforts in obtaining sound measurements going forward. With Analytics and Planning support, Admissions uses the same model to set target numbers (65-75) for CEHD recruitment and the EPP. In the next several years as more data is available, modifications and adjustments will continue as processes are refined and action plans ensue.

Each of these goals link to the Mission/Vision and Conceptual Framework undergirding the EPP's structure. Reviewing and analyzing differences at the specific timeline intervals leads to strategic modifications and revisions of goals. Evidence of discussions, planning, analyzing, and modifying recruitment goals are generated by every specialization within the samples provided (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans).

With stakeholder investment, the EPP's recruitment goals consist of constructing, revising, and modifying when and where appropriate processes should take place by which insight, action plans, and innovation drive our efforts in aligning our Recruitment goals with our Vision (#57 Recruit Goals). The remaining Recruitment Goals focus on 7) discovering more ways to support Faculty Outreach into schools; 8) being the difference without breaking the bank - new ideas with minimum cost are important to rural P-12 schools with limited resources; 9) broaden a listing of employment agencies - making connections in support of career employment for teacher candidates; and 10) create a strong stakeholder network with P-12 schools seeking support through related projects associated with social emotional expertise, mental health expertise, and other resources a University can provide through partnerships.

Through the CEHD and EPP's mission, vision, diversity/inclusion, and equity and justice statements, a strong educational foundation for innovative, collaborative, interactive, and experiential learning occurs with candidates. The EPP utilizes a multi-phase approach in recruiting highly qualified, diverse graduate candidates from a broad range of backgrounds who are racially/ethnically diverse, Indigenous, rural, urban, and first-generation candidates. First, we focus our efforts on local P-12 schools and our ND rural P-12 schools. Through Admissions the EPP worked through the pilot program, "Town Ambassadors." Candidates who graduated from a rural high school return to their former high schools to recruit for Teacher Education. This effort links past to future and fosters relationships between the EPP and towns across the

state. For graduate candidates taking classes online, classroom teachers often have a vested interest in obtaining a degree which makes an impression upon their P-12 students. This is a value-added component. North Dakota is holistically, a rural state with only a few "cities" of notable size and is considered "frontier urban." With P-12 students represented from all over North Dakota, the EPP defines "rural" as any area, housing, or population outside of an urban city (#54 Demographic Data). All cities and towns across North Dakota have high need areas for graduates transitioning through our program.

Second, in conjunction with the Admissions Office, the EPP participates in Fall Open Houses and other "Open House Saturdays" where candidates/families visit campus, hear about UND, and visit their college of interest. Candidates/families tour CEHD and visit various classrooms where collaborative, experiential, and interactive learning is highlighted. While this is for undergraduates, there is increasing interest by potential graduate candidates also attending the tour the University (#60 Recruitment). There are several accelerated undergraduate programs where candidates enter the program in standard fashion, but by the third year they apply for admission to the Graduate School, taking graduate courses as they finish preparing for Student Teaching. The program is designed for them to obtain their bachelor's degree and a master's in the final year. This model is increasing enrollment in our online programs, and combined with transfer candidates, current teacher education enrollments are well above last year (#61 Enrollment Data).

Third, the EPP deliberately seeks to provide rural and urban P-12 school districts with graduates to fill needed positions: School Counselors, Reading Specialists, SPED educators, Educational Leaders, and TESOL teachers. P-12 principals across the state often call and request information about EPP completers as they seek to fill job openings in their districts. More recently, a Recruitment Fair for candidates and invited P-12 schools was held (#60 Recruitment). While intended for undergraduates, several SPED graduate candidates participated due to the tremendous demand for this field. On the heels of that fair, the Graduate School held a Graduate Fair with the same purpose of connecting graduates with potential employers. On an ongoing basis, P-12 principals and other P-12 administrators frequently contact the Director of Teacher Education, Coordinator of Field Placement, Associate Dean of Student Services, Educational Leadership Program Director (a former Principal/Superintendent), and SPED faculty seeking candidates to fill vacant positions across the state.

Fourth, collaborative recruitment with UND Admissions and the combining of resources with the School of Graduate Studies has provided greater results. Through participation in Graduate School Fairs, information regarding the programs is shared with high school counselors as our college utilizes Admissions officers and EPP Advisors who provide detailed information and a strong overview at the program level. Greater connections with the Grad Recruiter open more doors and like the undergraduate, the graduate program has a team specifically working to recruit for the College (CEHD). Additionally, this EPP has one person designated in Admissions who dedicates support for the college/EPP recruiting efforts with a team of four admission specialists. Graduate advising is different than undergraduate with a specialization faculty member working directly with candidates. While graduate faculty respond to potential candidate inquiries, there is an online admissions specialist in the college, Karen Harrie, who works closely with the larger programs in SPED and School Counseling. This further supports recruitment and retention for

graduate degree candidates.

While data from our Open House Undergraduate Admissions Feedback indicates candidates enjoy their visits to campus with faculty, graduate candidates seek different purposes and have different agendas when visiting graduate faculty. The EPP currently works with Admissions to include specific education-oriented questions that go out to graduate candidates after a point of contact or a campus visit. This is an effort to gain more feedback as linked to the recruitment goals (#58 Admissions; #60 Recruitment).

We currently disaggregate data based upon specializations, but as part of continuous improvements, the EPP is transitioning to disaggregation of assessment data based upon measures of diversity (race, ethnicity, rural, first generation). This information will provide the EPP information needed to determine if any discrepancies exist (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn).

3.2 Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

For admission into any EPP graduate program (specialization/discipline), candidates first apply to the School of Graduate Studies. In meeting the Graduate School criteria, candidates then apply to their preferred program (#58 Admissions). The standard expectation for graduate applicants is a 3.0 GPA, reference letters, written personal statements, and in some cases, the completion of an acceptable test (e.g., GRE). With such expectations for entry, the candidate then applies to the program (specialization/discipline) of choice. It is understood that candidates must be dedicated to obtaining an advanced degree. Many of the EPP programs also have additional expectations beyond the completion of an FBI Background check which are identified in the entry letter in conjunction with official acceptance (#58 Admissions). International candidates are required to complete a similar requirement from the country of residence. All EPP graduate programs require clinical experiences where graduates work in P-12 school settings. Completing a federal background check upon admission to the graduate programs fulfill requirements also put into place by P-12 schools. School Counseling is the only program to adhere to specific cohort groups, all other programs have entry points at each admission cycle. Candidates may be together in courses at different points of their program of study, creating communities of learners with varied levels of education and experiences.

3.3 Monitoring & Supporting Candidate Progression

Faculty advisors work closely with their graduate candidates, advising specific coursework to achieve the candidate's desired outcomes. To provide additional candidate support, the EPP has a School of Graduate Studies and a Writing Center. Both are available online and in person to all graduate candidates. Additionally, School Counseling has professional success coaches. The EPP has recently engaged in an agreement with CircleIN, which further supports the online learning environments for candidates (#62 Retention).

The EPP's graduate programs have a similar structure: Apply to the School of Graduate Studies and to the program/specialization; complete coursework with practicum; complete Coursework with clinical experience (one semester to one year), and successful completion of either a Scholarly Project (last year) or an Independent Study, culminating in successful degree completion and graduation (#51 Adv Std Hndbks).

The academic programs each have similar expectations for progressing through the master's program. Each specialization has a Program Director who directly (or with faculty), reviews and monitors the progress of candidates collectively. Again, as

noted in the candidate support concept, each Master candidate has a Faculty Advisor who supports and monitors the progress throughout the candidate's program. Using five instruments, data is gathered and analyzed, to inform continuous improvement efforts at the specialization/program and unit levels (#22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt; #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #69 AdvCompleterSrvy; #68 Adv Alumni Survey; #67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt).

From admissions to coursework completion comprises one phase of advanced programs. The second and last phase is the work surrounding the Scholarly Project or Independent study. This is not time bound but based upon each candidate's progression and topic focus. It is common for this work to take up to a year depending upon the candidate's topic and depth of research.

The EPP currently disaggregates data based upon specialization areas (TESOL, Reading, SPED, Educational Leadership), with plans to disaggregate by specific attributes (gender, race/ethnicity, 1st generation college, rural, etc.) in the future. With the implementation of CircleIN, disaggregation by such characteristics can be achieved, so each specialization area/discipline can have a clearer understanding of candidate needs at any point in their program (#62 Retention).

For graduate candidates, the EPP adheres to the CEHD Grievance Policy. Candidates enrolled in or taking courses in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) are expected to abide by UND's Code of Student Life and demonstrate high standards of ethical and professional conduct. Candidates are expected to follow policies established by their specific academic program(s) as well as any relevant professional associations (i.e., North Dakota Educational Standards and Professional Board Code of Ethics). Candidates are expected to familiarize themselves with applicable University and CEHD policies and degree program requirements. Similarly, candidates should expect faculty and staff members to demonstrate the same ethical and professional standards and to abide by all University of North Dakota (UND) policies including those set forth in the UND Faculty Handbook. This process applies to any academic grievance. An academic grievance is defined as: a statement expressing complaint, resentment, or accusation lodged by a candidate about an academic circumstance arising out of a candidate's enrollment in CEHD or while taking a CEHD course (such as grading, testing, and quality of instruction) which is thought by the candidate to be unfair. Complaints concerning discrimination or harassment should be made to the Equal Opportunity and Title IX office and handled through that office. Graduate candidate grievances regarding Graduate School policies fall under the authority of the Graduate School. All other grievances concerning a graduate candidate's academic issues should follow the process described in this policy.

A.3.4 Competency at Completion

The Research Project is considered the competency model in gathering data to determine quality completion of advanced program candidates. Overall, candidates across the unit were rated at the "meets" or "exceeds" level, providing evidence that candidates demonstrate sufficient competencies as measured through the key assessments.

Assessment data collected through the key assessments address the six CAEP prescribed areas. Within the data table, ratings fall on a scale between 1-3 with 1 being rated as progressing, 2 as meets, and 3 as exceeds. Data Tables are provided (#23 Adv Disp Data; #24 Adv Rescrch Data; #25 AdvClinExp Data).

