

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution:

Black Hills State University

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

For 125 years, Black Hills State University (BHSU) located in Spearfish, South Dakota, has been transforming the lives of students through innovative academic programs and a dynamic learning community. BHSU is a growing multipurpose university with nationally accredited degrees in education, business, and the arts and sciences. The South Dakota legislature established Black Hills State University as a liberal arts university to be governed by a Board of Regents. BHSU is the only multipurpose university located in western South Dakota and within a 200-mile radius of Spearfish. The mission established by the Board of Regents states that BHSU offers undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional education to promote excellence in teaching and learning, to support research, scholarly and creative activities, and to provide service to the state of South Dakota and the region. The vision of Black Hills State University is to be recognized as an innovative, high-quality university in the Black Hills region, the state, the nation, and the world. Core values of the university include scholarship, student-centeredness, educational excellence and life-long learning, integrity, inclusiveness, innovation and change.

Black Hills State University is organized into three colleges which include the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business and Technology, and the College of Education. The College of Education is the professional education unit at the university and it performs the key leadership role in governance and management of curriculum, instruction, and resources for the preparation of professional educators. The unit is responsible for the quality of all school personnel prepared at the institution regardless of whether the program is administratively located in the College of Education, one of the other colleges at BHSU, the library, or in P-12 schools. The College of Education monitors all pertinent student data for the unit, including applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality. The mission of the College of Education

is to prepare competent, confident, and caring professionals.

The unit offers initial certification in nineteen areas that include programs in elementary and secondary education. Each teaching program is aligned with the mission and conceptual framework of the unit, standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and professional standards from its designated Specialized Professional Association (SPA).

The unit also offers four advanced programs in the areas of Reading Specialist, Science Specialist, Math Specialist and Technology Facilitator. These programs are aligned with the mission and conceptual framework of the unit, standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and professional standards from the designated Specialized Professional Association (SPA).

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

South Dakota is an NCATE partnership state. Three national team members and two state team members conducted the review. One state consultant and one South Dakota Department of Education observer were non-voting members and present throughout the visit. The BOE team operated as a combined team, made a single recommendation for each standard, and wrote a single report.

There were no deviations from the state protocol.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

BHSU does not operate a branch campus or off-campus site. There are 129 candidates in undergraduate programs and 60 candidates in advanced programs on campus as cited in the 08-09 Title II report.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances affecting the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission of the College of Education (unit) is to prepare competent, confident, and caring professionals. Competent graduates demonstrate broad knowledge and apply research-based

instructional practices; they reflect and think critically to impact all students. Graduates exhibit confidence in their ability to positively affect student learning, behavior and motivation. Caring graduates establish relationships in an environment of mutual respect and rapport as evidenced by all students feeling valued and safe.

The mission is complemented by the unit vision, which is to be recognized for leadership, innovation, and high quality programs in the Black Hills region, the state, the nation, and the world.

The mission and vision are integrated into the following beliefs about teaching and learning:

Belief in learning communities in which members discuss, explore, and learn together;

Belief that teaching is an active and reflective process that links theory into practice;

Belief that all students can learn;

Belief in using multiple methods and strategies to promote learning for all;

Belief that learning is inquiry-based and a life-long process.

The mission and vision are linked to the university's core values of scholarship, student-centeredness, educational excellence and life-long learning. Scholarship includes research and creative activity to contribute knowledge and art to the general public; teaching by using relevant and cutting edge practices to prepare students for the future; and service by accepting leadership roles in society and making meaningful contributions to the profession.

The unit accepts the responsibility to treat each student with dignity and respect.

The value of excellence and lifelong learning includes reflection on performance, creativity, ingenuity, and continuous improvement.

The unit adheres to the values of integrity, inclusiveness, innovation and change.

The unit has adopted technology proficiencies for the undergraduate program and initial certification. The candidates develop knowledge and skill with technology and integrate technology into teaching.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The mission of the College of Education (CoE) at Black Hills State University (BHSU) is to prepare competent, caring, and confident professionals. The conceptual framework has been carefully monitored and updated since the previous NCATE visit as stakeholders have met over time to reflect upon the mission through a review of new research, new alignment with the university mission, and articulation of a set of beliefs about teaching and learning. Technology and diversity competencies have been updated and reflected throughout the curriculum.

BHSU's programs are approved by the South Dakota Department of Education (SDDoE). SDDoE

reviewed the programs in 2009 and all initial programs and the Reading Specialist advanced program are recognized as approved. In addition, the unit chose to undergo SPA program review for its K-12 physical education program by AAHPERD/NASPE. The K-12 Physical Education program is currently recognized with conditions. The Math Specialist, Science Specialist, and Technology Facilitator advanced programs were not required to undergo review as they are considered by SDDoE as endorsements. However, the unit has provided assessment data for the programs equal to data for the Reading Specialist advanced program.

An examination of Praxis II scores indicates that BHSU CoE candidates consistently score 100 percent passage. Also, new to the unit is the reporting of candidate performance by quartile rather than mean scores. An analysis of candidate scores over a three year period indicates that 27 percent of candidates score in the upper quartile, 58 percent of candidates score in the average range nationally, while 17 percent of candidates score in the lower quartile nationally. Moreover, the unit requires candidates in each initial teaching program to use the Major Field Test or a locally developed exit exam. Exit surveys, employer surveys, and graduate follow-up surveys over a three year period indicate that 96 percent of candidates perceive that they know their content area at the highest rated level.