Content Knowledge: Scores fell into the range of 2.0 to 2.5 across the EPP. School

Counseling had the strongest indicators with TESOL having the lowest in the first set of data, but notably increasing in the last 2 data sets.
Data Literacy: Analyzing the multiple program data sets found scores associated with data literacy between the range of 2.0-2.9. These scores demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of data literacy.
Research-Driven decision making: Scores across programs ranged from 2.0-2.9 in the processes of research driven decision making. These scores demonstrate a solid candidate understanding in data-based decision making.
Collaborative skills (Professional, Diversity): Program/specialization scores ranged from 2.25 to 2.37 indicating a strong pattern of meeting expectations.
Tech Applications: Across all specializations, technology applications scores ranged from 2.0 to 2.65 indicating a definite pattern of meeting expectations.
Dispositions: It is important to note across all programs between Disposition 1 and Disposition 2 scores ranged 2.25 to 2.37 indicating candidate growth through progressing through their program. This is important both for program competency and supporting progression.
Laws, code of ethics, and professional standards: Scores across all programs fell into the range of 2.0 to 2.5 denoting a keen sense of understanding and applying professional standards.
The assessments related to research, clinical experience, and dispositions describe the proficiency of the graduate programs as evidenced in the data. Reviewing findings, it is evident faculty continue to adjust programmatic criterion expectations. The adjustments can be found in Program Action Plans (#53 Action Plans). Overall changes further support candidate progression in meeting and exceeding expectations.

Standard R.4: Program Impact (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #5 STOT Tech Pkt.docx

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

2 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

3 #33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

4 #34 Exit Surv Data.xlsx

R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

5 #43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts.pdf

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

6 #70 Init TtT Survey.xlsx

R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

7 #71 Comm Mentoring.pdf
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

8 #72 Marzano Tech Pkt.pdf
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

9 #73 Comm Case Study.pdf
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

10 #74 Sprvsr Survey Data.xlsx
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

11 #75 NeXT.pdf
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

12 #86 TtT Validity.pdf
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

4.1
Through various data collection tools, the EPP gathers information to determine the effect of its program completers on P12 student learning, and applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions upon P12 learning and development. The EPP set about establishing multiple processes whereby an examination of effectiveness could be viewed through two lenses. Below are explanations of the collaboration established with the ND Mentoring Program of Bismarck, in its infancy stage, as details continue evolving in a collaborative approach with the ND Mentoring Program, the Grand Forks School district, and the EPP. This process has many components and establishing the specific stages and determining role responsibilities with the state agency are in the formative stages and needs more structure before the formal initiation. Below is an explanation of these ideas with the Mentoring Agency. The EPP anticipates more fruitful decisions will be determined this summer and included in the addendum. The EPP anticipates having more structural components confirmed and conducting a small pilot study this summer to address challenges and benefits of the process. The smaller the P12 student population will assist in managing the project's immediate outcome.
The ND Century Code 15.1-18.2-05 states "The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) shall: c. (1) Select and train experienced teachers who will serve as mentors for first-year teachers and assist the first-year teacher with instructional skills development." The mentoring program is designed to retain teachers and extend P12 learning and development. Veteran teachers serve as mentors for first year teachers. The ND Teacher Mentoring Program's (NDMP) goal: This EPP's approach is to have veteran teachers who came through the EPP program (UND) assist in the assessment of program completer's impact on P12 learning and development in their second year. There are multiple P12 faculty who have graduated through the EPP program and who also have gone through the ND Mentor teacher program. When those teachers have been in the field for multiple years, they are often called Master Teachers. Having experienced both trainings provides an

understanding of process, as well as knowledge of the assessment tool (STOT) also since it is used measure teacher knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
The STOT, utilized for student teaching, is an assessment now administered for the mentoring program in both the first and second year (#5 STOT Tech Pkt). The NDMP/EPP partnership is eager to gather longitudinal data given the importance of demonstrating the impact on P12 learning. This will be a strong research effort in determining completer impact and effectiveness in addition to sustaining evidence for accreditation processes (#71 Comm Mentoring).
District Master teachers, NDMP Mentor trained, will assess UND Completer In-Service Teachers through the STOT. Created and validated by NExT, the STOT is currently employed for data gathering associated with pre-service candidates and program completers. As a convenience sample, EPP completers were drawn in their first or second year of teaching from those hired by the GF local school district. Data will be aggregated so anonymity is maintained. Continuity of data across multiple phases of teacher preparation and early service leads to richer, longitudinal data.
Completing the teacher education program through the EPP and the Mentoring program, each EPP completer is supported and assessed by a Master Teacher (MT). The MT has a strong knowledge and training in both programs. Pre and post assessments with the STOT are conducted in a semester to determine growth and development in a specific timeframe. With final processes completed, data collection will begin Fall 2022 and continue into Spring 2023 as connections in schools with the NDMP and identification of completers continue.
The current assessment employed to measure completer effectiveness is a case study using the Marzano P12 Model (#72 Marzano Tech Pkt). Data are currently collected through various principals' annual evaluations of the EPP completer in the first few years. This measure provides insight into how well the new teacher (EPP completer) is doing in their first few years of teaching. Although the sample size is small, it is representative of our completers, albeit convenient sample. Initially recruiting across the district last year, there were limited email responses, therefore, we selected one school and focused efforts on contacting specific alumni given the unacceptable sample size (minimum of 5 students).
As a P12 district, Grand Forks has a dedication and consciousness for effective teaching practices coupled with a state mandate to measure teacher effectiveness (knowledge, skills, and dispositions). This local school district adopted the Marzano model to analyze in-service teachers' pedagogical expertise and content mastery in addition to addressing the collective/individual needs of all district children. The district invited Dr. Marzano to visit and present his tool with explanations and case studies, and subsequently began transitioning to this model with every teacher in the district participating.
As a nationally recognized assessment tool, the Marzano evaluation is employed yearly through a principal's observations and analysis of each early career teacher in their classroom. School district policies and procedures are adhered to for access to EPP completer evaluations. With a request to the superintendent's office for evaluation considerations, assistant superintendents shared the request with the principals. Data obtained through email contacts of various EPP completers resulted in an insufficient sample size of professional evaluations (#73 Comm Case Study). The Associate Dean followed up with graduates to gain a better understanding of why there was a lack of participation. Teachers want to know their information is secure and protected. The teachers suggested focusing on one school and expanding

afterwards to another. The Associate Dean and Director of Teacher Education requested completers send a copy of their principal evaluation to the Initial Assessment Data Manager for removal of all identifying markers. After the initial challenge in obtaining sufficient sample size (minimum of 5), efforts to personally connect with P12 district staff and administration yielded more responses.

In reviewing the principal's evaluations of the completers, particular attention was paid to correlations with the completer's knowledge, skills, and dispositions. According to the principal's evaluations, teachers were assessed on more items than originally considered. There are 48 skills demonstrating four domains. In rating the teacher, the Marzano model uses a -point scale ranging from Not Using, Beginning, Developing, Applying, to Innovating including a rating of Not Applicable (#72 Marzano Tech Pkt).

Seven completers shared their evaluations, representing three cycles of data (#72 Marzano Tech Pkt). As case study data, this provides sufficient data for analysis of trends in completer preparation using a scientifically validated instrument. Data were in accordance with the four domains and at the skills level. With the content analyses conducted, the following results emerged. There were 39 applying, 4 developing, 3 not using, 1 beginning, and 1 innovating. In Domain 1: Classroom Strategy and Behavior: using academic games, chunking content, using physical movement, helping student to reflect on learning, and engaging students in cognitive tasks. In Domain 2: Professionalism and Collegiality: participating in District Professional Development. Domain 3: addressing scales & rubrics and reflecting on learning. Domain 4: using behaviors that indicate affection for students. Out of the 48 evaluations, 81% of the time, completers are applying what they know and can do while 8% are developing in the same manner, 6% are not doing either and 2% are beginning and 2% are innovating what they know and can do. At an 83% mark of applying and innovating, this is an acceptable start in understanding the growth and development of P12 students in relation to the completer's efforts. All samples were completed by employers who were trained in implementing the models.

This new effort in determining how the EPP completers effectively contribute to P12 student learning and growth is the most compelling. The Marzano tool utilization is important as it is a nationally recognized instrument, and many institutions find it helpful in mentoring and supporting teachers. This data collection and effort requires extensive communication, explanations, connections, and feedback to internal and external stakeholders to demonstrate how the process is constructed for the EPP's use. The analysis revealed in the samples reviewed, over 90% of our completers have a positive influence on P12 student learning. Findings were shared at the TSPEC; this is mutually beneficial with our partnership with P12 stakeholders.

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

The satisfaction of employers is obtained through the Supervisor Survey, a proprietary instrument from the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT) through the institutions of NExT. (#74 Sprvsr Survey Data; #75 NExT). The Supervisor Survey asks those who supervise first-year teachers to assess their readiness for the teaching profession. The survey asks supervisors to assess the quality of completers' instructional practices, abilities to work with diverse learners, abilities to establish positive classroom environments, and levels of professionalism. The survey is administered to direct supervisors of teacher education graduates employed in schools as teachers approximately one year after the completers completed their preparation programs. Developed in 2010, the Supervisor Survey has been through

multiple revision cycles involving validity and reliability analyses, focus group feedback, expert review, and cross-walking with professional standards.
An email is sent to employers of completers in late spring, near the of the completer's first year of teaching. Data are aggregated and analyzed to determine strengths, challenges, and opportunities for change in the areas of Instructional Practice, Diverse Learners, Learning Environments, and Professionalism. As identified with CAEP guidelines, the EPP instrument contains specific questions designed to align with major components of Standard 4: learner & learning, content, instructional practice, professional responsibilities, and technology integration. The EPP presents 3 years of data, (2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21). The scale of measurement is based upon a 4-point structure: agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, disagree, and not able to observe. The data are provided in aggregated format by the EPP.
Analysis of the data demonstrates greater agreement (greater with agreement and tend to agree) for all areas identified in Instructional practice with little to no disagreement among the same areas (5% and less). For example, on the item, Effectively Teaches Subject Matter, the percentages of favorable responses continue to rise 2018 through 2020, 91% to 96% to 100%. This trend applies to all areas: Select Instructional Strategies to align with learning goals (92% to 95%); Adjust Instructional Plans to Meet Student Needs (88% to 95%); Analyzes Types of Assessment Data to Identify Student Learning Need (78% to 91%); Engages Students in a Range of Technology (78% to 100%.); and Designs Assessments to Match Learning Objectives (83% to 100%). The one year of outlier data inclusive of ratings "tend to disagree" responses account for a negligible percentage (4-5%) in sporadic cases.
The next area assessed by the Supervisor/Employer Survey was related to instruction Diverse Learners with 3 items being scored by the principals: Effectively Teaches Student from Culturally and Ethnically Diverse Backgrounds and Communities (83% to 91%); Differentiates for Students of Varied Developmental Levels (87% to 95%); and Accesses Resources to Foster Learning for Students with Diverse Needs (83% to 96%).
Employers determined Learning Environments as associated with four items: Uses Effective Communication Skills and Strategies to Convey Ideas and Information to Students (92% to 96%); Connects Core Content to Students Real Life Experiences Across Time (83% to 81%) and this includes a 13% percent disagreement in the first year 18-19; Maintains a Classroom Environment that Promotes Student Engagement (91% to 95%); and Creates a Learning Environment in which Differences such as Race, Culture, Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Language are Respected (91% to 95%).
Professionalism is measured in 3 items with scores similar in increase increments as the other sections: Seeks Out Learning Opportunities Aligned with Professional Development Goals (78% to 91%); Uses Colleague Feedback to Support Teacher Development (92% to 95%); Acts as an Advocate for All Students (88% to 100%).
The EPP places significant importance on this feedback in aligning EPP programming to standard and field/employment expectations. With collaborations, clarity in expectations, and P12 interpretations needs are more clearly communicated. The triangulation in conjunction with these items characterized in other areas assists in gaining a clearer picture of the entire EPP.
While we presently collect demographic data on our EPP candidates, we do not link these responses to assessments, but this is a priority and is addressed in our

transition plan. However, we do obtain demographic data from schools where completers are employed which document teaching in schools with diverse populations. A table of results is provided (#43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts).
Another source of employer satisfaction is our partnership with the Teacher and School Professionals Education Committee (TSPEC) (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt). This partnership consists of members from the local school district including, but not limited to, educators from all licensure levels and specializations, the Superintendent, Special Education Director, Indigenous Language Liaison, English Language Teacher, Director of Teacher Education, Associate Dean of Assessment, EPP faculty including those from CAEP specializations and from Arts and Sciences, and an undergraduate and graduate student. This partnership provides feedback on all aspects of the process involved in TE: curriculum, assessment, suggestions for changes in protocols associated with assessment, student teaching, and most importantly gap identification and suggestions for resolutions to gaps and challenges. The intent with this mutually beneficial partnership is to add those who will further our understanding of both learning and teaching. The most recent example is the addition of the Indigenous Language Liaison from the local school district. The EPPs understanding of how best to meet the needs of Indigenous students is enriched by having insight from this source.
Feedback from the school districts during and following a recent Recruitment Fair included comments consisting of "wish we had more UND grads" and "we need 4 more of this teacher." This provides compelling evidence of the importance and validity of our program. Principals continually seek to hire this EPP's graduates, and this is the most compelling piece of evidence that confirms that this unit is making a difference for the P12 classroom. We continue to collect data and will present updates as part of the addendum.
4.3 Satisfaction of Completers
The EPP demonstrates program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job, and that their preparation was effective. The Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS), a proprietary instrument from NExT, is used to measure satisfaction of completers near the end of their first year of teaching. The TTS was first developed in 2010 and has been through multiple revision cycles that involved validity and reliability analyses, focus group feedback, expert review, and cross-walking with professional standards. A summary of the most recent validity and reliability analysis can be found in the NExT information.
As a key component in our EPP practice, reflection is critical to practice. These data provide the base for reflection, revision, and revision of structures, roles, and processes. The TTS poses specific questions addressing the learner, learning, instructional practice, technology, and professional responsibilities. Reflection is also a critical component of the EPP's philosophy, completer reflection development is important for each gateway point. Completers pass through the program with a clear understanding of the importance of reflection and analysis of the "days teaching" as a process for continuous improvement well past graduation.
TTS (#70 Init TtT Survey; #86 TtT Validity) asks completers to rate their preparedness across six scales: Instructional Practice, Diverse Learners, Learning Environment, Professionalism, Instructional Practice for Diverse Learners, and Technology and Resources. The items are also aligned to the InTASC Standards. Responses are on a 4-point scale ranging from Agree, Tend to Agree, Disagree and Tend to Disagree. Despite Covid pandemic related effect, many completers.

Responses are on a 4-category scale ranging from Agree, Tend to Agree, Disagree and Tend to Disagree. Despite Covid pandemic related effect, most completers agreed they were well prepared for their first year of teaching.
Three cycles of data are presented. 2019 (response rate 50%; 54/109) with 87% of respondents agreeing they would recommend their program to a potential candidate; 2020 (response rate 44%; 59/135) with 88-91% completers indicating they would recommend their program to a prospective candidate, while 84-88% indicated a level of agreement that the program prepared them to be successful in their current teaching position; and 2021 (response rate 41%; 63/153) with 90% of respondents agreeing they would recommend their program to a potential candidate. One noteworthy observation is a distinct drop in the 2019 completers (2017-18 graduates) where 16% did not believe the program prepared them for teaching. Compared to all other years reported, even during Covid years, the completer satisfaction ratings (agreement with the statements continued to climb.
The Exit/Alumni survey is also utilized to gather data and insights on completer satisfaction (#33 Exit Surv Tech Pkt; #34 Exit Surv Data). Like the TTS and the Employer Survey, the Exit/Alumni survey has been through multiple revision cycles involving validity and inter reliability analyses, focus group feedback, expert review, and cross-walking with professional standards as linked to NExT. Again, responses are on a 4-point scale of agree and tend to agree and likewise, Disagree and tend to Disagree. Agree and Tend to Agree are viewed as one score and likewise for the disagree items. Examining 3 cycles of data across specializations (Early Childhood, Elementary/Middle, Secondary, and Special Education) scores are averaged to provide a clear description of the entire EPP program. Despite Covid effects experienced by all EPPs it is evident our completers are satisfied with their education. Completers across different specializations evidence some effects, but overall, over 80% of the highlighted areas assessed are indicative of responses representative of completer satisfaction.
From the Exit survey findings and despite the pandemic, the most considerable evidence was of a normality in scoring. In analyzing the data, an average was taken across the 3 cycles reported. Scores were then considered across specializations with a unit level synopsis averaging across specializations optimized understanding. While there are many questions included in this survey, only 10 questions were chosen to highlight. Data indicated through the combined scores of completers that 80% and greater represented completers satisfaction in Perceptions of Teaching. These selected topics include "how satisfied were you with the integration of technology throughout your program. Over all specializations, 81% to 85% (84% average) agreed they were satisfied. In asking the question of all completers if they would recommend this EPP program, scores ranged from 85% to 98% agreement with an averaging of a 90% agreement. Asking completers if they could effectively teach their subject matter associated with licensure, completers resoundingly indicated they could with a 95% average across specializations.
The next section of the survey identified as Instructional includes four questions focusing on Lesson Plans, Assessment, Digital Technology, and Knowing where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding. All completers indicated a level of agreement with these topical areas ranging between 90%-95% averaged agreement with no notable highlights. Of particular interest though is the completers scored agreement with utilizing resources in building global awareness. From 83% to 88% with an average of 86%, this is by no means a concerning score,

yet it is evident that completers believe they have not had enough experiences in identifying and accessing resources to build global awareness in their perception. With faculty of diverse cultures, classroom experiences including more diversity, equity, and inclusion focused curriculum, this EPP will take this opportunity to more intentionally address this through continuous improvement efforts.

The very next question in the survey, completers indicated their level of agreement in feeling prepared to effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds. A marked distinction is made here as completers agreed (92% across specializations) they could teach these students. Ranges from 88% agreement to 97% demonstrate that completers are continuing to determine what it means to be a teacher of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. The last two questions ask completers if they can differentiate themselves to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds. 90% agreed they could do this, with Secondary and Early Childhood specializations demonstrating the most reservations. Lastly, the question addresses differentiating instruction for students with IEPs (Individual Education Programs) and 504 plans. While the special education specializations completer agreement was exceptionally high, 98%, the other 3 specialization's completer's agreement ranged from 81% and 82% to 88%. It is key to recognize when there is less agreement about certain topics. It is critical to establish pathways for students to share and come forward when identifying areas in which they are not in agreement or feel less secure in the skills. This too is an area the EPP identifies as an area for continuous improvement efforts.

In questions regarding the preparation for teaching area, across specializations, scores remained the same with only a slight dip in one, but nothing noteworthy. For example, one question regarding student teaching inquired if the Cooperating Teacher co-planned and co-taught with the student teacher and all Early Childhood students agreed; Elementary scores were higher in year 21 compared to the previous two years, and Special Education gained percentage points in the more recent survey. In the analysis of data literacy, most specializations saw a small decline over time except Special Education whose scores dipped in year 20 but rose again in 21 to match year 19. In the Preparation for Teaching questions, completers indicated they were integrating technology into all specializations.

And finally, across the EPP Unit, scoring in the items of content, methods, and field experience reveal the same considerable evidence as stated above. Despite the effects of Covid overall, all specializations were little affected by Covid as evidenced in completer ratings. Each of the semester term scores is averaged to provide a clear and fair representation across specializations. Across specializations, when completers were asked if the major helped them learn content, more than 90% of them agreed. In the item of Methods course assisting completers in designing and effectively implementing instruction and assessment, completers across all specializations indicated agreement levels exceeding 90% or better than their courses did prepare them. The outlier, Early Childhood did have agreement levels, slightly less than 90%. Lastly, completers responded to questions about Field Experience as adequately providing practice observation and teaching before student teaching (or Special Education Internship) at 90% and above. As noted earlier, even with the pandemic, this EPP's candidate support efforts led to high levels of completer satisfaction. The EPP increased support to students where they were in their educational path; working to make sure everyone knew they were supported in completing their degree in a timely manner.

Standard R.A.4. Program Impact (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #19 Adv Assmt Plan.xlsx

RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

2 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf

RA.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

3 #67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt.docx

RA.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

4 #68 Adv Alumni Survey.docx

RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

5 #69 AdvCompleterSrvy.docx

RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard RA.4 Satisfaction with Preparation
The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Component RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities.