In pedagogical content, besides 100 percent passage of candidates on the appropriate Praxis II PLT exam, clinical faculty rate 99 percent of candidates as outstanding or proficient in demonstrating their knowledge of how P-12 students learn. An analysis of Student Teacher Appraisal instrument data across 26 effective teacher indicators reveals that clinical faculty rate 97 percent of candidates as outstanding or proficient.

Within the advanced program and advanced endorsements, capstone clinical ratings indicate that 100 percent of program/endorsement completers earned ratings of distinguished or proficient on portfolio artifacts related to NBPTS propositions including content and pedagogy, use of research and reflective practice, and collaboration. Exit survey data indicates that program completers perceive that the programs have increased their specialized knowledge of content and assisted them in drawing upon educational research findings to facilitate reflection. Employer surveys reveal that advanced program completers have greatly increased their technology integration skills.

Within the Reading Specialist program for other school professionals, 100 percent of program completers earned distinguished or proficient ratings on portfolio artifacts related to commitment to student learning and managing and monitoring student learning. In addition, over a three year period, 93 percent of Reading Specialist program completers scored 80 percent or above on rubric elements related to using assessment data to design and deliver effective interventions.

Within the competent, caring, and confident educator conceptual framework, the unit has included a number of professional dispositions related to the conceptual framework. These include conduct, competence in inspiring self-directed learning, confidence, and caring which includes dispositions of fairness and a belief that all students can learn. Over the past two years, clinical faculty has rated 97 percent of program completers as demonstrating desired dispositions consistently or most of the time.

Since the last visit, the unit has worked to improve its assessment of candidates and has strengthened candidate performance in technology integration, working with diverse populations, implementing the one-year residency model, and implementing the Teacher Work Sample, developed and field tested by the Renaissance Group. At the advanced level, improvements have been made in the assessment system, the implementation of consistent clinical experiences across advanced programs, and enhancing field experiences with diverse learners.

The onsite team reviewed the IR Addendum developed from questions raised by the offsite team and

verified the information contained therein by interviews, observations, and discussions with multiple stakeholders including unit faculty, support staff, students, candidates at the initial and advanced level, principals, superintendents, and cooperating teachers.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Continuous improvement is documented by many of the initiatives discussed above. Cooperation between the College of Arts and Sciences and College of Education (CoE) can be seen in continuing Praxis II test scores at the 100% passage level as well as in joint strategic planning activities, assessment initiatives in secondary programs, advanced programs, and methods classes. The collegiality and sharing within the CoE faculty in the strategic planning initiatives, the multiple grants which have been awarded to the unit and used for faculty technology training, the special education faculty initiative, the online learning initiative, and the math-science candidate marketing initiative demonstrate the capacity building exercises which the unit has developed to ensure continuous improvement.

Along with the unit's strategic planning activities, the unit has refined its conceptual framework to include new dispositional statements which support the competent, caring, and confident teacher candidate. Various committees have been developed which have met over time to discuss and resolve issues concerning the CoE mission, the development and implementation of a strategic plan, the progress of candidates at each transition point from admission to exit and follow-up at the first and third year of teaching.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

While Standard 1 is not listed by the institution as moving toward the Target Level, the evidence cited above and provided in the Institutional Report confirms much movement toward the Target level.

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Because of the Area for Improvement reported in Standard 5 during their 2003 visit, the unit and its leadership have spent considerable time and effort in improving the collegiality and collaboration between the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences. This is verified through anecdotal conversations between unit and Arts and Sciences faculty as well as objective evidence in the form of program reports developed from SPA standards for each program area, improvements in secondary and advanced program assessment activities and data reporting, and collaboration in the teaching and development of specific methods courses.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFI's reported	

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFI's remain	

1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has made substantial progress in improving its assessment system as it has moved Standard 2 toward the Target level. The College of Education (COE) Assessment System Handbook, written in 2009, provides in-depth descriptions of the assessment system, data collection, data analysis, and instrument reliability and validity studies, as well as discussion concerning the development of instruments that are free of bias. The Handbook articulates how the unit conceptual framework aligns to state and national standards as assessed by rubrics developed to monitor student dispositions within the clinical setting.

In 2007, the unit created a structure to enhance the direct involvement of its faculty members, university administrators from all three colleges, and members of the professional community in the assessment process. Professional stakeholders comprising the College of Education Advisory Council review assessment data annually in order to recommend possible changes to enhance the effectiveness of the assessment system. Other committees, such as the Field Experience Governance Committee, meet regularly to advise the Director of Field Experiences regarding processes related to field experiences, clinical practices, and progress of the transition to the one-year residency model.

The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of data collected through assessments to make modifications related to changes in assessment technology and professional standards. A Teacher Work Sample developed by the Renaissance Group has been added to the clinical component of initial programs to ensure assessments that are free from bias. Members of the Assessment Committee regularly compare results of the Teacher Work Sample with established assessments such as the PRAXIS, PLT, and GPA to ensure reliability and validity among measures. Inter-rater reliability testing also ensures that the Teacher Work Sample measures student progress reliably.