Determining employer satisfaction is obtained through a survey (#67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt). Including a Qualtrics link, an email is sent to employers of completers each semester and returned the same. Data is disaggregated by programs and analyzed to determine strengths, challenges, and opportunities for change.
The common assessment, Employer Survey, was developed collaboratively by an Assessment Committee made up of representatives from each program/specialization area falling under CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) Advanced Standards: Educational Leadership, Reading, School Counseling, Special Education, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Also included was the Associate Dean of Student Services and Assessment. During Academic Year 2018-2019, the committee used the Lawshe method to identify the key criterion for comprising the rubric to a standard of full agreement (1.0) across all programs. A small sub-group was formed to operationalize each criterion. The resulting document was presented to the committee for feedback and refinement. The committee then worked collaboratively to adapt the wording, attaining 100% agreement on the descriptors, ensuring it met the needs across the range of programs using CAEP aligned common assessments and had sufficient levels of content validity. As a survey, reliability and inter-rater reliability factors are not

applicable. A current challenge remains obtaining responses as they are dependent upon the Employer's response.

In Spring 2018, the assessment continued to be revised and was adopted in Fall 2019 for implementation beginning at the conclusion of the 2019/2020 School Year. Continuous improvement efforts have centered on ensuring adequate response rates given that the survey is sent to employers of P-12 school employees. In Spring 2020, Covid and the disruptions to P-12 school settings had a negative impact on response rates. The EPP has begun to problem solve other methods for collecting this data. At present, there is no data to review, although the process is well established. All data is collected in Qualtrics using a link that is sent to employers of graduates.
In the specializations of Counseling, TESOL, Reading, Special Education, and Educational Leadership, data was to be collected in Spring 21, but no responses were submitted.
Recently validated by the University Director of Assessment, Dr. Tim Burrows, the new survey included reconsideration of a Likert scale, revised structured responses, and alignment of tools to eliminate reader confusion. Important to continuous improvement, these findings will be integrated in fall 2022. The EPP is integrating an educational approach to support future graduates regarding the key role of employer feedback.
Another source of employer satisfaction is the partnership with TSPEC (Teacher and School Professionals Education Committee) (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt). This partnership consists of members from the local school district including, but not limited to, educators from all licensure levels, the Superintendent/Principal, Special Education Director, Indigenous Language Liaison, English Language Teacher, Director of Teacher Education, Associate Dean of Assessment, EPP Undergraduate and Graduate Faculty including those from Arts and Sciences, and an undergraduate and graduate student. This partnership provides feedback on all aspects of the process involved in TE: curriculum, assessment, suggestions for changes in protocols associated with assessment, student teaching, and most importantly gap finding and suggestions for resolutions to gaps and challenges. The intent with this partnership is to add those who will further our understanding of both learning and teaching. The most recent example is the addition of the Indigenous Language Liaison from the local school district. The EPPs understanding of how best to meet the needs of Indigenous students are enriched by having insight from this source. Other entities that network with our TSPEC and serve the state include the ND Department of Public Instruction, ND American Colleges of Teacher Education, and ND Education Standards and Practices Board.

While there is a process in place, there is limited opportunity to explain the results due to a lack of data. Under the Covid hardship, this EPP would like to take into consideration employers are satisfied with completer's preparation to work with diverse P12 students and their families.

RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
The provider demonstrates that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and their preparation was effective.

Completer Survey/One year post graduation survey was developed collaboratively by an Assessment Committee made up of representatives from each program/specialization area falling under CAEP Advanced Standards: Educational Leadership, Reading, School Counseling, Special Education, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Also included was the Associate Dean of Student Services and Assessment. During Academic Year 2018-2019, the committee used the Lawshe method to identify the key criterion for comprising the rubric to a standard of full agreement (1.0) across all programs. A small sub-group was formed to operationalize each criterion. The resulting document was presented to the committee for feedback and refinement. The committee then worked collaboratively to adapt the wording, attaining 100% agreement on the descriptors, ensuring it met the needs across the range of programs using CAEP aligned common assessments and had sufficient levels of content validity. As a survey, reliability and inter-rater reliability factors are not required.

In Spring 2018, the assessment was implemented across all five disciplines by the Assessment and Data Manager. At that time, the assessment titled "Exit Survey" was changed to Completer Survey (#69 AdvCompleterSrvy). Completion rates remained low, and the Assessment Committee began working on redeveloping the assessment to better reflect CAEP standards. Finalized during the 2018-2019 academic year, the current version of the survey/assessment was sent to graduates each semester beginning Spring 2019. Continuous improvement efforts center on ensuring adequate response rates given the survey is sent to people who have already graduated and are likely working in P-12 school-based settings. In Spring 2020, Covid and the disruptions to P-12 school settings had a tremendous negative impact on response rates. All data is collected using Qualtrics through a link sent to graduates. Graduates are not required to provide their names, but we encourage them to do so to gather Employer survey data.

First implemented in Spring 2019 with recent graduates, the first group to be sent the Alumni survey one year post graduation aligned with the beginning of the Covid Pandemic (#68 Adv Alumni Survey). During the pandemic, responses were tremendously impacted within our P12 partnerships. In the survey, specific questions address the learner, learning, instructional practice, technology, and professional responsibilities. Within the disciplines, Counseling, TESOL, Reading, Special Education, and Educational Leadership, data was to be collected in Spring 21, but no responses were submitted. For the Graduate programs, a matrix was generated to plot all data collection and the cycle associated with each program (#19 Adv Assmt Plan).

Standards R.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #1 Disag Trans PhaseIn.docx

R5.2 Data Quality

2 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality

3 #3 CS Tech Pkt.docx

R5.4 Continuous Improvement

4 #4 LP Tech Pkt.docx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

5 #5 STOT Tech Pkt.docx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

6 #6 TWS Tech Pkt.docx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

7 #11 Praxis Scores.docx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

8 #12 Init Prgms Handbks.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

9 #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt.docx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

10 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

11 #28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

12 #32 Aff Agrmts.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

13 #52 Init Assmt Plan.xlsx

R5.2 Data Quality
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

14 #53 Action Plans.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

15 #60 Recruitment.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

16 #64 NCATE 2015.pdf

R5.4 Continuous Improvement

17 #70 Init TtT Survey.xlsx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

18 #76 Watermark Info.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

19 #79 Assmt Cncptl Frmwk.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

20 #81 ILAC Mnts.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

21 #82 Rdg Cnt.pdf

R5.4 Continuous Improvement

22 #86 TtT Validity.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard R.5 Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement
R5.1 Quality Assurance System
The EPP (Educator Preparation Program) has a robust Quality Assurance System (QAS) that relies on valid and reliable assessments, human resources, policy and procedures, and current software to ensure quality control and continuous improvement. Based upon the EPP's belief in student centered-constructivist experiential education and joined by state entities, local districts, online stakeholders, and our educational partners, this EPP has a long legacy of approved practices lending to the recognition of quality and assurances found throughout the entirety of the specializations. With the assistance of course instructors, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers, the EPP collects artifacts and makes observations at gateway points in the students' program of study (i.e., program entry, mid-program, Methods, and student teaching,). These artifacts and observations are rigorously assessed using rubrics and disposition forms. Data from these rubrics and disposition forms are entered into a software program and monitored over time by the Data Assessment Coordinator. The EPP has transitioned from the use of LiveText and VIA to Watermark Licensure and Student Planning software (Watermark) (#76 Watermark Info). Currently, Watermark enables the EPP to store and monitor the

data effectively. Additionally, it supports the EPP in obtaining disaggregated and aggregated reports that inform a) candidate admission, advisement and retention, b) specialization improvement, and c) unit improvement. Disaggregated reports are generated on student, enrollment, specialization, and gender. Data is not currently disaggregated by race/ethnicity, rural/urban, or First-Generation College Student, but the EPP created a transition plan in place for disaggregating such data as associated with assessments to address potential disparities moving forward.

The EPP is committed to monitoring student progress throughout the entirety of their gram and engaging in continuous specialization and unit improvement. The EPP utilizes multiple measures as described in the Technical Packets at gateway points in the specialization and clearly assess students' growing preparedness and specialization and EPP quality across time (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #5 STOT Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Tech Pkt; #14 Init Prg Disp Tech Pkt). The selection of measures was made based on a developmental approach, which includes monitoring student performance at the beginning, continued development, and maturation throughout the programs, and at the end of the program through student teaching (graduation). The Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS) given to our specialization completers address the effectiveness of the completer on the P12 students learning (#70 Init TtT Survey; #86 TtT Validity). Through the propriety Praxis II assessment tool, this gathers data to measure the Content (specific disciplines) and Principles of Learning and Teaching (Pedagogy) as associated with professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of which are associated with teaching effectiveness (#11 Praxis Scores).

Assessment and quality assurance continues as candidates prepare to apply for and enter the specialization. Applicants are evaluated on GPA, Praxis Core or ACT-plus-writing scores, and performance in T&L 250 Introduction to Education. During the specialization, students are evaluated at 4 distinct phases. Phase 1: Admissions as described above; Phase 2: Teacher Education Coursework including Disposition 2 completed by Faculty, Phase 3: Coursework including Methods, Lesson Plan assessment, Disposition 3 completed during the Co-Requisite Field Experience, and an audit of all coursework to qualify for the last phase-- Phase 4: Student Teaching. The TE Handbook summarizes how candidates' field experiences progress throughout the specialization (#12 Init Prgms Handbks, pp. 14-16).

During the first year of employment, graduates/Alumni have an opportunity to provide feedback on their specialization (#70 Init TtT Survey). Although self-reported, this assessment gathers important and informative data. This provides critical insight into the functioning now the completers are in the teaching field and changes and modifications are made to address gaps identified through the survey.

Data collected by faculty, cooperating teachers, and supervising teachers are submitted through Watermark. The Assessment Coordinator runs descriptive statistics, disaggregates by specializations, and creates reports for the Assessment Committees, the Director of Teacher Education, and all faculty during the Fall and Spring Assessment Retreats. Specializations review data prior to the Assessment Retreats then during the Assessment Retreat is quite enlightening. The outcomes associated with disciplines are captured in Program Action Plans. These are developed to support continuous improvement for current and future candidates. At each Assessment Retreat, there is a different lens by which faculty engage with data. For example, the focus may be on Data Literacy, Diversity and Technology (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, 2/2/18, p. 36), or closely examining the Exit Survey and Transition to Teaching Survey results to inform what steps would be developed for the Action Plans

(#2 Assm Retreat Mins, 11/8/19: p. 21).

This system allows the EPP to determine areas in which candidates are and are not meeting expectations. It also allows the specialization faculty to identify and determine where assessments or learning activities need to be improved or strengthened. One example is the discussions emerging from the 2019 Spring Assessment Retreat that centered on diverse learners and technology. It prompted syllabi review by the assessment committees, results were shared out, and in the fall, faculty increased the intentionality within syllabi for addressing ELL (English Language Learner) students, diverse students, and integrating technology. This change occurred across all levels and specializations and was implemented in Fall 2019. All the changes were premised on the lower scores of candidates in those areas in our assessment data.

As described above, the EPP uses this system in multiple critical Quality Assurance efforts. Faculty discuss specialization level and EPP data trends then develop plans for improvement. In addition to these faculty events, the Initial Licensure Assessment Committee (ILAC) meets routinely through the academic year and identifies focus areas based on student performance (#81 ILAC Mnts). Finally, the system is used to identify student concerns and to help the Teacher Education Student Review Committee respond to reported deficiencies in individual student performance (#12 Init Prgms Handbks,Teacher Education Student Review Committee, p. 31).

Through Quality Assurance practices, all EPP faculty are well-versed in system content and process. Faculty engage in regular interrater reliability training to ensure competence to measure candidate progress (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, 11/2/18: p. 29 and 11/8/19: p. 24-26). ILAC consists of four faculty across specialization areas (Early Childhood, Elementary, Elementary, Secondary, Special Education, and Physical Education), as well as the Director of Teacher Education, the data manager, and the Associate Dean of Assessment (ADA). All faculty participate in the Assessment Retreats. As a point of pride, it demonstrates the faculty commitment, rather than delegating assessment and quality assurance to a faculty sub-group. During the Spring Retreat, faculty generate Action Plans that result in a variety of changes which are subsequently evaluated the following year in both the Fall and Spring Assessment meetings. Specialization faculty determine what was learned, what needs to change, who will assist with changes, and identify support in this process (#53 Action Plans). Various comes are discussed and iterations to enhance the process and strengthen any action supporting students, student learning, and/or the effectiveness of contributing to diverse P12 student growth is primary. Once all elements are identified with who, why, when, and where faculty report continued work and updating as the year progresses. During the Fall Retreat, there are discussions of specialization updates as based upon Action Plans. If there are challenges, then brainstorming with EPP Faculty serves to support problem solving to strengthen the process, the specialization, and the EPP.

R.5.2 Data Quality

The QAS is functional for faculty, who can use it to answer a wide range of questions for each of the specialization areas within the EPP. This is due in large part to the elevated level of involvement by faculty in the QAS, which is reviewed annually through various assessment activities (described below). The QAS tracks students across multiple semesters, uses various instruments and opportunities to provide triangulated measurement, and relies on data collection strategies and timing that are routine and standardized. In this way, real-time reports of student performance

can be generated quickly and both individual and specialization-level assessment questions can be addressed.
The QAS has two primary limitations, both of which are in the process of being revised and improved. The first is the limited ability to generate disaggregated data, particularly based on demographic characteristics. This is an effort we are working to address (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn). The second limitation is our low response rate for the Employer Survey, which limits our ability to determine how students overall are performing as they transition to teaching.
The data collected through the QAS are high quality based upon multiple standards. Relevance is determined by ensuring that appropriate measures have been selected or developed, and that they are used to measure performance that is central to the goals of the specialization. To demonstrate conceptual knowledge, we rely on standardized tests (Praxis CORE or ACT-plus-writing and the Praxis Specialty exams), as well as GPA, both objective in nature. We also use applied assessments, the Lesson Plan and Teacher Work Sample, which provide evidence of the candidates' abilities to use their conceptual abilities in the classroom. This multi-modal approach helps to ensure that the tools are measuring what is both intended for the QAS and relevant to teaching excellence.
To determine verifiability, the EPP relies on both inter-rater reliability and multi-method measurement. Each Fall, the EPP faculty discusses and practices the skills of inter-rater reliability, to ensure that they are evaluating and responding to assessment data consistently. All faculty are trained in how to use rubrics and their ratings in each area of performance are compared and analyzed to identify areas in which reliability is demonstrated or not. A review of our specialization data tables indicates faculty inter-rater reliability is acceptable (#2 Assm Retreat Mins). Verifiability is also demonstrated by using multiple methods of assessment to provide varying perspectives on individual student performance.
Representativeness is assured by collecting data at multiple points within and across all specialization areas for each student. Our QAS includes a very thorough guide for data collection, which outlines the responsibilities for faculty and support staff (#52 Init Assmt Plan). This ensures faculty collect the appropriate data in each class and data is subsequently captured through the Assessment Manager. This assists in determining cumulative data that reflects both individual development and overall specialization performance.
Finally, the data is actionable as it leads to specific decision-making and changes in the EPP. Verified every Spring, the Retreat focus is on reviewing data from the preceding year and identifying areas of improvement. Each Retreat ends with the construction of an Action Plan based upon findings from the data (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans)
Assessments are analyzed to ensure they meet EPP purposes and to ensure administration procedures are clear and transparent. Candidates are informed of all assessment points and purposes in the TE Handbook and course syllabi. The assessment instructions are presented clearly and the role they play in candidate monitoring. The criterion for successful completion is clearly articulated.
Proprietary Instruments: Assessments are directly tied to standards, as demonstrated in the evidence (#5 Technical Packet). The EPP uses the STOT, a proprietary tool developed by NDACTE and is employed in the state's EPPs. The STOT includes the following: "This assessment is based on the 10 national standards of effective practice for new teachers (InTASC). Standards 1-3 address The Learner and

Learning. Standards 4-5 address Content Knowledge. Standards 6-8 address Instructional Practice. Standards 9-10 address Professional Responsibility." All 34 items reflect key characteristics of one of the 10 InTASC standards.
The STOT scoring indicators are precise and include evaluation levels of Underdeveloped, Emerging, Proficient, and Distinguished, each of which includes a description of behavior that meets the criterion for that score. The levels of descriptors are increasingly complex and sophisticated as they transition from Underdeveloped to Distinguished, reflecting skills more nuanced and developed, with behaviors that are observable and increasingly closer to an independent function in a classroom.
The EPP employs a Lesson Plan Rubric to evaluate candidate performance on each of the 10 InTASC, standards, following a Backwards Design process. This is clearly stated in the purpose and administrative instructions of the instrument (#4 LP Tech Pkt). Each rubric item is linked to an InTASC standard, and the evaluation of each item is clearly described as "Does not meet Standard," "Progressing toward Standard," "Fulfills Standard" or "Exceeds Standard." The rating descriptors become increasingly complex as they transition from "does not meet" to "exceeds," with behaviors in "Exceeds Standards" demonstrating advanced skills appropriate for independent classroom teaching.
Developed by ILAC, the Lesson Plan (LP) Assessment was analyzed for content validity using the Lawshe method. The ADA explained the faculty role as experts determining Content Validity. Faculty ranked adequate levels of content validity: essential, useful but not essential, or not necessary. Items with elevated levels of agreement were kept while those deemed "not necessary" were dropped. During the Fall 2018 Assessment Retreat, faculty received Inter-Rater Reliability training. There were two trials, and the ratings were sufficiently similar, especially with the second trial after group discussion (#2 Assm Retreat Mins).

In Spring and Fall 2020, a faculty training video including extended faculty was produced and viewed by completing the assessment to increase Inter-Rater Reliability. March 2021, training on all the key assessments was conducted during the Annual Assessment Retreat to improve consistency in implementation. The training video on this assessment was distributed and shared with all responsible faculty in Spring 2021 (#2 Assm Retreat Mins).

The second EPP-created Instrument is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), also based on the 10 InTASC standards and uses the same 4-point scoring mechanism. ILAC developed the TWS Assessment. The EPP analyzed the document for content validity using the Lawshe method during the annual Fall 2017 Assessment Retreat. The ADA for the EPP explained the faculty role as experts in determining content validity. Faculty ranked "essential, useful but not essential, or not necessary" for the revised TWS Assessment Rubric. In establishing content validity, ILAC retreat data to revise the assessment and full implementation began Spring 2018.

In Spring and Fall 2020, a faculty training video including extended faculty was produced and viewed by completing the assessment to increase Inter-Rater Reliability. March 2021, training on all the key assessments was conducted during the Annual Assessment Retreat to improve consistency in implementation. The training video on this assessment was distributed and shared with all responsible faculty in

Spring 2021. The training developed in these instruments provides another layer of quality assurance and rigor.

QAS relies on well-trained faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers to collect multiple types of data across various points in the specialization. This results in data that is based on observable skills and behavior, which can be carefully described and provide actionable feedback. Because each student receives evaluations and feedback from multiple faculty and supervisors, they can be confident in their performance, and the EPP can be confident in the quality of assessment of students. The most compelling evidence is the blend of proprietary assessment tools with the strong EPP created surveys and the strong processing systems structure. Per the assessments, the CAEP Criteria and required structures fit well within the CAEP Sufficient level. Data and outcomes reveal the strong structure and the reliability and validity as found in the appropriate section explanations.

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

Internal Stakeholders: Faculty, Advanced Assessment Committee, Advisors & Core Advisor(s) ADA, CEHD (College of Education and Human Development) Dean, University Assessment Committee, Academic Program Review within the Provost Office, and UND's Director of Assessment Dr. Tim Burrows,

External Stakeholders: ND State Board of Higher Education, Essential Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) Director Dr. Rebecca Pitkin, Teachers and School Personnel, Evaluating Committee (TSPEC), Teacher Talk, University Supervisors, and Alumni.

This EPP is affiliated with two groups considered to be Internal and External Stakeholders. Process and structure of the candidate preparation is important to the unit as the Assessment Conceptual Framework describes through the Quality Assurance System, foundation for the framework (#79 Assmt Cncptl Frmwk). The design represents the various entities engaging in the EPP's structure and at the core the Stakeholders are an integral component in the process. Multiple entities constitute various roles represented within each.