Decisions regarding candidate performance are based on multiple assessments completed at multiple points during the program collected internally and externally. Transition points and the corresponding assessments highlighted in the COE Assessment Handbook provide the framework by which accurate

assessment of student progress is made. Follow-up surveys provide evidence of candidates' success following graduation.

The unit has developed a separate database system to collect assessment data on candidate performance. One major change in the collection of assessment data is the use of frequency counts by quartile of national-test takers, rather than mean data, in order to make better comparisons of candidates to state and national groups

The unit's conceptual framework has been thoroughly reviewed with the research into the competent, caring, and confident professional being updated. An emphasis on the clinical nature of reflective practice is evident in instruments, curriculum, and programs based upon data found in specific exhibits.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has made substantial progress in improving its assessment system as it has moved Standard 2 to the Target level. The COE Assessment System Handbook, written in 2009, provides in-depth descriptions of the assessment system, data collection, data analysis, and instrument reliability and validity studies, as well as discussion concerning the development of instruments that are free of bias.

In 2007 the unit created a structure to enhance the direct involvement of its faculty members, university administrators from all three colleges, and members of the professional community in the assessment process. A Teacher Work Sample developed by the Renaissance Group has been added to the clinical component of initial programs to ensure assessments that are free from bias.

The unit has developed a separate database system to collect assessment data on candidate performance. The unit's conceptual framework has been thoroughly reviewed with the research into the competent, caring, and confident professional being updated.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of data collected through assessments to make modifications related to changes in assessment technology and professional standards. A Teacher Work Sample developed by the Renaissance Group has been added to the clinical component of initial programs to ensure assessments that are free from bias.

Decisions regarding candidate performance are based on multiple assessments completed at multiple points during the program collected internally and externally. In 2007 the unit created a structure to enhance the direct involvement of its faculty members, university administrators from all three colleges, and members of the professional community in the assessment process.

The unit has developed a separate database system to collect assessment data on candidate performance. The unit's conceptual framework has been thoroughly reviewed with the research into the competent, caring, and confident professional being updated.

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The COE Assessment System Handbook, written in 2009, provides in-depth descriptions of the assessment system, data collection, data analysis, and instrument reliability and validity studies, as well as discussion concerning the development of instruments that are free of bias.

The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of data collected through assessments to make modifications related to changes in assessment technology and professional standards. A Teacher Work Sample developed by the Renaissance Group has been added to the clinical component of initial programs to ensure assessments that are free from bias.

A Teacher Work Sample developed by the Renaissance Group has been added to the clinical component of initial programs to ensure assessments that are free from bias.

The unit has developed a separate database system to collect assessment data on candidate performance. The unit's conceptual framework has been thoroughly reviewed with the research into the competent, caring, and confident professional being updated.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not systematically aggregate and analyze data for program improvement.	The unit systematically aggregates, disaggregates, and analyzes data for program improvement. Data is broken out by specific program and by off-campus and distance delivery, analyzed through a systematic approach by stakeholders, and utilized to inform program decisions, including curriculum and clinical practice.

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented in the Institutional Report, observations made by the onsite review team, and interviews with unit faculty, clinical faculty and candidates support the fact that the unit puts forth effort to design, implement and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice. The unit has established and maintained partnerships with its primary stakeholders to design, implement and evaluate an effective program for field experience and clinical practice. Field and clinical experiences are designed through the collaboration of unit faculty, clinical faculty and requests from candidates. The unit has numerous partnerships with neighboring schools districts.

The design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice are articulated and appropriate. In the first field experience, candidates observe teaching and learning for over 40 hours in two different schools, with at least one offering a diverse setting. In the second experience, candidates work directly with students and plan and implement at least three lessons. In the final placement, candidates take on responsibility for teaching and learning, or co-teaching. All final placements are approved by the director of field experiences. In the final placement some initial candidates complete a 1 year residency in a professional development school (PDS). The unit works with five districts in PDS partnerships. Those candidates not enrolled in the 1 year residency complete the same amount of hours in a clinical practicum in other partner schools. At the advanced level, candidates are already hard at work in schools as professionals but when the need arises mentors and BHSU faculty provide other opportunities for experiences. Also at the advanced level, candidates conduct an action research field experience and work collaboratively with BHSU graduate faculty and clinical mentors.

Once initial candidates have met program requirements for entrance into the field experience or clinical practice program, the director of field experiences becomes responsible for candidate placements. After reviewing candidates' transcripts, the director of field experiences, with input from the unit faculty, clinical faculty and the candidate, coordinates the placement of all candidates. Each placement is recorded and reviewed prior to the next placement to ensure that candidates will have experiences with students from diverse backgrounds. The unit shared this system with the onsite team and it was verified through interviews.

The unit ensures that each candidate is placed under the supervision of a properly trained clinical faculty member and university supervisor. Criteria for clinical faculty are a minimum of three years of successful teaching experience, teaching assignment in their area(s) of certification, demonstrated commitment to best instructional practices, and identification as excellent teachers in the school district. To also prepare clinical faculty for working with a candidate, the unit schedules meetings, provides a handbook and is available via email or phone for any support needed. The unit continues to provide support through site visits, continuous communication (email or phone) and conferences with all three parties. This was verified by interviews with clinical faculty, BHSU faculty and candidates, examination of all the documents cited above and observed during visits to the P-12 schools.