Many of the Stakeholder processes are considered standard operating procedures. One question posed this spring to our Stakeholders was "how could we differently structure our meetings and processes to contribute toward a Value-Added component- something we are missing or not getting." This is an important aspect given the request for deepening our efforts and examining opportunities for change that will benefit the input from Stakeholders. With multiple yearly meetings, all matters emerging from the EPP are shared with other entities within the college and university, teachers from the schools, with members of TSPEC, and members of the community with whom we hold partnership agreements. Sharing with TSPEC consist of updates and upcoming events and priority pieces from CAEP, updates and/or changes regarding State Board, requests for support and consideration of how to improve data collection, etc., (#27 TSPEC tech Pkt; #28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt; #32 Aff Agrmnts). One such example is the request at Teacher Talk about how to get more information regarding new teachers and their P12 impact. Several teachers and university supervisors suggested utilized work generated by the teacher's students, which was great. Another suggested utilizing feedback from the principal. After more inquiry from other CAEP accredited institutions, Principal evaluation was indeed a

good starting point.

Internal stakeholders hold first point of contact, but communication with external partners produces brainstorming that is shared and important to improvement and eliminates narrow thinking. This pattern is not defined by time although changes occur and are continuously being considered, it still takes the combination of the two entities to finalize official change. Twice a year, there are meetings that include Teachers and a community collection of local and distant partners (#28 TeachTalk Tech Pkt). During such meetings, announcements and information are shared, questions asked, and often a "digging into a situation" requiring insightful feedback either from the TE perspective or from a P12 perspective.

Stakeholders often contribute ideas and when it comes to making final decisions, TSPEC has the important vote. This EPP gathers data, explains the perspectives, requests feedback, and seeks counsel, but the bottom line remains what is best is weighted by TSPEC at the end of the day. Our Internal and External Stakeholders truly do want to be a strong and notable part of our quality assurance system. Whether it is offering a physical presence at a local event to visit and talk with faculty and students, School officials know it is important to share and listen. To be heard at the initial point where decisions are made and served in the capacity to help is more important than a rubber stamp at the end of the day.

TSPEC and their role in addition to the relationships built over the years provide strong and insightful decision making and input. This EPP depends upon strong collaborations with partners and school affiliates to have a strong specialization. The EPP would not be the entity it is without this prized connectivity. Often TSPEC and Extended Faculty provide outside perspective that is needed when the vision becomes narrowed, or choices seem few. This EPP understood long ago Value Added was not simply having a great relationship, but building, collaborating, and innovating results in evidence moving schools and our EPP forward. One of the greatest outcomes of this relationship is the idea of forging a Lab School together (#60 Recruitment). While Covid put this on pause, we are re-engaging in conversations and plans to make this a key element in this region: a different and more exciting educational approach: innovating, problem solving, collaborating, inquiry and data driven decision making resulting in the creation of a unique educational experience that only begins with trust and strong collegial relationships.

R5.4 Continuous Improvement:
Our candidates do well as verified in data triangulation collected via our assessment tools (#4 LP Tech Pkt; #5 STOT Tech Pkt; #6 TWS Techn Pkt; #14 Initi Prg Disp Tech Pkt). Yet, we can do better. CEHD/EPP is one of the last Legacy Institutions to move from NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) to CAEP (#64 NCATE 2015). We were doing okay in 2015 with room to address needed changes, many of which are now in place, demonstrating measurable improvement. With CAEP and our EPP evolving, there were specific areas we find easy to address which other require greater time to adapt for the betterment.
The greatest technical improvement is shifting from the Livetext of Watermark to the Student Learning and Licensure (SLL). The illustration of moving from a Dinosaur to a Spaceship seems to be appropriate. Based upon specified standard criterion, the

software now provides finite information especially relevant to student data: disaggregation of gender, diversity, rural and first-generation. This remains one of our most marked points of transitioning and improving as an EPP.

Another important aspect is the connectivity and understanding of how assessment fits in multiple spaces and all critical to accreditation. A telling example: One Science Methods report (ESPB- Licensure Report) is generated by a Secondary Science professor given accreditation year. Parts of this report are included in the Annual Assessment Report required through the University regional accreditor HLC (Higher Learning Commission); Provost office requires parts of this report in the Academic Program Review Report which is shared with the ND State HE Board; and of the same report, components are also included in the evidence of State reports (Program Reporting) for the CAEP submission. Thus, Continuous Improvement is critical to each part of the assessment puzzle so the entire picture can be accurately captured.

In this EPP, tracking modification processes or adapting specific tools, or even refining policies must pass through committees, and other entities. In the process of concept determination, once a decision is made, then changes move through the structural system. The Committee brings the concept through CourseLeaf given curricular changes (college and university) and on to university/state board if required. Of note, when traveling through the U system, certain approvals are required which can extend from another department to ESPB. It is customary practice to always have approvals to eliminate questions. Therefore, there are many checks and balances in the structure to support sound quality practices and processes.

Over the last two years, ILAC has taken a focused review of the Child study assessment and its purpose. The original design was to collect data through an interview of an adolescent or child to evaluate the candidate's understanding and knowledge of child/adolescent development. Given additional variations, interviewing international students became a means of integrating diverse perspectives into this experience. It became more about the international perspective rather than the intended focus of child development. From multiple perspectives, if the interview were completed properly, an international student could be an ideal interviewee. It was argued that in some instances language barriers were too great to gather clear data. And it was not unusual for candidates to return sharing information about an international student spending part of their childhood in a refugee camp. While the refugee camp was not the issue there emerged more questions relative to the refugee camp. The loss of focus created a lack of information regarding child development and more information on the processes of transitioning from a refugee camp and coming the United States. There was a mixed reaction as some Committee members thought this should still take place and others not so (#81 ILAC Mnts). The question of validity was paramount. Therefore, because the quality and reliability of the data was questionable, it was determined to have a closer look at the purpose. This will be resolved this coming fall as none of this data was reported given the issue of validity. This example provides evidence of how important it is to consider data outcomes and meet the standards criteria and more importantly how reliability and validity are maintained.

The EPP has a specific structure designed to account for each assessment within and across specializations in Watermark and in Qualtrics (#52 Init Assmt Plan). The data assessment coordinator monitors the collection and faculty from all specialization areas contribute to the analyses, interpretation, and use of information as decisions

are made to improve and address EPP challenges. More recently because of a state legislative mandate, faculty in Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle, and Secondary specializations were determining how to address the integration of Reading in the Content (#82 Rdg Cnt). While Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading already required this course, the Middle/Secondary specializations were required to decide what would work best to meet this new state requirement.
The above child/adolescent example, case in point, illustrates what is termed regular and systematic data driven changes (#3 CS Tech Pkt). The Assessment Committee will revisit this topic because of the mixed interpretation of the tool and its findings. Having another meeting to review this and discuss matters with faculty provides opportunities for greater insight and opportunities for changes....and all for the better.
One of the key elements of specializations making data driven decisions are the Action Plans outlining future intended outcomes (#53 Action Plans). These remain a strong piece in making significant changes. Each specialization can adapt or modify their specializations based upon informed data decisions. This informed decision-making results in positive and innovative changes not just for one specialization, but the entire EPP.

Standard R.A.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 #1 Disag Trans PhaseIn.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.2 Data Quality

2 #2 Assm Retreat Mins.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.2 Data Quality

3 #18 Adv ESPB.pdf

RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

4 #19 Adv Assmt Plan.xlsx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.2 Data Quality
RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

5 #20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

6 #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

7 #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

RA.5.2 Data Quality
RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

8 #23 Adv Disp Data.xlsx

RA.5.2 Data Quality

9 #24 Adv Resrch Data.xlsx

RA.5.2 Data Quality

10 #27 TSPEC Tech Pkt.pdf

RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

11 #32 Aff Agrmts.pdf

RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

12 #51 Adv Std Hndbks.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

13 #53 Action Plans.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.2 Data Quality

14 #64 NCATE 2015.pdf

RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

15 #67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

16 #68 Adv Alumni Survey.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

17 #69 AdvCompleterSrvy.docx

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

18 #76 Watermark Info.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System
RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement

19 #77 Comm Grad Schl.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

20 #78 AAC Mnts.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

21 #79 Assmt Cncptl Frmwk.pdf

RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

22 #83 QAS Data Dates.pdf

RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard RA5 Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement
RA5.1 Quality Assurance System
The EPP has a robust Quality Assurance System (QAS) that relies on valid and reliable assessments, personnel, policy and procedures, and current software to ensure quality control and continuous improvement (#83 QAS Data Dates). Based upon the EPP's belief in candidate-centered constructivist experiential education and joined by various state entities, local districts, external stakeholders, and our P-12 educational partners, the EPP has a long legacy of procedures and practices lending to the recognition of quality and assurances found throughout the entirety of the programs. With the assistance of faculty, the EPP collects artifacts and makes observations at transition points or phases in the candidate's program of study (i.e., program entry, mid-program, and end of program). These artifacts and observations are rigorously assessed using rubrics, disposition forms, and surveys. Data from the assessments and disposition forms are submitted by the candidates into Watermark where program faculty assess them. The Graduate Assessment Coordinator monitors the process. The EPP has transitioned from the use of self-maintained documents to utilizing Watermark Licensure and Student Planning software, hereinafter referred to as Watermark (#76 Watermark Info). Currently, Watermark enables the EPP to store and monitor the data effectively. Furthermore, specific employer and completer surveys are obtained through Qualtrics which the Graduate Assessment Coordinator manages (#67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt; #69 AdvCompleterSrvy). The Graduate Assessment Coordinator is completing a PhD and has extensive experience in conducting statistical analyses. Additionally, Watermark supports the EPP in obtaining disaggregated and aggregated reports that inform a) candidate admission, advisement and retention, b) specialization area, and c) EPP unit improvement. Disaggregated reports can now be run based on candidate, enrollment, program, and gender. Data is not currently disaggregated by race/ethnicity, rural/urban, or First-Generation College Student, but the EPP presents a transition plan in place of disaggregating such data as associated with assessments to address potential disparities moving forward (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn).
The EPP monitors candidate progress throughout the program on an annual basis engaging in continuous unit improvement. Therefore, the EPP-created assessment measures employed at specific points in the program clearly assess candidates' growing preparedness and program quality across time (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt; #67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt; #68 Adv Alumni Survey). The selection of measures was made based upon a developmental approach, which includes monitoring candidate performance at the beginning, continued professional development throughout the program, at key points, and at the conclusion using Clinical Experience Portfolio at the time of graduation (#19 Adv Assmt Plan). The Alumni survey given to our candidates addresses the effectiveness of the program one year post graduation within the