At both initial and advanced levels, field experiences are evaluated by all involved: candidates (perform both self-assessments and assessments of university faculty and clinical faculty), clinical faculty, and university supervisors (mentors at the graduate level). The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is the tool used to assess candidate proficiencies upon completion of the program by an initial candidate. Two TWSs are completed by each candidate. The onsite visit provided an opportunity for examination and review of evaluation data and TWSs with the rubrics.

There are specific entry and exit criteria as well as transition points for candidates throughout their programs at the initial and advanced levels. This is verified through interviews with the unit's faculty and the candidates. BHSU aligns its program with INTASC standards as well as national SPA standards and state standards.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has continued to assess its field experiences and clinical practicum and make changes as needed. One major change is the movement towards a one-year residency as a final placement for the candidates in the initial elementary education program. The unit intends to continue to expand this one-year residency experience to other initial programs as well (secondary and P-12 candidates).

Since the last visit the unit has redefined the conceptual framework. The mission is to develop competent, caring and confident professionals. Interviews with candidates verified that the clinical faculty models these characteristics. The clinical faculty also verified in interviews that candidates from BHSU possess these.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The unit has moved to the target level in Standard 3. Most notable is the unit's collaboration with clinical faculty at the PDS sites. BHSU faculty members provide professional development to clinical faculty geared towards the public schools' improvement plans. The unit faculty, clinical faculty and candidates study together in this design. The unit and clinical faculty exchange areas of expertise, and this benefits the candidates as well as the P-12 student population.

If a candidate's final placement is in a PDS site, they are truly part of that school and its community. From day one, candidates interact and are teachers involved with families and administrators. They are treated as members of the clinical faculty.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

At both levels, candidates must meet entry and exit criteria. The requirements at these transition points for the initial candidates are admission to the program, admission to student teaching and program exit. If any concerns arise at this point the director of field placement has a conversation with the candidate. If the concerns persist a Plan of Assistance (POA) is designed with the candidate. This is a written document that must be created with the candidate and university faculty. If the plan is not followed and the prescribed results are not demonstrated, a candidate can be removed from the program through a process by the Professional Progress Committee.

The Professional Development Schools (PDSs) are a strength. This partnership between all stakeholders is clear and consistent. As candidates progress through their final placements, a co-teaching model is developed. This replaces the former 'take-over' time a candidate may have had in the past.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
There are none to remove.	

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has made continuous efforts to ensure that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to facilitate learning by all students. This is stated in the unit's conceptual framework. The unit has developed assessments for measuring proficiencies related to diversity such as the Proficiencies Initial Awareness Level, Proficiencies Initial Acceptance Level and Proficiencies Initial Affirmation Levels. A review of syllabi and the diversity curriculum organizational map shows how diversity is embedded in coursework. Specific assignments include contextual information and learning environment reports, lesson plans and a diversity research paper. Interviews with unit faculty, clinical faculty and candidates further reiterate the commitment to that idea that all students can learn.

Initial candidates are assessed for diversity proficiencies at three levels at three transition points. These levels are awareness, acceptance and affirmation. Candidates can be brought to the Professional Progress Committee if there are concerns. Advanced candidates are assessed for these proficiencies upon admission to the program.

Survey data show that alumni confidence in feeling prepared to appreciate and work with diverse student populations has increased with 100 percent of 2009-2010 alumni rating themselves at a high level. Similar survey data on ratings of the candidates and their abilities to work with all learners by employers, clinical faculty and university supervisors are also increased (some also up to 100 percent).

Evidence collected and examined by the onsite team confirmed that faculty demographics include males and females, and faculty is made up of white, non-Hispanics as well as two American Indian/ Alaskan Native and one Asian/ Pacific Islander. Many of the unit's faculty members have worked with diverse

student populations. A chart lists university faculty experiences working with diverse learners. This chart shows a vast amount of international, urban and rural settings.

BHSU's president has created a new committee, the Equal Education/ Employment Opportunities Committee. This committee advises the affirmative action officer and the president about equal education/ employment opportunities. Interviews and data collected by the onsite team from the human resource professional at BHSU clearly indicate the unit's good faith efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty.

The onsite team examined and confirmed that there is diversity among the candidates in the initial and advanced programs. Males and females are represented as well as candidates from low socio-economic status. More than one ethnic/racial group is represented and candidates are afforded experiences to work with one another.

The unit shows its commitment to providing candidates opportunities to interact with peers from culturally and racially diverse groups through their partnerships with organizations and events on campus. Some of these are the holiday project involving the Lakota Omniciye Student Organization and Out in the Silence program for GLBT students, the Holidays on Campus program and Mix-It-Up day (all three sponsored by the multicultural committee).

Visits to P -12 schools reveal the demographics of the P – 12 students in the settings where candidates are placed. Field and clinical experiences offers candidates experience with students from diverse populations. Data collected by the unit and examined by the onsite team is evidence of the low socio-economic status in some of the partner schools and PDS sites and that Native American, Hispanic and African-American students attend schools where candidates are placed for field experiences and clinical practice. This design is to expose candidates to issues of cultural and individual diversity. The field experiences office and unit faculty have worked to expand the number of PDS sites based on the schools capacity to offer experiences working with diverse P – 12 students.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The recruiting efforts for diverse faculty when openings occur indicate that the unit is continuously improving. Moreover, the unit has worked diligently to provide multicultural activities to its campus constituents and has selected PDS sites carefully in order to ensure that candidates are exposed to diverse socioeconomic and ethnic populations.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Evidence cited above and information provided in the Institutional Report confirms diversity is an area in which the unit is moving towards the Target level.

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

N/A

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from culturally and racially diverse groups.	Data was provided to show that candidates have opportunities to interact with faculty who represent three different ethnic/racial groups in the unit.
2. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with peers from culturally and racially diverse groups.	Candidates have opportunities to engage with candidates from low socio-economic status as well as candidates from two different ethnic/racial groups.

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Interviews and examination of electronic artifacts reveal that the professional education faculty in the unit is well qualified for their teaching assignments and other responsibilities. There are 32 full-time tenure track and term faculty, 9 full-time BHSU faculty who are part-time in the unit, and 17 adjunct faculty. All full-time tenure track faculty have doctorates or terminal degrees in their fields. All full-time non-tenure track faculty have doctorates or master's degrees. A review of course syllabi and other artifacts reveals a consistent presence of the conceptual framework throughout various courses. The review also supports the unit's commitment to diversity and technology.

Clinical faculty also have experience as K-12 teachers or administrators. Clinical faculty have experience in the K-12 setting at the levels they supervise. Professional Development School clinical faculty have certification and at least 3 years of experience in the content area and grade level in which

they supervise. Methods faculty have current or past certifications in the fields in which they teach and supervise.

Unit faculty have extensive content knowledge and they model best professional practices in teaching. They employ an array of instructional strategies and assessments including cooperative learning, small and large group instruction, direct instruction, role playing, videotaping, reflective writing, and instruction through distance technology. They integrate technology and diversity throughout their teaching.

Full-time faculty members in the institution are engaged in scholarly or creative activity. Faculty vitae list scholarship activities such as grant writing, book reviews, participation in professional conferences, and various publications. They conduct research for the state through grant-funded investigations of educational issues of concern to the state. They conduct research on their own teaching practices.

Faculty work with students to involve them in research. Undergraduate students have completed award winning research projects and presented their research at state and national conferences. Faculty engage graduate students in collaborative research projects that result in submissions for publication. These scholarly efforts were wide spread among the faculty. It was not isolated to the work of only one or two faculty members. It also represents consistent effort over a number of years.

Artifacts reveal that unit faculty are involved in service to the school community in a useful fashion. There were many examples cited in the individual faculty vita. Faculty vitae provide evidence that professors are collaborating with P-12 schools. Collaboration with other college units to improve teaching is evident.

According to exhibit documents, faculty are evaluated using multiple assessments. The tenure and promotion process involves faculty self-assessment, as well as annual reviews of faculty work by chairs. Faculty are also evaluated by candidates; these assessments are included in faculty assessment evaluations. This is consistent with the South Dakota Board of Regents requirements, and the COHE-BOR collective bargaining agreement that all tenured, tenure track, and term full and part-time faculty participate in annual Professional Staff Evaluations. The summary of faculty performance ratings demonstrates that faculty perform exceptionally well on the evaluations. The tenure and promotion policies are well defined and readily available. Adjunct faculty members are also evaluated. Faculty provided examples of adjuncts that were not renewed because of poor evaluations.

Unit faculty members are supported with opportunities for professional development. The unit also provides training and support for the online teachers. Instructional design staff are available to help with course development and online teaching. Travel funds are available to attend and present at professional conferences. Instructional improvement Grants and Faculty Research Grants provide additional funding sources for professional development activities. This was verified by interviews with faculty and administrators.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last visit, the unit has hired new faculty to support the No Child Left Behind legislation in reading, math, and science to support initiatives in these areas. Grant funded projects (SELECT and DAKOTA ASSETS) have resulted in the need for additional faculty.

The unit's decision to move to the one year residency model and the use of the Teacher Work Sample has resulted in professional development for professional and clinical faculty.

The increased emphasis on faculty and undergraduate student research overload assignments for tenured

and tenure track faculty have been eliminated.

The unit has greatly expanded its interactions and collaborations with the various departments. The President has a strong belief that teacher preparation is an all-campus responsibility.

BHSU is now a member of the Renaissance Group which is committed to strong collaborations with unit and arts and sciences faculty in the preparation of teachers. Since the 2003 visit, the unit has created a unit Advisory Council which include representation from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business, created a unit Accreditation Committee that include representation from each college that contributes to secondary teacher licensure, created a program coordinator to facilitate advising, write program reports, write assessment reports, and facilitate changes based upon assessment results.

The unit assessment coordinator position has been created to provide support to faculty members in all campus departments charged with preparing SPA and program assessment reports. An annual assessment retreat is hosted by the unit which includes deans, department chairs and program report writers from each college and department involved in teacher preparation.

A collaborative advising system has been developed for secondary education candidates being assigned an advisor from their content major and an additional advisor from the unit. These structural changes have supported improved communication, cross college research and publications, sharing of pedagogy, and program modification.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

While Standard 5 is not listed by the institution as meeting the Target Level, the evidence cited above and provided in the Institutional Report confirms movement toward the Target level.