workplace.
Assessment and quality assurance continues as candidates prepare to apply for Graduate School and graduate programs. During the graduate program, all applicants are evaluated at multiple stages. It should be highlighted: there are five different discipline programs utilizing the same assessment tools and because of tremendous collaboration a 100% consensus was reached in the effort of the development of assessments flexible enough to be used across disciplines. Phase 1 requires Admission to the School of Graduate Studies and the EPP. Early to mid-program a Disposition evaluation is conducted and is completed by faculty. Phase 2 (mid-program) includes coursework and the Research Project. Moving into Phase 3, Disposition 2 assessment is completed at the conclusion of the Capstone Clinical Experience. Leaders from each discipline, Reading, TESOL, Special Education, Educational Leadership, and School Counseling engaged in significant collaboration to develop the system to reflect the requisite skills aligned to each specialization area. Following graduation, during the first year of employment, graduates/Alumni have an opportunity to provide feedback on the program through the Alumni Survey (#68 AdvAlumniSurvey). Although self-reported, this assessment tool gathers data that is quite important. This provides critical insight into alumni perceptions on their preparation for their advanced roles, and any areas identified as gaps; further informing the EPP's continuous improvement efforts. Another important assessment tool is the Employer Survey (#67 AdvEmpSrvyTechPkt) designed to garner employer feedback on the preparation of graduates for roles within P12 schools. This informs the EPP's decision making and revisions that may be needed structurally, timing for assessments, survey revisions, etc., The assessment system is intended to support growth and development in candidates enhancing their levels of expertise and specialization while simultaneously enriching quality in every phase of the program. Data collected by faculty and clinical internship supervisors are submitted in Watermark. The Graduate Assessment Coordinator runs descriptive statistics, disaggregates by specializations, and creates reports for use by the Assessment Committee, and all faculty during the Fall and Spring Assessment Retreats. While data is reviewed by specializations prior to the Assessment Retreats, this time set aside for facilitating discussions within and across discipline areas during the Assessment Retreat yields rich discussion in continuous improvement efforts. The outcomes associated are captured in Action Plans. These are developed to support continuous improvement for current and future candidates. At each Assessment Retreat, there is a different lens by which faculty engage with data. For example, the focus may be on Data Literacy, Diversity and Technology (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, p. 36), or closely examining the Exit Survey and Transition to Teaching Survey results to inform what steps would be developed for the Action Plans (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, p. 21). The foci are based on the data, and as determined by the Assessment Committee in conjunction with the Associate Dean of Assessment.
This system allows the EPP to determine areas in which candidates are and are not meeting expectations. It also allows the program faculty to identify and determine where assessments or learning activities need to be improved or strengthened. For example, the EPP uses a system known as "Starfish" where faculty are required to document candidate performance in each class at key points in the semester. The flags raised (Kudos/doing great, areas for improvement, referrals to university support systems) go to the candidates as well as the candidate's advisors for appropriate follow-up. These processes led to discussions across specializations of

apparent stress levels in graduate students throughout the pandemic which led to problem solving and ultimately discussion groups facilitated by the School of Graduate Studies in attempts to elicit feedback on the status of candidate mental health in order to provide supports to all candidates across the entire university over spring break about the focus groups designed to support Graduate Students who may be in need of support (#77 Comm Grad Schl).

The EPP uses this system in several critical Quality Assurance activities, including CAEP Annual Assessment reporting, Annual Assessment Retreats, Periodic Program Review, and continuing self-improvement discussions and actions at the specializations level, the Assessment Committee level, the department level, and the college level. As described more fully in our Compelling Evidence example below, this data is shared with all faculty in the EPP each Spring semester during the Spring Assessment Retreat. During that meeting, faculty discuss both program level and full-EPP data trends and develop plans for improvement. In addition to these full-faculty events, the Advanced Assessment Committee (AAC) meets routinely throughout the academic year and identifies focus areas based on candidate performance (#78 AAC Mnts). Advanced Committee meeting minutes provide strong evidence of these actions. Finally, the system is used to identify candidate concerns and to guide the responses to reported deficiencies in individual candidate performance (#51 Adv Std Hndbks).

Because of our comprehensive and inclusive Quality Assurance practices, all EPP faculty are well-versed in the processes of this system. Faculty also engage in regular interrater reliability training to ensure they are comfortable with the tools used to measure candidate progress (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, 11/2/18, p. 29 & 11/8/19, pp. 24-26). As noted above, the AAC routinely interacts with this data. The AAC consists of faculty from across the 5 specialization areas (Special Education, Reading, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Educational Leadership, and School Counseling) as well as the Associate Dean of Assessment. Importantly, all faculty participate in the Assessment Retreats. This is a point of pride for our EPP, as it demonstrates a culture of data driven decision making and the full commitment of the faculty to this process, rather than delegating assessment and quality assurance to a faculty sub-group.

During the Spring Assessment Retreat, the faculty in each specialization area generates a set of Action Plans resulting in potential changes which are subsequently evaluated the following year in both the Fall and Spring Assessment meetings. To exemplify the impact of this process, the EPP presents evidence (#2 Assm Retreat Mins, Spring 2021). Based on Action Plans, the faculty determine what was learned, what needed to change, who would assist with the changes, and from whom support would be sought in this process (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans). Various interpretations of outcomes would be discussed, and the decision would be to enhance the process and strengthen any action needed to support candidates, their learning, and/or the effectiveness of their effectiveness in promoting diverse P12 student growth. Once all elements are identified (who, why, when, and where), specific faculty are responsible for bringing this back to the disciplines for continued work and updating as the year progresses. At the Fall Retreat, there is a reporting of any programmatic updates based upon the Action Plans. If there are successes, the specializations celebrate, but if there were challenges, then brainstorming and problem solving with faculty from other specialization areas ensues to further strengthen the process, the programs, and the EPP unit.

R.5.2 Data Quality

Strengths and Weaknesses:

The Quality Assurance System (QAS) is generally functional for faculty, who can use it to answer a wide range of questions for each of the program areas within the EPP. This is due in large part to the high level of involvement by faculty in the QAS, which is reviewed annually through various assessment activities (described below). The QAS tracks students across multiple semesters, uses a variety of instruments and opportunities to provide triangulated measurement, and relies on data collection strategies and timing that are routine and standardized. In this way, real-time reports of student performance can be generated quickly and both individual and specialization level assessment questions can be addressed.

The QAS has two primary limitations, both of which are in the process of being revised and improved. The first is the limited ability to generate disaggregated data, particularly based on demographic characteristics. This is an effort that we are working to address disaggregation of data based on race/ethnicity (#1 Disag Trans PhaseIn). The second limitation is our low response rate for the Employer and Completer Survey, which limits our ability to determine how students overall are performing post-graduation or the challenges they may be encountering in their new roles.

The data collected through the QAS are of high quality on several standards. Relevance is determined by ensuring that appropriate measures have been selected or developed, and that they are used to measure performance that is central to the goals of the program. To demonstrate conceptual knowledge, we rely on assessments that address key skills related to the profession as well as GPA. To demonstrate conceptual knowledge, we rely on assessments that address key skills related to the profession implemented through the Clinical Portfolio (Internship), the Research Project, and Disposition evaluations. All provide evidence of the candidates' abilities to use their conceptual abilities in the P12 classroom and coursework. This multi-modal approach helps to ensure that the tools are measuring what is both intended for the QAS and relevant to teaching excellence.

To determine verifiability, the EPP relies on both inter-rater reliability and multi-method measurement. Each Fall, the EPP faculty both discusses and practices the skills of inter-rater reliability, to ensure that they are evaluating and responding to assessment data consistently. Faculty are trained in the Lawshe method, as well as how to use assessment rubrics, and faculty ratings in each area of performance are compared and analyzed to determine inter-rater reliability levels. A review of our program data tables indicates faculty inter-rater reliability is at acceptable levels (#2 Assm Retreat Mins). Verifiability is also demonstrated by using multiple methods of assessment to provide varying perspectives on individual student performance. More specifically, as the Advanced Survey assessments were created by the EPP, the AAC utilized the CAEP Evaluation Framework to determine sufficiency on EPP Created Assessments.

Representativeness is assured by collecting data at multiple points in the program, and by ensuring data is collected across all discipline areas. Our QAS includes a very thorough guide for data collection, which outlines the responsibilities for all faculty as well as support staff (#19 Adv Assmt Plan). This ensures that all faculty are collecting the appropriate data in each class, and that the data is subsequently captured through the Assessment Manager.

Data is collected on all candidates at several points across all specializations. This

enables the collection of cumulative data, reflecting both individual development and overall program performance.
Finally, the data is actionable as it leads to specific decision-making and changes in the EPP. This is verified every Spring, when the focus of the Assessment Retreat is on reviewing data for the preceding year and identifying areas for improvement. Each Retreat ends with an Action Plan based upon findings from the data (#2 Assm Retreat Mins; #53 Action Plans).
Assessments are carefully analyzed to ensure that they meet EPP purposes and to ensure that the administration procedures are clear and transparent. Candidates are informed of all assessment points and purposes in the discipline specific handbook and in course syllabi. The instructions for each assessment are presented clearly, and the role they play in candidate monitoring throughout their program and EPP continuous improvement efforts.
Each of the EPP-created assessments were developed by the AAC to align with CAEP standards and criteria using the Lawshe method for determining content validity and the applicability across specialization areas. The process is described in greater detail in the Technical Packets (Technical Packets: Disposition Assessment, Research Project Assessment, and Clinical Portfolio Assessment). Each technical packet includes information about the validation and inter-rater reliability process as well as efforts around continuous improvement. It is a source of pride and accomplishment to generate cross-specialization common assessments that are flexible enough for the different disciplines yet assess the common CAEP standards relative to candidate preparation.