5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

N/A

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Limited collaboration between education faculty and arts and sciences faculty leads to inconsistent advisement of candidates.	Limited collaboration between education and arts and sciences faculty has been addressed. Clear roles for the academic and the unit faculty advisement have been established. This new dual system of advisement for candidates leads to consistent advisement of candidates.

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not

been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The dean of the College of Education serves as the unit head and is given the authority to make decisions within the unit. She is responsible as well for the teacher education programs university-wide, including programs outside the College of Education. There is a well-developed organizational chart and description of the unit and university governance system. Chairs, directors, and coordinators report to the dean and manage unit operations including budget, faculty and staff, and facilities. A Teacher Education Advisory Council has been developed with unit leadership and P-12 leadership involved in advising the dean on teacher education matters. A Mission and Strategic Planning committee has created a strategic plan with faculty input to address challenges and to use opportunities to provide the best education for students in teaching, wellness, outdoor education, and library programs planning.

The small size of the unit allows for more informal interaction among program coordinators and department chairs. Chairs, coordinators, and deans work together on specific initiatives like the science and math initiative and for purposes of strategic planning. Chairs and the assessment coordinator work together to discuss and use data to ensure ongoing assessment for programmatic change.

There is a Teacher Education Handbook which clearly delineates the responsibilities of individuals and describes unit operations and processes. In addition, academic calendars, catalogs, grading policies and other publications that promote and support the unit are accurate and current.

A review of budgets indicates that the CoE budget is proportional to other budget units at the university. Grant and private funding has been secured to assist the unit in developing new initiatives such as providing tuition assistance to undergraduate and graduate candidates, adding professional development schools and field experiences, mentoring first-year teachers, developing new courses, and providing training in assessment and technology. Faculty and staff are available in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of the unit.

Faculty workloads are based on a 30 unit per year assignment. Faculty loads typically do not exceed 12 hours per semester; however, occasionally a teaching load may exceed this for one semester followed by

a load reduction in the subsequent semester. The equivalent of six credit hours of time per academic year is assigned to support scholarly work and professional service. Looking at data provided on faculty productivity, faculty have regularly been involved in scholarship in the form of books written, articles written, presentations made, and university and college committee service, and community service. The supervision of clinical practice does not exceed 18 candidates for each full-time faculty supervisor as evidenced in the workload summary.

Part-time faculty members are hired for their special expertise. Department chairs work with each part-time faculty member and provide sample syllabi and course outcomes to ensure consistency in quality of instruction.

Evidence from interviews and tours of campus facilities indicates that unit facilities include technology-enhanced classrooms equipped with data projectors, computers, DVD players, document cameras, and video-conferencing capabilities. Library facilities and resources are adequate and students have access to a wide variety of current books, math and science media resources, instructional videos, electronic data bases, and materials to support the education of diverse learners.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Several collaborative grants have been funded to support the work of the unit. For example the Dakota Assets grant has facilitated the placement of teacher candidates in high need schools. The Transition to Teaching grant and the Teacher Quality Enhancement grant have helped to increase non-traditional enrollment.

Candidate advising has been given considerable thought and attention under the direction of the new BHSU president and new vice president for student affairs.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not Applicable.

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Library and educational technology facilities and services are strong and support candidates' use of instructional media and web-based technologies.

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

<p>Documents Reviewed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Standard 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1: State program review documents and state findings • Exhibit 2: Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years • Exhibit 3: Key assessments and scoring guides used by faculty to assess candidate learning against standards and the outcomes identified in the unit's conceptual framework • Exhibit 4: Data tables and summaries that show how teacher candidates have performed on key assessments over the past three years • Exhibit 5: Samples of candidate work • Exhibit 6: Follow-up studies of graduates and data tables of results • Exhibit 7: Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results • Exhibit 8: List of candidate dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn, and related assessments, scoring guides, and data <p><input type="checkbox"/> Standard 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1: Description of the unit's assessment system in detail including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points • Exhibit 2: Data from key assessments used at entry to programs • Exhibit 3: Procedures for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias • Exhibit 4: Policies and procedures that ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make improvements • Exhibit 5: Sample of candidate assessment data disaggregated by alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs • Exhibit 6: Policies for handling student complaints • Exhibit 7: File of student complaints and the unit's response • Exhibit 8: Examples of changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system <p><input type="checkbox"/> Standard 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 1: Memoranda of understanding, contracts, and/or other documents that demonstrate partnerships with schools • Exhibit 2: Criteria for the selection of school faculty
--