The QAS relies on well-trained faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers to collect multiple types of data across various points in the program. This results in data that is based on observable skills and behavior, which can be carefully described and provide actionable feedback. Because every student received evaluation and feedback from multiple faculty and supervisors, they can be confident in their performance, and the EPP can be confident in the quality of assessment of students. The most compelling evidence is the blend of proprietary assessment tools with the strong EPP created surveys and the strong processing systems structure. Per the assessments, the CAEP Criteria and required structures fit well within the CAEP Sufficient level. Data and outcomes reveal the strong structure and the inter-rater reliability and validity as found in the appropriate technical packets.

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

Internal Stakeholders: Faculty, Initial Assessment Committee, Advanced Assessment Committee, Advisors & Core Advisor(s) Associate Dean of Assessment, CEHD Dean, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, University Assessment Committee, Academic Program Review, Dr. Karyn Plumm within the Provost Office, and UND's Director of Assessment, Dr. Tim Burrows,

External Stakeholders: ND State Board of Higher Education, Essential Standards and Practices Board (ESPB), Director Dr. Rebecca Pitkin, Teachers and School Personnel, Evaluating Committee (TSPEC), and Alumni.

This EPP is affiliated with two main groups considered to be the Internal and External

Stakeholders. The process and structure of the graduate preparation is important to the unit as described through the Quality Assurance System, foundation for the framework (#79 Assmt Cncptl Frmwk). The design represents various entities engaging in the unit's structure and at the core the Stakeholders are an integral component in the process. Multiple entities constitute roles represented within each. It is important to recognize entities in each category have distinct functions providing the Unit with a broader context of and for feedback.

Many of the Stakeholder processes have long been in place and are considered standard operating procedures. One question this year to our Stakeholders is "how we could differently structure our meetings and processes to contribute toward a Value-Added component"- something we are missing or not getting. This will be an important aspect given the request for deepening our efforts and examining opportunities for change that benefits the EPP. With multiple yearly meetings, all matters emerging from the EPP are shared with other entities within the college and university, educators/ principals from schools, with members of TSPEC, and members of the community with whom we hold partnership agreements. Sharing information with TSPEC consists of updates and upcoming events and priority pieces from CAEP, updates and/or changes regarding State Board, requests for support and consideration of how to improve data collection, etc. (#27 TSPEC Tech Pkt; #32 Aff Agrmts).

Internal stakeholders hold the first point of contact, but communication among external partners produces brainstorming opportunities critical to EPP improvement reducing narrowed thinking. Although this pattern is not defined by time changes occur and/or are continuously being considered, with a combination of the two entities to finalize official change. Often the graduate disciplines visit with the Dean of the Graduate School to ask questions, engage in a healthy debate, and share in decision making to contribute to mutually beneficial relationships with our P12 and community stakeholder groups. This astute feedback promotes different perspectives and enhances the process of moving forward a graduate need of our candidates.

Stakeholders often contribute ideas, but when it comes to determining decisions, TSPEC has the important vote. This EPP gathers data, explains the points, requests feedback, and seeks counsel as needed, but the bottom line, about what is best is shared in the collaborative decision making at the end of the day. Our Internal and External Stakeholders genuinely want to engage in and participate as a mutual affiliate and part of our quality assurance system. Whether it is offering a physical presence at a local event to visit and talk with faculty and students, school officials know it is important to contribute and listen. To be heard at the initial point where decisions are made and served in the capacity to help is more important than a rubber stamp at the end of the day (#79 Assmt Cncptl Frmwk).

The EPP depends upon the well-established, strong, collaborative relationships with our partners and school affiliates in maintaining a healthy unit predicated on continuous improvement efforts. The unit would not be the entity it is without this prized connectivity with external and internal partnerships. Often TSPEC provides the outside perspective that is needed when the vision narrows, or choices seem few. Value Added is very important to the Advanced Committee because these are

graduate candidates and unlike undergraduates many candidates already have jobs and understand the importance of relationships and partnerships.

A5.4 Continuous Improvement:

The EPP is committed to monitoring candidate progress throughout the entirety of the degree and engaging in continuous discipline and EPP improvement. Therefore, the unit selected multiple measures as described in the Technical Packets (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt). CEHD/EPP is one of the last Legacy Institutions to shift from NCATE to CAEP (2022) (#64 NCATE 2015). In reviewing the previous report, we were doing well and outlined future projections for change and evolution; many are now in place, demonstrating improvement. And, with the continued changes Associate Dean Combs and Associate Dean Walker initiated there remains a need to continue advancing in addition to the transitions and changes CAEP (the co-joining of TEAC and NCATE) is initiating and requiring. With the revised standards, the Advanced Committee continues changing, and lends influence upon the continued transitioning of this EPP. In specific areas and standards, the EPP adjusted in stride, but others are requiring greater time dedication to make it work for the better in the EPP.

While there is refinement and discussion of the choice tools, the greatest technical change deemed a tremendous improvement is shifting from the Livetext software of Watermark to the most current Student Learning and Licensure (SLL) (#76 Watermark Info). The illustration of moving from a Dinosaur to a Spaceship seems the best indicator of how clunky the old system was and the time it took to generate reports and disaggregate data. Now, based upon specified standard criterion, the new software provides finite information which is especially important. Without question, this desired outcome generated from the SLL provides the unfolding and dissecting of larger parts to drill down and analyze race, rural background, and first generation as associated with specific assessments. This is one of our most marked points of transition and certainly points of improvement.

The most important improvement evidence is the connectivity and understanding of "fitting" now understood by faculty. Additionally, the Provost office requires parts of this report in the Program Review Report (associated with Accreditation report) which is shared with the ND State Higher Education Board. And lastly, portions of this same report are included as evidence in State reports (Program Reporting) for the CAEP submission. What is then shared moves from the State and CAEP into CHEA and to DOE. Thus, Continuous Improvement is critical to each part of the puzzle so the entire picture can be accurately captured.

In this EPP, tracking any modification processes or adapting specific tools, or even refining policies must pass through the Advanced Committee. In the process of concept determination, once a decision is made, changes are addressed through the structural system. A change emerges from faculty, Advanced Committee reviews (process through to TSPEC), goes through the university system of approval, and on to state board if required. When transitioning through the university system, certain approvals are required which can extend from another department then to licensure board. It is customary practice to always have all partner approvals to eliminate questions and support the change. There are many checks and balances in the structure to support sound quality practices and processes.

Over the last three years, the AAC has moved mountains in obtaining strong, advanced discipline led degrees. The most compelling evidence possible for the EPP is

the directional change experienced two years before the current Associate Dean joined the Committee. Under the previous leadership, there was great discussion and interpretation about how to address different standards or follow a pathway. Unfortunately, it was determined about halfway through the process, this effort was not the right direction and faculty had to regroup. The Advanced Committee wrestled with information about not informing the disciplines, but the decision was made to change. After redirecting the process, improvement and processes were re-adjusted and supported in applying the evaluation tools to the CAEP EPP Created Assessments scale. The first order was to re-evaluate the assessment tools and the Committee worked to align standards and rubrics. Such work led to the current assessment documents (#20 Adv Resrch Tech Pkt; #21 Adv ClinExp Tech Pkt; #22 Adv Disp Tech Pkt). This year, Dr. Tim Burrows, University Director of Assessment, spent time reviewing all the rubrics (Rubrics and Surveys) and those suggestions are being integrated as one iteration in the fall term of 22.
The EPP has a specific structure designed to account for each discipline and assessment within that program collecting data across programs in the Watermark and in Qualtrics Surveys (#19 Adv Assmt Plan). The graduate assessment coordinator additionally monitors the collection and faculty from all disciplines contribute to the analyses, interpretation, and use of information as decisions are made to improve and address challenges in the EPP.
One of the key elements of Programs making data driven decisions are the Action Plans outlining future intended outcomes. These remain a strong hold in making important changes Each discipline can adapt or modify their programs based upon data. This informed decision-making results in positive and innovative changes not just for one program, but ultimately the entire EPP.

IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

Previous AFI(s)

(1) [NCATE STD4]Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with peers from diverse populations. [Both]

(2) [NCATE STD4]Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse populations. [Both]

(3) [NCATE STD4]Candidates in the Educational Leadership program are not guaranteed a field experience with diverse P-12 students. [ADV]

a. Statement of progress and supporting evidence for removing the AFI(s)

1 & 2: UND and CEHD Teacher Education specializations and our local Grand Forks School District continue efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and students. Our School district partner is experiencing an increased diversity population and has hired an Indigenous Liaison for the District. We currently work collaboratively to meet P12 student needs and focus on increasing our EPP candidate's experiences in the P12 schools. These new efforts open many doors and are providing more insight into developing cultural competencies of and for our candidates.

For our faculty, with new hires, our current demographic is more diverse as search committees focus on faculty from under-represented populations. These hires bring greater depth to our college and educational programs, as they assist students in

learning from and interacting with diverse faculty. With more intentionality, we are beginning to see change and while it is not "overwhelming" it is evident and encouraging. Additionally, working with UND Alumni Foundation, the college has created new scholarships for candidates from diverse backgrounds majoring in education and planning careers in PK-12 schools. We continue reaching out to community colleges through affiliation agreements to visit with student/advisors about processes to transfer credits and complete a bachelor's degree in Education. Through advising greater attention to removing barriers and highlighting cross listing of courses support transfer students entering TE. Lastly, our Indigenous Teacher Education program continues to grow, and we now have an Elementary and Early Childhood option. Students may choose furthering their Dakota and Lakota language while obtaining a degree in one of the two-degree programs. Therefore, as a priority we continue to recruit for our college from the Tribal Colleges.

3:Faculty directing the master's in educational leadership redesigned the entire curriculum. The attached ESPB report indicates the extensive changes from addressing standards to integrating new assessment tools to support candidate development and growth. The key change is the addition of a substantial field experience. A key feature includes Educational Leadership candidates participating in an internship at two different school settings with different student populations. As more data is gathered and analyzed, early indications highlight the success of the program changes in addition to tremendous growth in the graduate candidates.

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

1. #43 Diverse Clin Plcmnts.pdf
2. #88 EdL ESPB.pdf
3. #89 Fac Demo.pdf

State Standard(s) Evidence

Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)

1. #13 Init ESPB.pdf
2. #16 InTASC ESPB Rpt.docx
3. #17 InTASC ESPB Met.pdf
4. #18 Adv ESPB.pdf

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-Study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.