- Exhibit 3: Documentation of the preparation of school faculty for their roles
- Exhibit 4: Descriptions of field experiences and clinical practice requirements in programs for initial and advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals
- Exhibit 5: Guidelines for student teaching and internships
- Exhibit 6: Assessments and scoring rubrics/criteria used in field experiences and clinical practice for initial and advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals
- Standard 4
 - Exhibit 1: Proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop
 - Exhibit 2: Curriculum components that address diversity proficiencies
 - Exhibit 3: Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to diversity
 - Exhibit 4: Data table on faculty demographics
 - Exhibit 5: Policies and practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty
 - Exhibit 6: Data table on student demographics
 - Exhibit 7: Policies and practices for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
 - Exhibit 8: Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice
 - Exhibit 9: Policies, practices, and/or procedures that facilitate candidate experiences with students from diverse groups
- Standard 5
 - Exhibit 1: Data table on faculty qualifications
 - Exhibit 2: Licensure information on school faculty
 - Exhibit 3: Samples of faculty scholarly activities
 - Exhibit 4: Summary of service and collaborative activities engaged in by faculty with the professional community
 - Exhibit 5: Promotion and tenure policies and procedures
 - Exhibit 6: Samples of forms used in faculty evaluation and summaries of the results
 - Exhibit 7: Opportunities for professional development activities provided by the unit
- Standard 6
 - Exhibit 1: Policies on governance and operations of the unit
 - Exhibit 2: Organizational chart or description of the unit governance structure
 - Exhibit 3: Unit policies on student services such as counseling and advising
 - Exhibit 4: Recruiting and admission policies for candidates
 - Exhibit 5: Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
 - Exhibit 6: Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, and professional development
 - Exhibit 7: Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
 - Exhibit 8: Faculty workload policies
 - Exhibit 9: Summary of faculty workloads
 - Exhibit 10: List of facilities, including computer labs and curriculum resource centers
 - Exhibit 11: Description of library resources
 - Exhibit 12: Description of resources for distance learning, if applicable

Addendum Exhibits for Evidence

Addendum Exhibits 1

- AD 1.1a Inter-Rater Reliability Teacher Work Sample
- AD 1.1b Correlations Among PLT GPA TWS
- AD 1.1c Inter-Rater Reliability Advanced Level Portfolio
- AD 1.8a PRAXIS Content and PLT Data by Program

Addendum Exhibits 2

- AD 2.3a Inter-Rater Reliability Teacher Work Sample
- AD 2.3b Correlations Among PLT GPA TWS
- AD 2.3c Inter-Rater Reliability Advanced Level Portfolio

- AD 2.4a Unit Report PartI 09-10 Initial
- AD 2.4b Unit Report PartII 09-10 Advanced
- AD 2.5a Data from Evaluations of Advanced Level Clinical Practice Addendum Exhibits 3
- AD 3.4 Advanced Level Field Experience Clinical Practice Handbook 2010-11 Addendum Exhibits 4
- AD 4.4 Everyday Commitment to Diversity Diversity Proficiencies: Awareness level
- AD 4.6a SPED 300 spring 2011 First Reflection
- AD 4.6b SPED 300 fall 2009 dis report
- AD 4.6c SPED 300 SBR 2 fall 2010
- AD 4.6d SPED 300 405 final prompts 2010 fall
- AD 4.6e SPED 405 fall 2010 Mis Minds reflection 2
- AD 4.6f SPED 405 fall 2010 Mis Minds reflection 3
- Ad 4.6g SPED 405 spring 2011 SBR #1 (2)
- AD 4.6h EDFN 295 INTASC Standards Discussion Rubric
- AD 4.6i EDFN295 Contextual Info & Learning Envrn Rubric Diversity Proficiencies: Acceptance level - Initial
- AD 4.6j ELED 315 Amber's Lesson Plan - Differentiation
- AD 4.6k ELED 315 Amber's Unit Plan - differentiation
- AD 4.6l ELEDSEED 408 Jigsaw reflections

Initial Programs

- AD 4.7a EDFN 295 INTASC Standard Discussion Questions - Standard 1 Example
- AD 4.7b EDFN 295 INTASC Standard Discussion Questions - Standard 2 Example
- AD 4.7c EDFN 295 INTASC Standard Discussion Questions - Standard 3 Example
- AD 4.7d EDFN 295 INTASC Standard Discussion Questions - Standard 7 Example
- AD 4.7e EDFN 295 INTASC Standard Discussion Questions - Standard 9 Example
- AD 4.7f EPSY 302 - Journal Article Presentation Rubric
- AD 4.7g EPSY 302 - Journal Article Review Rubric
- AD 4.7h EPSY 302 - Research Project & Presentation Rubrics
- AD 4.7i EPSY 302 D2L Discussion Questions Rubric
- AD 4.7j SEED 450 Sarah's Unit European Exploration - Differentiation
- AD 4.7k EDFN 475 Rubric

Advanced Programs

- AD 4.7l ED727 Equity Ethics Samples
 - Community Profile Instructions
 - Course Problem Instructions
 - ED 727 Course Completion Standards Rubrics
 - Group2 rubric
 - Group #2 Project
 - Olson EC 1
 - Osborn equity check 4
 - Palmer Community Snapshot Rubric
 - Snapshot - T. Palmer
 - White Equity Check Two

Addendum Exhibits 5

- AD 5.1 PROF DEV
- AD 5.2 New Faculty Workshops
- AD 5.4a Samples Annual Professional Staff Evaluations
- AD 5.4b Samples Professional Development Plans

- AD 5.6a Pearce DIBLES Research Reports
- AD 5.6b Cooch Transition Research Report

Persons Interviewed

BHSU Participants

- NCATE coordinator (Micheline)
- Technology support

(Aaron Bauerly)

Orientation By The Institution and State

1. Rich Carriveau
2. Holly Downing
3. Nancy Hall
4. Carol Hess
5. Micheline Hickenbotham
6. Urla Marcus
7. Kristi Pearce
8. Kay Schallenkamp
9. Pat Simpson

Leadership Team Meeting (Leadership Team Only)

Unit Head, NCATE Coordinator(s)

1. Nancy Hall
2. Micheline Hickenbotham
3. Pat Simpson

Poster Session

1. Cindy Chandler
2. Dorothy Fuller
3. Nancy Hall
4. Carol Hess
5. Micheline Hickenbotham
6. Urla Marcus
7. Kristi Pearce
8. Mike Zehfus
9. Charlie Lamb
10. Rhonda Wolff
11. Rich Carriveau
12. Rajeev Bukralia
13. David Calhoon
14. Peggy Buckwalter
15. Kay Schallenkamp
16. Pat Simpson
17. Bert Juhrend
18. Holly Downing
19. Daluss Siewert
20. Pam Carriveau
21. Kathleen Matthews
22. Laura Turner
23. Devrim Ozdemir
24. Yadi Ziaeehezarjeribi
25. Priscilla Romkema

Interviews: Undergraduate Completers

1. Brandy Vavruska
2. Brett Suiter
3. Kathleen Engle

Interviews: Advisory Board

1. Len Austin
2. Rich Carriveau
3. Nancy Hall
4. Priscilla Romkema
5. Pat Simpson
6. Barry Jankord
7. Betsy Silva
8. Jim Heinert
9. David Calhoon
10. Curtis Card
11. Ron Rosenboom
12. Russ Reed

Interviews: Graduated Graduate Candidates

1. Julie Hatling (Math)
2. Kayla Griffis Bolke Hemmer (Reading)
3. Cheri Isaacson (Technology & Reading)
4. Ann Anderson (Science)

Interviews: Graduate Candidates

1. Shannon Moehlman (reading)
2. Merritt Keehn (Reading)
3. Stephenie Campbell (Reading)
4. Tere Frolick (Technology)
5. Brenda Murphy (Science)
6. Ashley Rita-Collins (Math)

Dinner

1. Len Austin
2. David Calhoon
3. Holly Downing
4. Nancy Hall
5. Corinne Hansen
6. Micheline Hickenbotham
7. Urla Marcus
8. Kristi Pearce
9. Priscilla Romkema
10. Kay Schallenkamp
11. Betsy Silva
12. Barry Jankord
13. Curtis Card
14. Jim Heinert
15. Rhonda Wolff
16. Rich Carriveau
17. Deb Barnett
18. Carol Hess
19. Ron Rosenboom
20. Warren Wilson
21. Daluss Siewert

22. Russ Reed
23. Pat Simpson

BHSU Participants: Leadership Meeting and Interviews with Deans & Unit Chairs

1. Len Austin
2. Nancy Hall
3. Betsy Silva
4. Curtis Card
5. Charlie Lamb
6. David Calhoon
7. Holly Downing

BHSU Participants

1. Sue McGrath
2. Scott Ahola
3. Terry Hupp & Anne Stevens
4. June Apaza
1. Julie Matthiesen –TIE Director (11:00 am)
2. Faye LaDuke-Pelster – PDS Coordinator
3. 5 clinical faculty from BF
4. 5 student teachers from BF
1. Micheline Hickenbotham
2. Melanie Hurley – PDS Coordinator
3. Three clinical faculty
4. 3 student teachers
5. Principal

BHSU Participants

Interview: Human Services

1. Nancy Grassel

Interview: COE Mission and Strategic Planning Committee

1. Nancy Hall
2. Carol Hess
3. David Calhoon
4. John Alsup

Interview: Professional Progress Committee

1. Len Austin
2. Nancy Hall
3. Betsy Silva
4. Mary Goebel
5. Rhonda Wolff
6. Rich Carriveau
7. Kathy Finkle

Interview: University President and Interim Provost/VPAA

1. Dr. Kay Schallenkamp
2. Dr. Kristi Pearce

Interview: Faculty and Program Coordinators

1. Verona Beguin
2. Cindy Chandler
3. Dorothy Fuller
4. Carol Hess
5. Betsy Silva
6. Charlie Lamb
7. Peggy Buckwalter

8. Tom Termes
9. Pat Simpson
10. Daluss Siewert
11. Kathleen Parrow
12. Pam Carriveau
13. Tim Steckline
14. Kathleen Matthews

Interview Field of Experiences Coordination

1. Dr. Pat Simpson
2. Rhonda Wolff
3. Rich Carriveau

Interview: Instructional Design/Library

1. Devrim Ozdemir
2. Scott Ahola

Interview: Principals & Superintendents

1. Katie Bray
2. Dan Liekvold
3. Dave Peters
4. Paul Soriano
5. Pat Derring

Interview: PDS Coordinators and Field Experiences Supervisors

1. Pat Parks
2. Melanie Hurley
3. Faye LaDuke-Pelster
4. Kathy Finkle

Interview: Current Undergraduate Candidates

1. Kayla Kennedy
2. Leonard Jacobs
3. Elizabeth Johnson
4. Wendy Kummer
5. Mary McGillvray
6. Clint Nicholes
7. Susan James

Interview: Assessment Director and Committee Members

1. Pat Simpson (Director)
2. Rich Carriveau
3. John Alsup
4. Melanie Hurley
5. Faye LaDuke – Pelster
6. Sunhwi Kim
1. Erin Holmes
2. Rhonda Wolff
3. Melissa Woodall

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

(Optional) State Addendum: