Self-Study Report

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
401 North Seventh Street
Room 109
Terre Haute, IN 47809
November 17, 2019 12:00 a.m.

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

Form Version: 1.0

CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

CAEP Self-Study Report

I. EPP Overview

Guide to the Self-Study Report

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The Bayh College of Education is one of five academic colleges at Indiana State University (ISU), located in the Wabash Valley of western central Indiana. ISU was founded in 1865 as the Indiana State Normal School, later named Indiana State Teachers College, then Indiana State College, and in 1965, it was renamed Indiana State University. ISU is a state-supported doctoral/professional university that has been accredited continuously by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) since 1915. ISU is the most diverse public university in the state, and a majority of its students come from Indiana and remain in Indiana after graduation. The Bayh College of Education's EPP is currently accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and is undergoing its first ever Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) review in 2019.

The Bayh College of Education's EPP is the third largest EPP in the state, using Title II data mandated by the state (latest year reported 2015-16). In particular, the Bayh College of Education houses teacher preparation programs in elementary education, early childhood education and special education in the Department of Teaching and Learning and supports secondary education and all-grade programs housed in their specific content departments. It also houses graduate-level P-12 educational administration, student affairs, and higher education programs in the Department of Educational Leadership, graduate programs in counseling and school psychology, and B.S. and M.S. programs in speech-language pathology in the Department of Communication Disorder and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology. Counseling and speech-language pathology programs are accredited by the Council of Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the Council on Academic Accreditation--American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CAA-ASHA), respectively.

The EPP has been effortful in bringing disparate programs under a more unified umbrella, in terms of administrative, curricular, and instructional structures. As part of a Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) Open Pathways initiative, competency-based curricular re-imagination of teacher education programs has been taking place since 2018, with redesign activities providing the foundational priority. Finally, our partnerships with the P-12 schools have encouraged us to begin offering year-long internships in pre-service teaching preparation. All initial certification programs provide experiential learning opportunities in school settings, and community engagement remains an identifying focus of our college and university.

Please note the Carnegie Classification, Doctoral/Research University as indicated on this self-study report is incorrect. The correct Carnegie Classification is Doctoral/Professional. At the time this report was prepared, this classification was not an option.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

Please see Evidence 3 - BCOE Organizational Chart for the organizational structure of the Bayh College of Education.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

The Mission, Vision, and Goals are outlined in the Bayh College of Education's Conceptual Framework document. The conceptual framework is a foundational document that identifies the core beliefs of the COE. These beliefs are the foundation of all programs housed in the Bayh College of Education.
Evidence 5 - BCOE Conceptual Framework

Mission: To prepare, promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world.

Vision: As we move to the future, we envision our College as a rewarding learning community for students, faculty, and staff. We continuously embrace new knowledge and model the best pedagogical practices. Our facilities enhance our work. A cooperative, supportive culture exists among the faculty and staff within the College and across campus. Faculty and staff members are chosen carefully and mentored well. We employ continuous improvement tools and philosophies on a daily basis, using data to make decisions and improve our instruction and processes in a timely manner. Student success demonstrates the genuine support they are getting from faculty and staff.

The sphere of influence of our learning community is expanding. Our administrators, teachers, and human service professionals are recognized for their educational contributions, including outreach services to those whom they serve. Our students, faculty and staff work collaboratively with schools and agencies to create rich, supportive, and healthy teaching and learning environments. Support for the mission is clear, the state wishes to increase its investment in what we do, alumni tell us how much they value their education, stakeholders and agencies seek our faculty for their expertise, granting agents seek us out, employers seek our graduates, increasing numbers of capable students desire an education with us, and we receive persistent recognition for our achievements.

With stable and consistent leadership, our objectives are clear and our work flexible and agile as we organize ways to be most effective, requesting and receiving the resources needed. We are dedicated to fostering a spirit of inquiry, and supporting a commitment to excellence for ourselves and our students. As one coherent organization, our collegial team recognizes and achieves the full potential of working together as we take pride in our work and feel fulfilled.

BCOE Goals:
1. Increase enrollment and student success
2. Advance experiential learning
3. Enhance community engagement
4. Strengthen and leverage programs of strength and promise
5. Diversify revenue: Philanthropy, contracts, and grants
6. Recruit and retain great faculty and staff

7. Raise the profile of educator preparation
8. Promote long-range academic planning

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

Evidence 5 - BCOE Conceptual Framework
The Bayh College of Education has established shared values and beliefs that guide the practices of all programs housed within the BCOE.
1. Student Success - We bring to bear scholarship, professionalism, respect, and high expectations for all students.
2. Collegiality - We enjoy being a collaborative team in a positive environment that communicates well and works together for the greater good of all.
3. Caring for Others - We are compassionate and supportive of others.
4. Responsibility - We are dedicated, dependable, and hard working.
5. Honesty - We have integrity and are trustworthy, ethical, and fair.
6. Openness to Change - We prize creativity and support continual improvement.
7. Social Justice and Diversity - We work to create environments that support and enable all members of our community to thrive.

With this year being a strategic planning year, the BCOE is in the process of reviewing and revising the mission, vision and values to align better with the needs of the field today.

EPP Accreditation Status

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?

◉ Yes

○ No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available

EPP is regionally or institutionally accredited

a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regional accredited, please move to the next page.

HLC response Letter
2011 HLC Letter

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. Site Visitors 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)
Science Education	8	6	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of

							2018-2019
Special Education-Undergraduate	4	3	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Early Childhood Education minor	62	49	Initial	Other	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Social Studies Education	14	20	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Special Education-Graduate	8	8	Initial	Master's	Online	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Technology Education	3	2	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
English Education	12	8	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
School Building Leadership	42	30	Advanced	Master's	Face to Face/Online	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
World Languages	0	3	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
School Psychology	18	16	Advanced	Specialist or C.A.S.	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
School District Leadership	42	30	Advanced	Specialist or C.A.S.	Face to Face/Online	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Gifted and Talented Certification	12	9	Advanced	Endorsement only	Online	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Math Education	4	3	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Physical Education	7	7	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Elementary Education	140	141	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
English as a New Language	34	30	Advanced	Post Baccalaureate	Online	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Art Education	3	3	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Business Education	1	1	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
School Counseling	22	21	Advanced	Master's	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019
Music Education	20	18	Initial	Baccalaureate	Face to Face	Indiana	Continued state approval as of 2018-2019

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	Doctoral/Research Universities
Location	Urban
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	Not applicable
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.

Clinical Educator List

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 5. The Parity Table

a. The parity 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 and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. This chart is an example of a chart that the EPP can complete.

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Comparative entity data	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities				
Fiscal Support				
Administrative support				
Candidate support services				
Candidate feedback, formal and informal				

Upload your self-developed parity table below

Parity 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 lead site visitor to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by the site 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
None other than the main campus at Indiana State University				

Table 7. Proprietary Assessments

Please list proprietary assessments used by the EPP (no more than 10):

Proprietary Assessment No.	Title of Assessment	Validity & Reliability information if available & applicable
Proprietary Assessment No.1	Indiana CORE Assessments for Educator Licensure	
Proprietary Assessment No.2	PRAXIS-II	
Proprietary Assessment No.3	The Indiana CORE Assessment for School Administrators - District Level	
Proprietary Assessment No.4	The Indiana CORE Assessment for School Administrators - Building Level	
Proprietary Assessment No.5	Indiana Core Assessment for Exceptional Needs - Blind or Low Vision	
Proprietary Assessment No.6	Indiana Core Assessment for Educator Licensure - High Ability	
Proprietary Assessment No.7	The Indiana Core Assessment for Exceptional Needs - Mild Intervention	
Proprietary Assessment No.8		
Proprietary Assessment No.9		
Proprietary Assessment No.10		

Please map above proprietary assessments to the appropriate CAEP Standards:

	CAEP Standard 1 Ini.	CAEP Standard 1 Adv.	CAEP Standard 2 Ini.	CAEP Standard 2 Adv.	CAEP Standard 3 Ini.	CAEP Standard 3 Adv.	CAEP Standard 4 Ini.	CAEP Standard 4 Adv	CAEP Standard 5 Ini.	CAEP Standard 5 Adv.	State
Proprietary Assessment No.1	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.2	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.3	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.4	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

No.5 Proprietary Assessment No.6	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.7	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.8	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.9	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.10	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

This page is intended to be blank

Standard 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 📎 1.1.1 - Key Assessment 1 - Professional Disposition

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

2 📎 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

3 📎 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

4 📎 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

5 📎 1.1.5 - Key Assessment 5 - Licensure Test Evidence.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

6 📎 1.3.1 - List of Program SPA Accreditations.docx

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

7 📎 1.3.2 - IDOE Approval Letter for State Review.pdf

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

8 📎 5.1.1 - QAS System.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

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

Standard 1.1 Understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards:
Candidates' understanding of the ten InTASC standards are assessed using multiple measures at multiple progression points throughout the candidates' program. This EPP uses a combination of EPP created assessments and the Indiana Licensure exam as evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge that impacts P-12 student learning. A thorough review and analysis of the evidence highlights several strengths as well as areas for growth and change.

The EPP has identified four key assessments; Professional Disposition, Teacher Work Sample, Unit Report, and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching which are strategically placed throughout the candidates' program to monitor candidate progression. Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, pages 20-21, outlines which assessments are administered at each progression level. The strategic placement of these key assessments allows program faculty an opportunity to monitor progression and provide early intervention as necessary.

First, the Professional Disposition assesses the Learner and Learning domain. This assessment is administered at several progression points during the candidates' program. (Evidence 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 Professional Disposition)

Second, the Unit Report (secondary candidates) and the Teacher Work Sample (Elementary and Special Education candidates) correspond to all four domains of the InTASC standards. Successful completion, ratings of Meets or Exceeds, on the Teacher Work Sample and Unit Report demonstrate proficiency on each of the InTASC standards (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report and 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample). Data presented for the Unit Report are for all secondary candidates combined. Disaggregated data by content area can be found in evidence 1.1.4.

Third, the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching is aligned with all ten InTASC standards and the individual components. This assessment is administered at the end of the student teaching placement. Overall ratings of Meets or Exceeds Expectations on the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching demonstrate a candidate has an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards. (Evidence 1.1.3 Key Assessment #3 - Final Evaluation of Student Teaching)

The final assessment of the candidates' understanding of the InTASC standards is the licensure test. (Evidence 1.1.5 - Key Assessment #5 - Licensure Test Evidence, Data Table 2)

I. Learner and Learning
On the Teacher Work Sample, 6 of 18 elements correspond to Learner and Learning. Three cycles of data are presented: Fall 2017 n=18, Spring 2018 n=57, and Fall 2018 n=25. Across the six elements, 100% of candidates Met or Exceeded expectations in Fall 2017 and 93%-100% in Spring 2018. In Fall 2018 as many as 48% of candidates were rated at the Developing level. 52%-76% of candidates Met or Exceeded Expectations on this domain, with a relatively low percentage of

candidates scoring at the Exceeds level (0%-12%). This trend in scoring for Fall 2018 is not evident on the other assessments assessing this domain.

On the Unit Report 6 of 16 elements correspond to Learner and Learning. Three cycles of data were reported: Fall 2017 n=51, Spring 2018 n=56, Fall 2018 n=68. For all three cycles and for all elements, the range of candidates scoring at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations was 96%-100%. Two candidates scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations level. One student switched majors to a non-education degree and one candidate resubmitted the Unit Report during the student teaching semester.

On the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching elements 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d correspond to Learner and Learning. Three cycles of data are reported. 100% of candidates in elementary education and special education were rated at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations Level on all elements pertaining to Learner and Learning. One secondary education candidate was rated at Does Not Meet Expectations on one element in Spring 2018. The remaining 98% of secondary candidates scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level.

Overall, for the Learner and Learning Domain, across all key assessments, all three cycles of data, and across all three initial programs, 96% of candidates were rated at the required level of proficiency on this domain. There was one exception on one key assessment, the Teacher Work Sample, for elementary candidates in the Fall 2018 where there was a high percentage of candidates who did not meet the required proficiency level as mentioned above.

II. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
On the Teacher Work Sample, 4 of 18 elements correspond to Content and Pedagogical Knowledge. Three cycles of data are presented: Fall 2017 n=18, Spring 2018 n=57, and Fall 2018 n=25. Across the four elements, 94% - 100% of candidates Met or Exceeded expectations in Fall 2017 with a small percentage (5.6%) of candidates rated at the Emerging level on one element. 93%-100% candidates were rated at the Meets or Exceeds level in Spring 2018 with 2-5% of candidates falling below the threshold on one or more elements. In Fall 2018, as many as 48% of candidates were rated at the Developing level. There was a low percentage (4%) of candidates who were rated at the Exceeds Expectations level in Fall 2018. Again, this trend in scoring for Fall 2018 is not evident on the other assessments assessing this domain.

On the Unit Report, 3 of 16 elements correspond to Content and Pedagogical Knowledge. Three cycles of data were reported: Fall 2017 n=51, Spring 2018 n=56, Fall 2018 n=68. For all three cycles and for all elements in this domain, the range of candidates scoring at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations was 98%-100%. Two candidates scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations level. One student switched majors to a non-education degree and one candidate resubmitted the Unit Report during the student teaching semester.

On the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, elements 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 5a, 5b, 5c correspond to Content and Pedagogical Knowledge. 100% of candidates in elementary education and special education were rated at the Meets or Exceeds

Expectations Level on all element. One secondary education candidate was rated at Does Not meet Expectations on one element. There was a significant percentage of candidates who received a No Basis for Judgment rating on 4d: Accesses local resources to evaluate content knowledge in their primary language. This trend was evident across all three programs. Further exploration into this trend may be necessary to evaluate whether more direction should be provided to raters or if candidates do not have adequate opportunity to demonstrate this element effectively.

Overall, for the Content and Pedagogical domain, across all key assessments, all three cycles of data, and across all three initial programs, 93% of candidates were rated at the required level of proficiency on this domain. There was one exception on the Teacher Work Sample, for elementary candidates in the Fall 2018 where there was a high percentage of candidates who did not meet the required proficiency level.

III. Instructional Practice

On the Teacher Work Sample, 4 of 18 elements correspond to Instructional Practice. Three cycles of data are presented: Fall 2017 n=18, Spring 2018 n=57, and Fall 2018 n=25. Across the four elements, 100% of candidates Met or Exceeded expectations in Fall 2017. 95%-100% candidates were rated at the Meets or Exceeds level in Spring 2018 with 2-5% of candidates falling below the threshold on one or more elements. In Fall 2018, 24-48% of candidates were rated at the Developing level on one or more elements. There was a low percentage (4-8%) of candidates who met the Exceeds Expectations level in Fall 2018. Again, this trend in scoring for Fall 2018 is not evident on the other assessments assessing this domain.

On the Unit Report, 4 of 16 elements correspond to Instructional Practice. Three cycles of data were reported: Fall 2017 n=51, Spring 2018 n=56, Fall 2018 n=68. For all three cycles and for all elements, the range of candidates scoring at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations was 96%-100%. Two candidates scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations level. One student switched majors to a non-education degree and one candidate resubmitted the Unit Report during the student teaching semester.

On the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, elements 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 8c, 8d correspond to Instructional Practice. 100% of candidates in elementary education and special education scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level. For elementary education, there was a high percentage, 20%-47% of candidates who were rated at the No Basis for Judgment on 8b: Accesses family and Community Resources. This is an area for continued exploration to determine why there is a high percentage of candidates rated as No Basis for Judgment. For secondary candidates, there was one candidate in Spring 2018 who scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations Level. The remaining 98% of secondary candidates scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level.

Overall, for the Instructional Practice domain, across all key assessments, all three cycles of data, and across all three initial programs, 95% of candidates were rated at the required level of proficiency on this domain with one exception on the Teacher Work Sample as noted in previous domains.

IV. Professional Responsibility InTASC 9 and 10

On the Professional Disposition, 2 of the 10 elements (Integrity and Collegiality) correspond to the Professional Responsibility domain. The professional disposition assessment is administered at three points in the candidates' program, data presented are for disposition during coursework (midpoint) and disposition during student teaching (final). Midpoint professional disposition data are reported for three cycles, Fall 2017 n=136, Spring 2018 n=142, and Fall 2018 n=144. Data presented are for all EPP candidates. Candidates are expected to be at the Proficient level at the midpoint assessment. Less than 65% of candidates scored at the Proficient level; 20%-44% Fall 2017, 29%-65% in Spring 2018, and 55% in Fall 2018.

Professional disposition data during student teaching are reported for three cycles: Fall 2017 n=49, Spring 2018 n=147, and Fall 2018 n=41. Data presented are for all EPP candidates. Candidates are expected to be at the Proficient level. For all three cycles, 98% of candidates were rated at the Proficient level.

On the Teacher Work Sample, 4 of 18 elements correspond to Professional Responsibility. Three cycles of data are presented: Fall 2017 n=18, Spring 2018 n=57, and Fall 2018 n=25. Across the four elements, 100% of candidates Met or Exceeded expectations in Fall 2017 and 95% of candidates in Spring 2018 with 2-5% of candidates falling below the threshold on one or more elements. In Fall 2018 as many as 28% of candidates were rated at the Developing level. There was a low percentage (8%) of candidates who met the Exceeds Expectations level in Fall 2018. Again, this trend in scoring for Fall 2018 is not evident on the other assessments assessing this domain.

On the Unit Report, 3 of 16 elements correspond to Professional Responsibility. Three cycles of data were reported: Fall 2017 n=51, Spring 2018 n=56, Fall 2018 n=68. For all three cycles and for all elements, the range of candidates scoring at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations was 98%-100%. Two candidates scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations level. One candidate switched majors to a non-education degree and one candidate resubmitted the Unit Report during the student teaching semester.

On the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, elements 9a, 9b, 9c, 10a, 10b, 10c, 10d correspond to Professional Responsibility. 100% of candidates in elementary education and special education scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level. There was a high percentage, 28%-43% of elementary candidates and 44%-47% of secondary candidates who were rated at the No Basis for Judgment on 10c: Builds Connections with Community Resources. This is an area for continued exploration to determine why there is a high percentage of candidates rated as No Basis for Judgment. For secondary candidates there was one candidate in Spring 2018 who scored at the Does Not Meet Expectations Level. All other secondary candidates, 98% scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level.

Overall, for the Professional Responsibility domain, across all key assessments, all three cycles of data, and across all three initial programs, at least 98% of candidates were rated at the required level of proficiency on this domain with one exception on the Teacher Work Sample as noted in previous domains. Additionally, this is the only

domain in which the Professional Disposition is aligned. The data show significant improvements from the midpoint to the final disposition. At the midpoint assessment, there was a significant percentage of candidates who were rated at the Adequate or Below Expectations level; 45% in Fall 2017, 71% in Spring 2018, and 1% in Fall 2018. By the final administration of this assessment during student teaching, the percentage of candidates at the Adequate level on these two elements decreased drastically to less than 2% in Spring 2018.

Overall Analysis and Future Directions:
As a whole, the data demonstrate mastery of the InTASC standards across all assessments at different points in the candidates program. However, data did show a significant decline in scores on the Teacher Work Sample for the Fall 2018 semester. On 15 of the 18 components assessing the InTASC standards on the Teacher Work Sample, 12%-48% of the candidates were assessed at the Developing level. This trend was not evident in the Fall 2018 on the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching. Several factors could contribute to this anomaly: errors in entering scores in the assessment system or differences in faculty teaching the course that particular semester. Additionally, the Teacher Work Sample was revised for Spring 2018 to a four- level rubric. Fall 2018 may have been the first time that faculty used the four-level rubric which may have impacted the scoring. Consideration should be given to exploring why there was a decline in candidates' scores on the Teacher Work Sample in Fall 2018 and measures should be put in place to minimize the vast difference in the Spring cycle. This may require additional rater training on the assessment or revising the indicators to be more clear.

After a thorough review of the evidence for standard 1.1, the majority of key assessments occur in the final semester of the candidates' program. Adding an additional key assessment earlier on the candidate's progression may be beneficial to assist faculty with improved monitoring and allow candidates to have earlier feedback on their performance. Additionally, informal observations are conducted during the student teaching experience, however; they are not considered key assessments. Candidates may benefit from adding one or more of these observations early on in the program to help candidates self-monitor their progression. Consideration should be given to adding the informal observations of student teaching as a formal key assessment.

On the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, there was a high percentage of candidates who were rated at the No Basis for Judgment on elements that pertained to community involvement. Further exploration is necessary to determine if this is due to unclear indicators of what constitutes community involvement or if our candidates are lacking opportunities during their student teaching experiences to demonstrate this concept.

An evaluation of student teaching occurs during the TOTAL, Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning, semester for elementary education and special education candidates and during early field experience for secondary candidates. Currently this evaluation is completed on the 'Final Evaluation of Student Teaching Form'. It may be beneficial to rename this point of administration to differentiate between early field experience/TOTAL internship and the true cumulative "Final" Evaluation of Student

Teaching.

Standard 1.2 Understanding of the Teaching Profession:
Candidates are assessed on their understanding of the profession through their use of research to guide planning and teaching, the use of assessments, and their ability to monitor P-12 learner growth and then use the data to improve instruction. These areas are assessed at multiple points using multiple measures throughout the candidates' program.

Summary of Evidence:
First, in Assignment 3 of the Teacher Work Sample elementary education candidates design a lesson, administer a pre-test, use the data from the pre-test to inform changes and administer a post-test to measure their impact on student learning. In Assignment 4, candidates provide an analysis of the pre and post-test data documenting how the data was used to impact student learning. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample). Secondary education candidates complete a similar assignment and are assessed on this on criterion 5 and 7 on the Unit Report. (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report)

Second, all candidates' use of research and evidence to measure their P-12 students' progress and their professional practice is assessed by the host teacher and university supervisor during their student teaching experience using the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching form. (Evidence 1.1.3 Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching)

1.2 Analysis and Interpretation:
On the element assessing pre and post-test analysis within the Teacher Work Sample, 100% of elementary education candidates scored at the Meets or Exceeds level in Fall 2017, 96.5% in Spring 2018, and 88% in Fall 2018. The decline in the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in Fall 2018 may be a result of several factors; there was a recent revision to the rubric from a three- point to a four- point and the faculty teaching the course in Fall 2018 may not have used the revised rubric previously. An additional measure of P-12 student impact is the pre-test and post-test scores from the Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 1.1.2 pg. 21). In Fall 2018, 23 of the 26 elementary education candidates showed improvements in their class test averages from the pre-test to the post-test and 20 out of 23 in Spring 2018. Between the two cycles, 6 candidates showed no change on their class average test scores from the pre-test to the post-test. It is difficult to determine if the lack of change in class test scores for those six candidates is a result of a) an error in the inputting of data in the spreadsheet, b) an error running the data, c) P-12 students not being present for both the pre-test and post-test, or d) difficulties in the candidates instruction/planning between the pre-test and the post-test.

On the element "Assessment of Learning" within the Unit Report, 100% of secondary education candidates in the Fall 2017 met or exceeded expectations, 96% in Spring 2018, and 99% in Fall 2018. An additional measure of P-12 student impact is the pre-test and post-test scores from the Unit Report (Evidence 1.1.4 pg. 56-57). 80 of

the 81 secondary candidates showed improved class average test scores from the pre-test to the post-test.

The data provide substantial evidence that our candidates have strengths at selecting and/or designing assessments that provide evidence of student learning. Furthermore, the data support that our candidates have strengths using assessments as research tools to understand and respond to their students' learning needs such that they have a positive impact on student learning.

1.2 Future Use:
Further exploration regarding the decline in candidates' performance on the Teacher Work Sample in Fall 2018 is warranted as several factors may have attributed to the lower scores during that one cycle of data. While candidates did not meet the minimum proficiency level on the Teacher Work Sample, those candidates successfully completed the capstone course and performed at or above the minimum proficiency level on the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching. One question moving forward is do we as an EPP, adequately identify and put interventions in place for those candidates who do not meet the proficiency level?

Standard 1.3 - Specialized Professional Associations
Of the 12 initial licensure programs listed, nine are fully accredited, one is recognized on a probationary status until 2020, and two are in the process of a State Review (report submitted on 9/15/18). (Evidence 1.3.1 - List of Program SPA Accreditations) and (Evidence 1.3.2 - IDOE Approval Letter for State Review)

Recognized with Probation
Math Education - Recognized with probation until 2-1-2020

Standard 1.4 Candidates Demonstrate College-Career Ready Standards:
The Teacher Work Sample (elementary and special education candidates)/Unit Report (secondary candidates) assess the candidate's ability to teach to college and career-ready standards.

For elementary education and special education candidates, Assignment 3 of the Teacher Work Sample is a measure used to assess the candidate's ability to teach to college and career-ready standards. Candidates create a five-day lesson plan which is aligned with the Indiana Education Standards for career and college readiness. This element is highlighted in green in the Teacher Work Sample Key Assessment packet. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample)

For secondary education candidates, Criterion 6 of the Unit Report is a measure used to assess the candidate's ability to teach to college and career-ready standards. Candidates create a five-day lesson plan which is aligned with the Indiana Education Standards which demonstrate career and college readiness. This component is highlighted in green in the Unit Report Key Assessment packet. (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report).

1.4 Analysis and Interpretation:

The data demonstrate that our candidates have strengths at planning and implementing lessons to prepare students to be college and career ready. Data are presented for three cycles; Fall 2017 n=18, Spring 2018 n=57, and Fall 2017 n=25. 98% of elementary education candidates demonstrated proficiency at the "Meets" or "Exceeds" levels for the College and Career Ready criterion for both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. In Fall 2018, 72% of the elementary education candidates were rated at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level. As mentioned in 1.1, the percentage of candidates not at the proficiency level for Fall 2018 is an anomaly and could be a result of several factors. For all three cycles reported, 100% of special education candidates were rated at the Meets or Exceeds levels for College and Career Ready standards.

For secondary candidates on the Unit Report, three cycles of data are presented; Fall 2017 n=51, Spring 2018 n=56, and Fall 2018 n=68. Data provided are aggregated for all secondary candidates as many programs have 10 or fewer candidates. Disaggregated data by secondary content area can be found in Evidence 1.1.4. In Fall 2017, 100% of secondary candidates scored at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level. In the Spring 2018 96% of candidates scored at the proficiency level of Meets or Exceeds with 4% scoring at the Does Not Meet level. The 4% = one candidate in Social Studies who changed majors. In Fall 2018, 99% of candidates scored at the Meets or Exceeds level.

Data would support that the majority, 96%-100%, of candidates across the three programs (elementary, special, and secondary) effectively demonstrated their ability to teach to college and career ready standards.

1.4 Future Directions:
1. Clearly identifying components related to College and Career Readiness may be beneficial, particularly in the Unit Report.
2. This EPP will work to revise the Unit Report to better align with standards and clearly identify performance level indicators for proper evaluation of candidates' performance.

Standard 1.5 Candidates Model and Apply Technology:
Candidates application of technology is assessed using two different measures, the Teacher Work Sample (elementary candidates)/Unit Report (secondary candidates) and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching.

For elementary education, candidates demonstrate competencies in technology throughout the Teacher Work Sample. Components used to assess technology in the Teacher Work Sample are Assignment 1 "Communication" which requires candidates to describe two commonly used technology tools they use to actively engage their learners. Assignment 2 "Supplementary Resources" requires candidates to cite electronic resources they use to benefit students in the unit. Assignment 3, "Use of Research to Build Content Knowledge" requires candidates to cite web sites, online and paper based journals and books to document their content area knowledge for teaching the skills in their unit. These areas are highlighted in pink. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample)

For secondary education, candidates are assessed for their understanding and application of technology in the Unit Report. Section 4, "Activities of the Unit" is used to assess technology. This area is highlighted in pink. (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report, page 3).

All candidates are required to keep an Excel spread sheet of pre-test and post-test data as part of the Teacher Work Sample/Unit Report which provides evidence that candidates can use technology to track and monitor student data.

The second measure used to assess all candidates' application of technology is the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching. Criterion 4.c. specifically articulates the expectation that candidates appropriately use technology resources as it assesses that the "candidate uses or modifies resources or technologies for content mastery." The criterion for 6.e. measures candidates' use of "technology to support assessment practices and to fully address learner needs." The criterion for 9.c. specifically assesses that candidates demonstrate "legal and ethical use of information and technology. Specific components used to assess the application of technology are highlighted in pink. (Evidence 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching)

1.5 Analysis and Interpretation:
With candidates being assessed with multiple measures and by multiple assessors, and consistently being rated as demonstrating proficiency at the "Meets" or "Exceeds" levels, there appears to be ample evidence to document that our candidates model and apply technology. Data on these two measures demonstrate that candidates use technology when preparing to teach (from learning more about their students and their students' school community to learning about their students' needs), engage P-12 students in meaningful learning during lessons, and use technology tools to monitor and record students' learning.

One concern is the significant percentage (33% in several instances) of evaluators that select "No Basis for Judgment" on criterion assessing the use of technology. This high percentage could be related to several factors including a lack of opportunity for evaluators to see candidates use technology in classroom instruction or the limited availability of technology in some placements.

1.5 Future Directions:
Moving forward, we will strive to ensure that all assessors have the necessary training and support in using the assessment tools to provide a valid assessment of our candidates.

We are also exploring strategies to better model technology throughout coursework. These may include additional training for EPP faculty on technology resources available to candidates and exploring other EPP-wide technology applications.

This EPP is actively engaged in discussions with the local school corporation to explore a technology partnership that would benefit the EPP and its candidates and the P-12 students and teachers. This is important, not only for the teachers and P-12 students, but also for our candidates as these classrooms serve as the models for our

candidates' clinical experiences.

Another area that we will focus our attention on is the lack of direct criteria to assess candidates' use of technology in the Teacher Work Sample, Unit Report, and Final Evaluation of Student Teaching.

Conclusion:
A thorough review of standard one evidence, which encompasses multiple measures at multiple progression points, across all three cycles of data and all programs, demonstrates our candidates have a solid understanding of the profession. Evidence further demonstrates that candidates have an understanding of the necessary teaching standards and specialized professional standards as well as the ability to apply available technology in the classroom.

Standard 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 📎 A1.1.1 - Advanced Programs - Licensure Test Data

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

2 📎 A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

3 📎 A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

4 📎 A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

5 📎 A1.1.5 - District Level Key Assessment 3 - Professional Disposition.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

6 📎 A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment 4 - Final Evaluation.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

7 📎 A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

8 📎 A1.1.8 - Building Level Key Assessment 3 - Community Relations.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

9 📎 A1.1.9 - Building Level Key Assessment 4 - Professional Disposition.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

10 📎 A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

11 📎 A1.1.11 - Visual Impairment Key Assessments Plan.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

12 📎 A1.1.12 - TESL Key Assessment Plan.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

13 📎 A1.1.13 - GT Key Assessment 1 - Unit Lesson Plan.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

14 📎 A1.1.14 - GT Key Assessment 2 - Teacher Observation Form.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

15 📎 A1.1.15 - GT Key Assessment 3 - Portfolio Project.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

16 📎 A1.1.16 - SPED Key Assessment 1 - Teacher Work Sample.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

17 📎 A1.1.17 - SPED Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

18 📎 A1.1.18 - SPED Key Assessment 3- IEP Assignment.docx

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

19 📎 A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx

A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

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

School Psychology - Ed.S:
Data to inform Standard A1.1 are gathered from multiple sources throughout the program. Formative, yearly data are gathered in the forms of fieldwork evaluations (completed by site supervisors) and annual evaluations (completed by university staff). Summative evaluations include the Master's Case (completed at the end of the second year of training), the Specialist Project (completed at the end of the third year of training), and the Completer Satisfaction Survey (sent to completers of the program within 2 years of program completion). All evaluations directly correlate to the training standards identified by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Among those standards are data-based decision making, consultation and collaboration, research and program evaluation, use of technology, and legal, ethical, and professional practice. Data gathered from these evaluations allow us to monitor our candidate's progress in skills central to the field of school psychology.
(Evidence A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1)
(Evidence A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2)
(Evidence A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey)

School Administration District Level - Ed.S:
Evidence to support Standard A1.1 is drawn from multiple sources throughout the

program. Formative data exist in the form of dispositional assessments, which are collected during the course-based portion of the Ed.S. and at the conclusion during the Administrative Internship. Summative assessments include the Central Office District-Level Long-Term Project to assess the candidate's leadership skills in organizational management and community relations in developing district policies and practices for effective district management and resource systems and district-community partnerships. Additionally, the Summative Mentor/Supervisor Assessment is administered and completed by the clinical internship coordinator/faculty supervisor at the conclusion of the Administrative Internship. Program assessments are in direct relationship with the district-level preparation standards identified by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). Among those standards are a shared district vision for learning, strategic planning, continuous improvement, building district cultures of collaboration and trust, promoting the use of technology, effective district resource management, collaboration with diverse stakeholders both internal and external to the district, acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner, evaluating decision making, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. Evidence gathered from these formative and summative assessments allow us to monitor our candidates' progress in skills central to district-level administration.
(Evidence A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment #2)
(Evidence A1.1.5 - District Level Key Assessment #3)
(Evidence A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment # 4)

School Administration Building Level - M.Ed:
Evidence to support Standard A1.1 are drawn from multiple sources throughout the program. Formative data exist in the form of dispositional assessments, which are collected during the course-based portion of the M.Ed. and at the conclusion during the Administrative Internship and an early-program assessment of leadership skills conducted by program faculty. Summative assessments include the Action Research Project to assess the candidate's leadership skills in data analysis and data literacy through a self-analysis of one's personal and professional capacity in a school-level internship/clinical practice setting. Additionally, the Summative Mentor/Supervisor Assessment is administered and completed by the clinical internship coordinator/faculty supervisor at the conclusion of the Administrative Internship. Program assessments are in direct relationship to the building-level preparation standards identified by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). Among those standards are a shared school vision for learning, strategic planning, continuous improvement, building cultures of school collaboration and trust, promoting the use of technology, effective school-based resource management, collaboration with diverse stakeholders both internal and external to the school, acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner, evaluating decision making, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through school advocacy. Evidence gathered from these formative and summative assessments allow us to monitor our candidates' progress in skills central to building-level administration.
(Evidence A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment #2)
(Evidence A1.1.8 - Building Level Key Assessment #3)
(Evidence A1.1.9 - Building Level Key Assessment # 4)
(Evidence A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment # 5)

Visual Impairment:
Prior to this accreditation cycle, the Visual Impairment Licensure Program has not been involved in an accreditation process. While course assignments have been utilized to assess understanding of content knowledge, they have not been aligned to CAEP or professional standards. Currently, program data have been collected in course or assignment grades and licensure test scores. To better align with professional standards and CAEP standards, new assignments have been created with implementation beginning in Spring 2019. (Evidence A1.1.11 - Visual Impairment Key Assessment Plan)

TESL:
Prior to this accreditation cycle, the TESL Program has not been involved in an accreditation process. While course assignments have been utilized to assess understanding of content knowledge, they have not been aligned to CAEP or professional standards. Currently, program data have been collected in course or assignment grades and licensure test scores. To better align with professional standards and CAEP standards, new assignments have been created with implementation beginning in Summer 2019. (Evidence A1.1.12 - TESL Key Assessment Plan)

Gifted and Talented:
Data to inform Standard A1.1 are gathered from multiple sources in our three course program. In each of the provided assessments, candidates are provided with formative assessment supports/evaluations before completing the final summative evaluation. The Unit Lesson Plan (completed in the second course) requires candidates to complete the assessment after receiving formative evaluation from the instructor. The Portfolio Project and the Teacher Observation Form (both completed in the third course) have extensive formative feedback before candidates complete each final summative evaluation. All evaluations directly correlate with the training standards identified by the National Association of Gifted Children- Council for Exceptional Children Standards (NAGC/CEC), InTASC, and Indiana-High Ability Standards. The standards address aspects of A1.1, with the provided assessments addressing data literacy and analysis, research, technology and legal, ethical, and professional practice. Data gathered from these evaluations allow us to monitor our candidates' progress in skills central to the field of Gifted and Talented.
(Evidence A1.1.13 - GT Key Assessment #1 - Unit Lesson Plans)
(Evidence A1.1.14 - GT Key Assessment #2 - Portfolio Project)
(Evidence A1.1.15 - GT Key Assessment #3 - Teacher Observation Form)

Special Education Graduate Certificate:
Data to inform Standard A1.1 are gathered from multiple sources in our program. In each of the provided assessments, candidates are provided with formative assessment supports/evaluations before completing the final summative evaluation. The Teacher Work Sample (completed in the middle of the program) requires candidates to complete the assessment after receiving formative evaluation from the instructor. The IEP (completed in the middle of the program) and the Action Research Project (completed at the end of the program) are summative assessments that are each completed with extensive formative feedback from the instructor. All

evaluations directly correlate to the training standards identified by the Council for Exceptional Children Standards (CEC) and InTASC standards, and one evaluation additionally lists the Indiana Exceptional Needs-Mild Educator Standards. The standards address aspects of A1.1, with the provided assessments addressing data literacy, data analysis, research, and legal, ethical, and professional practice. Data gathered from these evaluations allow us to monitor our candidate's progress in skills central to the field of Special Education.
(Evidence A1.1.16 - SPED Key Assessment #1- Teacher Work Sample)
(Evidence A1.1.17 - SPED Key Assessment #2 - Action Research)
(Evidence A1.1.18 - SPED Key Assessment #3 - IEP Assignment)

Summary of Licensure Test Data:
Evidence packet A1.1.1 provide three cycles of data for all advanced programs. Overall, advanced program candidates, including add on programs, met or exceeded the established benchmarks for their programs. Additionally, state pass rates are provided for the following programs as a comparison point; District Level Ed.S., Building Level M.Ed., Visual Impairment, and High Ability/Gifted and Talented.
(Evidence A1.1.1- Advanced Programs - Licensure Test Data)

Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)
- ☑ CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- ☐ CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
- ☐ State Program Review (State-selected standards)
- ☑ Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" or "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the previous question)

Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, candidates overall are meeting the levels of achievement set for them in all licensure areas. The data have been used, however, to consider a number of areas for potential improvement.

First, although minimum thresholds of performance are articulated for candidate performance, it is unclear whether the stated plan for remediation has been followed in the small number of cases in which candidates have not met the minimum threshold. Therefore, the Provider will re-examine its minimum thresholds and stated plans for remediation of inadequate performance. If both are deemed appropriate, the Provider will work with licensure area programs to ensure that planned remediation steps are implemented and documented, in support of improved candidate support and candidate learning outcomes.

Second, the provider has noted that a majority of performance-based key

assessments are administered near the end of candidates' programs of study, which does not allow areas of concern to be identified and remediated at an early stage of preparation. The Provider will therefore consider additional key assessments that occur closer to the mid-point of training, which would improve the opportunity to support candidates' learning and progress.

Third, some expected outcomes have been assessed by only a small number of evaluation items. The Provider will work with specialty licensure areas to examine whether all relevant standards are assessed with sufficient breadth and depth, and to identify ways in which decision-making may be improved in these areas. Examples include candidates' proficient use of technology and teaching to college- and career-ready standards.

Fourth, several assessment measures were identified as requiring further development revision to improve their utility for decision making and evaluation of candidate learning outcomes. The Unit Report rubric (Evidence 1.1.4) and Building-Level and District-Level rubrics (Evidence A1.1.4 - A1.1.8) were specifically identified. In addition, the Visual Impairment and Teaching English as a Second Language programs developed assessment plans that will ensure adequate decision-making according to professional standards.

Fifth, it is possible that the existing Professional Disposition assessment (Evidence 1.1.1) could be aligned with the articulated dispositions that are embedded within InTASC Standards. This would provide a more thoughtful approach to evaluating and making decisions about candidates' professional dispositions. Potential revision and alignment of the rubric will be considered by the specialty licensure areas.

Sixth, some of the disaggregated data reflected unexpected fluctuations in data patterns across specialty licensure areas and across time. The instability suggests that not all raters are adequately trained with respect to the purpose of assessment or the application of the assessment rubric to candidate performance. As part of the approved Validity and Reliability plan (Evidence 5.1.1), the Provider will be working with specialty licensure areas to ensure appropriate training for all individuals who will be using key assessment rubrics to evaluate candidate performance.

Finally, analysis of the assessment results has raised valuable questions about the administration points of the Professional Disposition (Evidence 1.1.1) and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence 1.1.4). The provider will be working with specialty licensure areas to determine whether the administrations of these measures are appropriate in number (i.e., are we evaluating candidates frequently enough, or too frequently?), time point (i.e., are we evaluating candidates at appropriate times during their preparation?), and setting (i.e., is the rubric appropriate for evaluating the expected range of course-based and field-based competencies for which we are using it?).

2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" or "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the first question of this page)

Based on the analysis of disaggregated data and the rubric review process, several

individual licensure areas, particularly at the advanced level, have identified areas for change related to assessment practices.

The Building-level and District-level school administration programs have identified a need to modify several of their assessment rubrics to align with their new professional standards and the CAEP criteria for adequate rubric development. This will improve the evaluation of candidate learning and decision-making across many aspects of the programs.

Both the Visual Impairment program and the Teaching English as a Second Language program at the advanced level were found to have insufficient assessment plans in place. As such, those programs have now developed plans that align assessment of candidate learning with the appropriate professional standards (Evidence A1.1.11 and A1.1.12).

School Psychology has used their evaluation of field experiences data (Evidence A1.1.2) to determine the need for and to develop a new evaluation form more appropriate for assessing candidate learning outcomes in the clinical setting (Evidence A2.1.1).

3. How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the professional standards in the licensure area at initial and specialty area for advanced? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the first question of this page)

The following rubrics for initial programs are tagged to professional standards
1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample
1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching
1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report

At the advanced level, rubrics used as evidence for this report are also used as evidence for the SPA reports and are aligned with professional standards.
A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations
A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples
A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project
A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment 4 - Final Evaluation
A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project
A1.1.8 - Building Level Key Assessment 3 - Community Relations
A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation
A1.1.16 - SPED Key Assessment 1 - Teacher Work Sample
A1.1.17 - SPED Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project
A1.1.18 - SPED Key Assessment 3- IEP Assignment

4. How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" in the first question of this page)

Of the 15 SPA programs, only one was not Nationally Recognized, Math Education. This program was Recognized with probation until 2/1/20. This program is evaluating its current assessment plan to better identify appropriate points of administration, revise rubrics, and ensure alignment with professional standards. The program will be revising rubrics in Spring and Summer 2019 and will resubmit a SPA report in September 2019.

Upload State Program Reports below

~~Early Childhood Education Minor State letter~~
Engineering and Technology State Letter
High Ability State Letter
Teachers of English Learners
World Languages State Letter

See **Attachment** panel below.

Upload CAEP Program Review with Feedback Addendum below
Upload other National Accreditation Agency Documentation below (e.g. NASM, CACREP, NASAD)

Business Education Accreditation Letter
Art Education Accreditation Letter
Music Education Accreditation Letter
School Counseling Accreditation Letter

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 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 📎 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

2 📎 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3 📎 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

4 📎 2.1.1 - MOUs.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

5 📎 2.1.2 - Affiliation Agreements.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

6 📎 2.1.3 - PDS Taskforce Documents.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

7 📎 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

8 📎 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

9 📎 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

10 📎 2.1.7 - TEC Bylaws and Member Directory.doc

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
11 📎 2.1.8 - Co-Constructed Observation Tool.docx
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
12 📎 2.1.9 - Educational Assessment Committee.docx
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
13 📎 2.2.1 - Student Teaching Handbook 2018-2019.docx
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
14 📎 2.2.2 - 2016 Professional Development.pdf
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
15 📎 2.2.3 - 2017 Professional Development.pdf
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
16 📎 2.2.4 - 2018 Professional Development.pdf
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
17 📎 2.2.5 - Placement Form.doc
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
18 📎 2.2.6 - University Supervisor Meeting Agendas.pdf
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
19 📎 2.2.7 - University Supervisor Evaluation Form.docx
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
20 📎 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences.docx
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
21 📎 2.3.3 - Evidence of Varied Clinical Experiences.docx
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

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

The following narrative and attached documents provide evidence of the EPP's commitment to collaborative partnerships with the P-12 schools. This evidence demonstrates collaborative and mutually beneficial relationships.

Standard 2.1 Partner Collaborations for Clinical Preparation

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS (MOU/A)
Indiana State University has a general contract agreement with all schools where

candidates are placed for field experiences. The contract was modeled after the contract used by most programs in the state. The contracts are reviewed and updated on a regular basis, with the next update beginning Spring 2019. These contracts generally cover early field experiences and student teaching. Additionally, Indiana State University may enter into a partnership by requesting a school complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). An example of an MOU is the current pilot cadet teacher programs at Northview High School and Sullivan High School. These MOUs list the expectations of each party and can be terminated at any time by either party should the programs become untenable for any reason. (Evidence 2.1.1 - MOUs and 2.1.2 - Affiliation Agreements)

Pilot Cadet Teacher Program
The pilot cadet teacher programs at Northview High School and at Sullivan High School were started as a way to introduce high school students to the field of teaching and encourage high school seniors to take the CASA basic skills test prior to starting college. The first school, Northview, was chosen because of our connection to the school as the Assistant Superintendent is on our Teacher Education Advisory Council. Also, the school has a well-established cadet teaching program. The second school, Sullivan High School, was added at the request from the school.

The goal of this program was to see how the students in the Cadet Teaching program performed on the CASA tests as compared to our on-campus students. We discovered that students at the high school level in the Cadet Teaching Program were more comfortable testing since that was a routine part of their high school experience (state testing, ACT, PSAT, SAT). The students in the program had more interaction with one another due to being in the same class and also studied and took the test together. The students in the cadet teacher programs have their test fees paid for by the Education Student Services office as part of their participation in the program. Because of what we learned from the ongoing programs at Northview and Sullivan, we are now forming mentoring groups for our first semester freshmen to provide the support they might need from their cohort group.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS (PDS)
PDS has a 20-year history at ISU. The purpose of the PDS is to strengthen relationships with area P-12 schools and develop a mutual relationship regarding input and responsibility. In 2015 a Task Force was developed to examine the PDS relationships that were in place. This task force was comprised of EPP Faculty, EPP administration, and administrators from PDS schools. The PDS Taskforce met several times during 2016 and made several recommendations to re-vitalize the PDS relationships. Due to numerous changes in leadership within the EPP, the recommendations were not implemented at that time. Additionally, external factors within the PDS corporations did not allow for implementation at that time. (Evidence 2.1.3 - PDS Task Force Minutes)

For the Academic Year 2018-2019, there is a PDS relationship with Rosedale Elementary School. In Fall 2018, two new pilot programs were implemented; the Immersion Program and a Year-Long Internship. (Evidence 2.3.2)

Immersion Pilot Program

Based on the exit interviews and completer satisfaction surveys, exiting candidates and recent completers indicated they would like to experience the first week of school and see what is involved in setting up a classroom, meeting students for the first time, and participating in beginning of school year activities. As a result of this feedback, the Immersion Pilot Program was developed and implemented in Fall 2018. The Immersion Program allowed candidates to be immersed in the beginning of the school year (5-7 full school days); set up a classroom, attend Open House, meet students and parents, and help set the culture of the classroom from the first day of school.

Lena Dunn Elementary School in rural Indiana has 39% English Language Learning students. Eleven candidates were recruited to participate in the Immersion program in Fall 2018. Candidates were selected based on academic standing and presence of an ELL Minor. Feedback on the Immersion program was provided at the January 2019 TEAC meeting. (Evidence 2.1.5 - TEAC Agenda and Minutes)

It is expected that the immersion program will continue next year for elementary education majors, and we anticipate extending the option to middle and high schools as well for our secondary and all grade education majors.

Year Long Internship Pilot
The Year-Long Internship program developed out of the Immersion Pilot Program. The Principal at Rosedale Elementary school expressed interest in having candidates for a full year, making their internship experience more in line with other professions that offer Year-Long Internships. Staunton Elementary School in Clay Community School district was eager to participate in the Year-Long Internship experience as well. The 11 candidates that participated in the Immersion program continued with that placement for their TOTAL experience and student teaching experience to equal the Year-Long Internship. At the end of the first semester of the year-long internship, three candidates were moved to a different placement for the second semester for various reasons (two wanted to student teach closer to home, one candidate was moved).

Candidates who participated in the Year-Long Internship will be asked to provide feedback on the Year-Long Internship experience. Feedback will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the internship and the interest from candidates and host schools in continuing the Year-Long Internship program. Feedback was received from administrators who have candidates in the Year-Long Internship during the January 2019 TEAC meeting. Overall, their feedback was positive with the majority expressing interest in continuing this opportunity. (Evidence 2.1.5 - TEAC Agenda and Minutes)

COLLABORATION AND FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS
Soliciting feedback from host teachers as well as candidates and university supervisors offers a tremendous opportunity to tailor the candidates' and host teachers' experience to be mutually beneficial. Feedback is gathered through written feedback forms and site visits where formative discussions regularly occur between candidates, host teachers, and university supervisors. There are also events on campus that host teachers, principals, administrators, and other community

stakeholders. At these events, stakeholders are invited to share their thoughts about what could make our partnerships even stronger.

Re-Organization of Education Student Services
As part of the shared responsibility for the educator preparation program, faculty reviewed feedback from school and community stakeholders and found the need for reorganization of offices and responsibilities to better serve our candidates and other valuable stakeholders. This reorganization included creating a position responsible for recruitment and advising of candidates, another for retention and completion, and another to manage scholarships and partnerships (such as PDS). Through these concentrated efforts, ISU hopes to attract a more diverse candidate pool, support them through completion, and offer competitive placements while in their program of study that will materialize into diverse work opportunities upon graduation. (Evidence 2.1.4 - Teacher Recruitment Plan)

Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC)
The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) began approximately ten years ago at the recommendation of a local principal who suggested we develop an advisory group that could provide suggestions and feedback on curriculum and student teaching placements. The TEAC currently has 15 members comprised of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and human resource directors from counties including and surrounding Vigo County. TEAC meets two or three times per year on the ISU campus. The TEAC was tasked with the overall goal of developing more frequent and reliable two-way feedback related to student teaching experiences. This two-way feedback serves both the members of the TEAC as well as the teacher preparation program.

The mission and role of TEAC has since expanded making this advisory group instrumental in providing guidance and feedback on current and potential programs. For example, it was the TEAC who strongly supported and encouraged faculty to develop a special education minor that would be available for either elementary or secondary education majors. (Previously, only elementary education majors had an option of becoming licensed in special education, and that was only an option with a double major in elementary education and in special elementary.) After expressing concerns that our educator preparation program was not producing enough completers in science and math, faculty designed and had approved two new majors, one in middle school math and one in middle school science. This was directly related to feedback from the TEAC.

Coordinators from all educator preparation majors, faculty, and other administrative staff are invited and encouraged to attend. Recently, discussion of a new special education license occurred and the faculty responsible for overseeing its development attended the TEAC meeting to obtain feedback from the members of that body. (Evidence 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes)

Campus Partner Advisory Group
The campus partner advisory group consists of program coordinators for each of the secondary content areas, all grade areas (Art, Music, and PE), Director of Education Student Services, BCOE Director of Assessment and Accreditation, BCOE Associate

Dean, and BCOE Dean. This advisory group was created as a way to bridge the gap between the Teaching and Learning Department housed in the BCOE and content areas which are housed within their own departments. The group meets once per month. Agenda items include assessment, course sequencing, and other accreditation and assessment needs.

Educational Assessment Committee
The Educational Assessment Committee was created as a way to streamline assessment within the College of Education. The committee is chaired by the Director of Accreditation and Assessment. The committee is comprised of CAEP standard team leads, a representative from Education Student Services, the Associate Dean, the University Assessment Coordinator, a campus partner from a secondary education content area, and a liaison from each educational department in the BCOE. This committee is tasked with reviewing rubrics, reviewing assessment processes, and any other accreditation and assessments needs. Data from key assessments, satisfaction survey results, and other assessment efforts are shared with this committee for dissemination to individual departments. Items developed within this committee are presented to the Teacher Education Committee for voting and approval. (Evidence 2.1.9 - Educational Assessment Committee)

Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning (TOTAL) Coaching Teacher Feedback:
TOTAL Coaching teachers complete a TOTAL Collaboration Conversation survey at the end of each semester to gather feedback on the TOTAL program. Feedback from these surveys are used to guide curriculum changes, TOTAL program improvements, and professional development opportunities. TOTAL coaches are also invited to participate in the TOTAL interview process with prospective TOTAL students. (Evidence 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents, pg 13)

Potential Areas for TOTAL Program Improvement identified in the 2017-2018 Collaboration Survey:
1) Update evaluation forms and make them available for online completion
2) Best practice sheet to be included in the TOTAL Coaching Teacher packet
3) For TOTAL students to teach a full day
4) Opportunities to increase use of technology or have an understanding of technology that is available
5) Co-teaching opportunities

As a result of the feedback from these surveys several technology workshops were offered in the Fall 2018 (October 2 "Technology in the Classroom") and ("Moodle" September 28). A workshop on Co-teaching was provided to TOTAL Students September 14, 2018. (Evidence 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents pages 16-26)

CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT:
Teacher Education Committee (TEC)
According to the Bylaws, "The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) is charged with the overall responsibility to assist in the planning, approving and coordinating of the various undergraduate and graduate programs which prepare licensed educators for the preschool through high school settings (PK-12). The Committee shall make certain the University is in compliance with the standards of the Indiana Department

of Education, Division of Professional Standards and the standards for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation as well as other relevant accrediting bodies (see Academic Affairs). All curricular and other academic items including assessment which would have a modifying effect on educator preparation at the University are within the charge of the TEC."

TEC Agendas and minutes can be found on the BCOE website https://www.indstate.edu/education/governance

TEC reviews each curricular change within the college prior to the request being sent to the University for the final approval. Individuals proposing curricular changes present reasons why the changes are being requested, share any input from stakeholders, and discuss how changes are impacted by current legislation. TEC is comprised of 21 voting members, representatives from all areas in the college of education, not limited to teacher education, an undergraduate student, a graduate student, and content specific partners from various other colleges on campus. Several ex-officio members are included representing the Deans Office, the Assessment Office, and Education Student Services. (Evidence 2.1.7- TEC Bylaws and Member List)

CO-CONSTRUCTION OF INSTRUMENTS
Student Teaching Observation Tool:
Feedback was received during Summer 2018 university supervisor training that there was interest in a new Student Teaching Observation Tool. The current Observation Tool is qualitative in nature. Since the University Supervisors are the individuals utilizing the observation tool, they were given the opportunity to provide feedback on themes or constructs they look for when observing student teachers. After feedback was received, the responses were categorized by major themes. A focus group consisting of two university supervisors, a host teacher, and two building administrators met to create the Student Teaching Observation Tool which is based on the feedback and identified themes. The focus group aligned the main categories of the Student Teaching Observation Tool to the Indiana Teachers Evaluation system. The main categories aligned with the state evaluation are Planning, Instruction, and Core Professionalism. An additional category, Classroom Management was added as this is an area that has been identified as important from various stakeholder groups. The proposed observation tool was introduced to the EAC for feedback. The Observation Tool was presented to the focus group and back to EAC until the final form was approved by the EAC. The Observation Tool was presented to the TEC for adoption at the December 2018 meeting (Evidence 2.1.8 - Co-Constructed Observation Tool). The new Student Teaching Observation Tool will be piloted by a small group of university supervisors in Spring 2019. We expect to have data available on the new tool by the site visit.

Standard 2.2 Partnership Selection and Retention
CO-SELECTION OF CLINICAL EDUCATORS
Host teachers are selected by building principals. Principals must sign placement forms attesting that the host teachers have the required licensing and ability to mentor candidates. In some circumstances the EPP may request certain host teachers who may have specific skill sets such as the ability to assist candidate with

achieving necessary skills such as organization, classroom management, or similar skills. (Evidence 2.2.5 - Placement Form)

Student Teaching placement for candidates during the TOTAL semester is a collaborative process. Candidates participate in an interview with a TOTAL faculty member and have an opportunity to share their interests with faculty. Interview responses are shared with the school principal who then uses this information to match candidates with a clinical educator based on interests and needs of the candidate. (Evidence 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents: page 15 Intern Interview Form)

TRAINING OF CLINICAL EDUCATORS AND UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
The university supervisors are responsible for training and relaying pertinent information to the host teachers. Due to candidates being placed across the state for their student teaching experiences, university supervisors are hired to cover geographic regions. The university supervisors act as the primary liaison between the EPP, candidate, and P-12 school and provide on-going support to host teachers. University supervisors attend a one-day meeting each summer. The focus of the meeting varies depending on the current needs. Topics have included interrater reliability training, training on using assessment instruments, general feedback and concerns, and how to train and support host/mentor teachers. (Evidence 2.2.6 - University Supervisors Meeting Agendas)

Student Teaching Handbook
The Student Teaching Handbook is a collaboratively created resource for all host teachers, candidates, and university supervisors. The handbook was created with Institutional and state guided information along with information gathered from clinical partnerships. The Student Teaching Handbook is reviewed and updated regularly to reflect any changes necessary as recommended by our stakeholders. The handbook provides students, clinical educators, and university supervisors with valuable information about the teaching program at Indiana State University. (Evidence 2.2.1 - Student Teaching Handbook)

TOTAL Coaches
TOTAL coaches complete three hours of training with EPP Elementary Education faculty. Additionally, TOTAL coaches are invited to participate in ongoing professional development opportunities sponsored by the Bayh College of Education. (Evidence 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES
The Bayh College of Education offers several professional development opportunities to candidates, EPP faculty, and P-12 teachers. (Evidence 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4 - Professional Development)

Duke Energy Power of Reading Summit
The Duke Energy Power of Reading Summit is a professional development opportunity geared specifically for educators and administrators in the K-2 environment. Sessions include 'scientific reading research in foundational skills and intervention instruction.' This full day event is free for participants through

cooperation between Duke Energy and the BCOE. Feedback from participants and other stakeholders inform the following year's offerings. The 2018 Reading Summit brought in a record 450 attendees. (Evidence 2.2.2 pg. 10-18, 2.2.3 pg. 10-18, 2.2.4 pg. 7-11)

Duke Energy Power of Math Summit
The Duke Energy Power of Math Summit is geared at providing new ways to engage K-2 students in mathematics. The sessions include research-based content around math fluency, creating dialogues about math, and new ways to build on student skills. This free professional development opportunity is open to educators and administrators. (Evidence 2.2.3 pg. 19-24, 2.2.4 pg 12-18)

Blumberg Workshops
The Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Special Education housed within the Bayh College of Education offers several education-focused topical workshops each year. Workshops are open to candidates, EPP faculty, and P-12 teachers. Based on feedback from various stakeholder groups, the March 2018 workshop focused on Classroom Management. (Evidence 2.2.2 pg 1, 2.2.3 pg. 1, 2.2.4 pg. 1-2)

EduTECH Conferences
The first EduTECH Conference was held in 2017 and is organized by the student organization, ISEA. This conference was developed based on feedback from clinical educators, faculty, and candidates that there is a strong need for more opportunities for candidates to learn effective use of technology, differentiation, and critical thinking in the classroom. Presenters include educators from local school districts and across the state of Indiana who serve as experts in their areas. Attendees include candidates, clinical educators, and administrators. The next EduTECH Conference is scheduled for April 2019. (Evidence 2.2.3 pg. 26-29, 2.2.4 pg 3-6)

CLINICAL EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS
Although we do not formally evaluate host teachers, there is ongoing communication between the university supervisors and candidates. If a host teacher is determined to no longer be an effective mentor, decisions may be made not to use them in the future. If we do use them as a host teacher, university supervisors will monitor and provide additional support. If a host teacher and candidate are determined to be an incapable match and challenges cannot be overcome, the candidate may be moved to a different placement.

University supervisors are evaluated annually by the Assistant Director of Education Student Services. (Evidence 2.2.7 - University Supervisor Evaluation Form). Candidates are also encouraged to complete a short evaluation on the university supervisor; however, response rates are low.

Standard 2.3 Candidate's Clinical Experiences
DIVERSITY AND BREADTH OF EXPERIENCES
The EPP works with partners to offer a variety of strategically timed clinical experiences that support candidate development of knowledge, skills, and professional disposition. (Evidence 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences) and (Evidence 2.3.3 - Evidence of Varied Clinical Experiences)

DEPTH OF EXPERIENCES
Several elements of the clinical experience sequence have been thoughtfully developed to ensure adequate depth of experience. Both the TOTAL and student teaching experiences are full-day experiences, with TOTAL being a part-time and student teaching being a full-time commitment for candidates. Both experiences also extend for 8-16 weeks, thus allowing candidates to develop relationships with their clinical supervisors and K-12 students and staff, and to gain extensive experience planning and delivering instruction, with a goal of teaching a "full load" of classes by the end of the student teaching experience.

In addition, based on feedback from stakeholders regarding candidates' pre-service preparation, both the beginning of year Immersion and a Year-Long Internship experience (described in 2.1) are currently being piloted to increase the depth of exposure for candidates and ensure they are fully prepared for all aspects of the teaching profession. The host schools involved in both pilot programs have been highly collaborative with the provider in agreeing to supervise candidates and develop the clinical experiences. Additionally, the immersion program provides a diverse experience to those candidates, particularly in Lena Dunn Elementary School where there is a large percentage of English Language Learners.

PERFORMANCE BASED ASSESSMENTS
(Evidence 2.3.3 - Evidence of Varied Clinical Experiences). This document provides course based assessments/assignments from various courses that are utilized for performance based assessments within the course. These assessments are in addition to the key assessments used across all initial programs and for all candidates.

INFUSION OF TECHNOLOGY
Based on feedback from various stakeholder groups and employer and completer satisfaction survey results, the use of technology is a recurring theme. This is an area in which the EPP continues to evaluate ways to improve. Discussions are underway with the local school district to enter a technology partnership (Evidence 7-Evidence of Infusion of Technology, page 3). This would be a mutually beneficial partnership that provides increased availability of technology in the P-12 classroom and provides candidates more opportunities to use and apply technology in their coursework. This partnership would also provide EPP faculty additional training and opportunities to model technology in the classroom. Additionally, multiple key assessments assess the use of technology during candidates' coursework and field experience, Teacher Work Sample, Unit Report, and Final Evaluation of Student Teaching. As the availability of technology fluctuates depending on school district, candidates' ability to demonstrate technology application may be limited depending on his or her placement. (Evidence 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4)

IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT
Assignment 3 of the Teacher Work Sample (elementary and special education candidates) and Criterion 5 and 7 of the Unit Report (secondary candidates) provides evidence that candidates measure impact on P-12 student learning through pre and post-test data. In addition, within these assessments, candidates are expected to

write a reflection which analyzes the data and provides implications for future use to help guide and change instruction. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample). (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report).

Data Analysis and Interpretation: Data are provided for two cycles. Overall, the data demonstrate that P-12 students showed improvement in scores from the pre-test to the post-test. There were a few students that either showed no change or showed a regression on the post-test. The results are unclear whether this was due to a candidate input error, individual P-12 student difficulties or other factors. Unfortunately, the data available only present the pre and post-test scores rather than the reflection or narrative analysis per candidate.

Standard 2 Analysis:
This EPP has a long, rich history of community partnerships. The examples/evidence above demonstrate that this EPP engages in mutually beneficial partnerships with a variety of stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups provide valuable feedback that influences programmatic changes that guide continuous improvement.

Standard 2 Future Directions:
1. With changes in leadership within the EPP and in local school districts, discussions are underway to revitalize the PDS relationship with Vigo County School Corporation, the local school district. Additionally, the EPP is looking to expand the Immersion program and Year-Long Internship program to additional schools.

2. With new leadership at multiple levels within the institution and the school corporations, there is tremendous potential for renewed and expanded opportunities locally and in other areas of our state. The University's process for reviewing and managing contracts has recently changed. The responsibility for reviewing and updating contracts and agreements for the BCOE was recently shifted to the Education Student Services Office. The Assistant Director of Education Student Services will assume this responsibility and is working on developing a formal process for reviewing and uploading contracts with all school districts. The goal is to begin implementing this process in Spring 2019.

3. Consideration will be given to expand the audience of the TOTAL workshops to all pre-service candidates as these workshops are currently only open to elementary education candidates. Additionally, some workshops may be made available to host teachers.

4. Continue to work collaboratively with stakeholder groups to develop co-constructed observation and evaluation tools for candidate evaluation.

5. Currently there is not a formal document that identifies selection criteria for host teachers. Additionally there are no formal guidelines to determine if a host teacher is effective. This EPP will consider creating a new document that identifies the selection criteria for clinical educators, how to determine if a clinical educator is no longer effective, and a written process if a clinical educator is deemed ineffective.

6. Currently there is not a formal process to evaluate host teachers. This EPP will

create a candidate feedback form to evaluate and provide feedback on their student teaching experience and host teacher effectiveness. Due to limitations within the school districts, this will need to be an internal process that is used to gather feedback on the experience as a whole rather than "evaluating" the teacher's performance or skill set.

7. Due to our host teachers being spread out across the state, limitations have been noted in the ability to train host teachers. Thus the responsibility of training host teachers has fallen onto the university supervisors. In the past, training videos were made available to host teachers online. This will be re-considered as a way to provide ongoing support and training for host teachers, particularly on the use of assessment instruments.

Standard 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 📎 A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

2 📎 A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

3 📎 A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

4 📎 A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

5 📎 A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

6 📎 A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

7 📎 A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

8 📎 A2.1.3 - SPSY Handbook 2018.pdf

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

9 📎 A2.1.4 - District Level - Application for Central Office Internship.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

10 📎 A2.1.5 - District Level Course Syllabi.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

11 📎 A2.1.7 - Building Level Princial Intern Handbook.pdf

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

12 📎 A2.1.6 - EDC Meeting Minutes.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
13 📎 A2.1.8 - Building Level Course Syllabi.doc

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

14 📎 A3.2.1 - SPSY Performance Improvement Plans.docx

A.2.2 Clinical Experiences

15 📎 5.1.3 - Fall 2018 Rubric Review Results.docx

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

---

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

School Psychology Ed.S.

Evidence Overview:
The school psychology program engages in regular and ongoing collaboration in the development and maintenance of clinical partnerships. Evidence of co-construction is offered in the following sources:

Standard Practicum and Internship Agreements:
One way we ensure joint understanding of clinical placement requirements and responsibilities is through the use of standard clinical affiliation agreements that offer a description of University, Agency, and Candidate responsibilities. Agreements include language surrounding the responsibility of the EPP and the candidate to communicate program requirements, and responsibility of the supervisor to make a good faith effort to help coordinate the required experiences for the candidate. Examples of the agreements used for both the practicum and internship course are provided. (Evidence 2.1.1 - SPSY Co-Creation of Partnerships)

Varied and Developmental Experiences:
The sequence of field work as candidates progress through the program is described below:
Candidates complete a first-year practicum experience, which occurs primarily within a University-based setting. The provided documentation provides evidence of a practicum experience (the Academic Support Clinic) that has been developed specifically for the first-year experience. A new component of this practicum experience is participation in the Sycamore Readers program. This will afford candidates additional opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary activities, as they work with students from other disciplines to monitor progress and guide delivery of services for those individuals whom are struggling to read. Syllabus language and supporting documentation are also offered to demonstrate collaboration with on-campus and community partners to include relevant inter-disciplinary interactions and community engagement opportunities as part of the first-year experience. (Evidence A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi and Evidence A2.1.3 - SPSY Handbook)

During their second year, candidates complete a 350-hour school-based practicum. Candidates are expected to indirectly deliver academic and behavioral interventions as well as engage in assessment and consultative activities. The experience culminates in delivery of the Master's Case, which is mentored by the candidate's field and university supervisors. The practicum agreement and course syllabus are offered to demonstrate partnerships between the University and various school

agencies. (Evidence A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi and Evidence A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships)

The capstone experience for Ed.S candidates is a 1200-hour school-based internship. Candidates are required to directly deliver academic and behavioral interventions and collaborate with other school personnel to complete special education evaluations. At the end of the year, candidates present their Specialist Project, which serves as an indicator of successful completion of degree requirements. The internship agreement and syllabus are offered to demonstrate partnership between the university and various school agencies. (Evidence A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi and Evidence and A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships)

Minimum Requirements and Standards for Acceptable Performance:
The program handbook (A2.1.3) and course syllabi (A2.1.2) are used to articulate the practicum requirements and the partnership between the program and field supervisors to determine when candidates have achieved the level of skill required to successfully complete practicum and internship experiences. Samples of handbook and syllabus language are provided to document (a) joint responsibility for training and determinations of acceptable performance, and (b) the opportunity for candidates to obtain relevant applied experiences as part of their practicum and internship experiences. Examples of appropriate culminating experiences for both practicum and internships are evidenced in the Master's Case Presentation and Specialist Project. (Evidence A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Sample)

Regular Supervisor Communication and Site Visits:
Site visits are regularly scheduled, in-person or virtually, as part of both the practicum and internship experiences. Site visits serve to ensure field supervisors have (a) regular access to program faculty, (b) appropriate and timely information about program requirements, and (c) an opportunity to discuss candidate performance and collaboratively problem-solve when needed. Evidence of scheduled site visits, notes, and communication with supervisors is provided in Evidence A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships.

Partnership for Remediation:
In the event a candidate has a Performance Improvement Plan in place during a field placement, the field supervisor is informed and in some cases agrees in advance to participate in implementation of the plan. Language related to field-based performance improvement plans is provided, and an exemplar addendum to the standard practicum agreement is provided. (Evidence A3.2.1 - SPSY Performance Improvement Plan)

Partnership for Problem-Solving:
The program first-year experience requires candidates to shadow school psychologists. Shadowing experiences have historically been coordinated through a single local cooperative that serves as our most stable training partner. As program enrollment has increased, however, supervisors have expressed concern about the time demands for helping with the shadowing requirements. Evidence is provided of the program's response to expressed concerns, through (a) reconsidering the appropriateness of the shadowing requirement, (b) reaching out for additional

supports to help candidates successfully complete the required experience, and (c) following up with the cooperative director.

Partnership for Evaluation:
As reflected in the Practicum Evaluation evidence packet (Evidence A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations, p. 19), multi-year analysis of field supervisor evaluations suggested that our field evaluation forms were not yielding data that were useful to the program, supervisors, or candidates. We hypothesized that these issues were potentially due to insufficient anchor points on the evaluation forms, poor alignment of evaluation items with candidates' actual field experiences, and inadequate overlap between the skills developed in coursework and skills evaluated during fieldwork. Therefore, we engaged faculty, field supervisors, and candidates in an effort to completely overhaul our field evaluation forms during Spring 2018. Full documentation of the revision process is provided to reflect supervisor engagement in planning, executing, and pilot testing the revised form. (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results)

Ongoing Collaboration:
As evidence of ongoing collaboration with our supervisors, we provide a summary of a meeting from February 2018 with supervisors from a local special educational cooperative as well as evidence of a November 2018 supervisor luncheon; such opportunities are invaluable for engaging with our supervisors around a number of topics relevant for strengthening clinical partnerships. (Evidence 2.1.1 - SPSY Co-Creation of Partnerships)

Analysis and Interpretation:
In sum, these documents provide evidence of a thriving and continual collaboration with field partners to co-create meaningful and mutually beneficial partnerships that provide candidates with opportunities to apply their knowledge and skills via relevant clinical experiences. We continue to examine ways to develop and improve our shared understanding of and responsibility for candidates' training outcomes.

Future Use/Implications:
Moving forward, we will continue to maintain regular communication with all supervisors both to preserve our partnership with them and to work with them to identify any potential areas of growth at the candidate and program levels. We will also look for ways to expand our ongoing partnerships to include districts beyond the local community. Lastly, we will implement some program-level changes that will improve candidates' preparedness for clinical experiences. These changes will surround a focused consideration of our testing sequence as well as more frequent checks for competency that incorporate skills across coursework, rather than being reserved to one area of performance.

School Administration - District Level, Ed.S

Varied and Developmental Experiences:
Ed.S candidates participate in a summer superintendency internship and complete an action research project. (Evidence A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 -

Community Relations Project) and Evidence A2.1.5 - District Level Course Syllabi)

Ongoing Collaboration:
The Educational Development Council (EDC) which meets twice a year, serves as the K-12 Educational Leadership Advisory Group and provides specific feedback to the Department of Educational Leadership on pre-service superintendent training in the Ed.S. program, as well as feedback on services provided to practicing superintendents statewide. Activities of the EDC include a varied combination of professional discussions, relevant trainings, reflective feedback opportunities, current issues information sharing, legislative updates, and strategic planning opportunities for the university and its partnering schools. (Evidence A2.1.6 - EDC Meeting Minutes)

There is an ongoing collaborative relationship between program faculty and site supervisors. The Ed.S. program utilizes the Superintendent's Authorization Form during site visits as a reflective method of candidate preparedness and potential. (Evidence A2.1.4 - District Level - Application for Central Office Internship)

Partnership for Problem-Solving:
Through active participation in the EDC, participants serve in a network of educational needs analysis and solution-focused school leadership ambassadors. Members are canvassed prior to each semi-annual meeting to determine what problems the group might need addressed and how they can partner for efficient and effective solutions to current needs and professional demands. Examples might include branding and marketing of public education in a competitive marketplace, solving the statewide and national teacher shortage, addressing the achievement gap for at-risk students, inclusionary practices for transgender students, redesigning the school calendar better to meet the needs of non-agrarian communities, and ensuring safety and security in an era of nationwide school violence. (Evidence A2.1.6 - EDC Meeting Minutes)

Analysis and Interpretation:
There is no doubt, the Ed.S District level program has a long history of success and candidates demonstrate their preparation and abilities in the field; however, there is limited evidence available. Through this evaluation process, gaps in formalized processes and structure have been discovered. Plans will be put in place to streamline and formalize processes to demonstrate effective ongoing collaboration with partners, the use of feedback to guide program improvement, involvement of stakeholder groups, and varied clinical experiences.

Future Directions:
1. The EPP will benefit from structuring the Educational Development Council (EDC) to include a standard meeting itinerary with business items, professional learning, critical conversation and reflection, and action items.
2. Another benefit will be to add additional opportunities for partnership input on Ed.S. program impact from the standpoint of employers and completers.
3. Consideration will be given to utilizing the Superintendent's Authorization Form as a criterion for candidate selectivity.

School Administration - Building Level, M.Ed.

Partnerships Through Clinical Experiences:
EDLR 758-793, summative courses in the Principal and Building-leadership Preparation Program, include a Principal Internship experience. Each internship is collaboratively created and sustained in each of the 25 to 40 school building partnerships each academic year, in which pre-service principal trainees are paired with and supervised in ongoing training, support, and action research regarding leadership capabilities under the guidance of a building-level school leader.

Standard Practicum and Internship Handbook:
In order to ensure a mutual understanding of the principal internship requirements and the responsibilities of candidates, supervising field mentors, and university supervisors, we created a Principal Internship Handbook that offers a description of the experience and shared responsibilities of all involved in the collaborative experience, as well as an array of activity options that can be selected for clinical duties and allowable projects in leadership training. The intent is that all stakeholders will make a good effort to make a positive impact on both leadership preparation and student learning through pre-service leadership contribution under the guidance of a field expert. Examples of the Handbooks used are provided. (Evidence A2.1.7 - Building Level Principal Intern Handbook)

Varied and Developmental Experiences:
Prior to the successful completion of the year-long Principal Internship, candidates complete over 300 hours of in-school activities in leadership, which occur in the elementary, middle school, or high school P-12 setting. Activities are varied and tailored to meet the professional interests, aptitudes, and abilities of the candidates, and especially the needs of the school, teachers, staff, and learners within those building sites and school districts. Specific to the notion of varied and developmental experiences is the Action Research Project, where learners conduct a four-stage cycle of inquiry: planning, acting, developing and reflecting. Candidates first identify a need that exists in the school in which they are interning, then collect and analyze the data. Once the data is collected, candidates develop a plan to respond to the data and finally share the data with stakeholders. These activities are co-created, guided, and analyzed by the leader (intern), site supervisor (partnership principal/designee) and university supervisor. (Evidence A1.1.7 - Building level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project)

Minimum Requirements and Standards for Acceptable Performance:
Overall, Principal Internship requirements, as well as those activities including the Action Research Project, are articulated by the Principal Intern Handbook and course syllabi, and revised per professional needs and P-12 contexts, each year by program supervisors, after input by candidates and field supervisors. Candidates have achieved the level of skill required to complete intern activities and the overall experience when they achieve a preponderance of scores of 3 (meets expectations) and 4 (exceeds expectations) on program evaluation sheets and rubrics. Rubrics for all assignments and intern experience are available for review, so as to document joint responsibilities for assurances of acceptable performance and an opportunity for candidates to obtain applied experiences, as well as relevant and helpful feedback on

their professional pre-service performance on the applied experiences.
(Evidence A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project)
(Evidence A2.1.7 - Building Level Principal Intern Handbook)
(Evidence A2.1.8 - Building Level Course Syllabi)

Regular Supervisor Communication and Site Visits:
Site visits to clinical partner schools and Principal Intern settings are held at least two times, in person, each semester, with an opportunity of ongoing, synchronous online meeting capabilities. Asynchronous communication takes place between Principal Intern candidates and university supervisors through journaling activities each week, and, in most cases, candidates are working in-person with their field supervisors, or in proximity with regular community, in up to 10 hours of practical application within the schools.

Partnership for Remediation:
In the event that a candidate is receiving unfavorable reports or feedback of concern from site mentors or university supervisors, or a preponderance of 1's (does not meet expectations) or 2's on activity rubrics, then the university supervisor and site mentor (principal) would meet to design a plan for remediation, as well as a corrective, progressive, plan for rectification of those difficulties. This type of remediation would also be used in the event of reports of counterproductive dispositions by a site mentor.

Partnership for Problem-Solving:
The 300-hour Principal Intern experience has an expectation that pre-service building leadership candidates shadow school principals and/or designees. Through discussions with building leadership, we have found that some buildings may have additional challenges and there has been a need for the candidate to work with other designees within the building in order to ensure that our candidates have relevant, hands-on shadowing and mentoring opportunities and training. These circumstances are managed individually among the university supervisor, field mentor, and site candidate. If necessary, candidates can be pulled from a particular placement and be reassigned by the Principal Program Coordinator.

Partnership for Evaluation
Each year, site supervisors are asked to complete a summative evaluation form for their Principal Intern candidate. However, there is a limited amount of data that has been collected on the Principal Internship program from field partners. Through Employer and Completer surveys as well as future district and school partner dialogue, we will design a system that better serves as a robust measure of partner evaluation of our building-level preparation programs. (Evidence A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation)

Analysis and Interpretation:
The program exhibits strengths with respect to establishing working relationships with diverse clinical sites that meet the needs of its candidates. In addition, expectations and requirements of the internship experience are clearly articulated via the internship handbook, and pre-internship activities are flexible enough to accommodate the needs of the partnering clinical site. University supervisors also

complete in-person internship visits on a regular basis to maintain positive working relationships with clinical supervisors and interns and to facilitate open lines of communication. Because clinical experiences are completed in districts that are convenient for candidates, and since candidates reside in diverse geographic locations within the state, it is challenging to develop stable and ongoing clinical partnerships. Therefore, additional attention is needed to the mechanisms through which clinical supervisors have the opportunity to provide feedback and input into the clinical experience.

Future Use:
The program will use completer and employer surveys to gather feedback on the clinical experiences of candidates which will contribute to program improvement efforts. Additional mechanisms will also be examined for collecting formative feedback from clinical partners. Areas in which additional input would be beneficial include (a) the clarity and appropriateness of the 300 hours of pre-internship activities, and whether these meet the needs of candidates and clinical partners; (b) the knowledge and preparation of candidates near the beginning or mid-point of the internship experience, and (c) clinical partners' perspectives on the appropriateness and clarity of the internship requirements. With these potential questions in mind, a plan for heightened reflective feedback and program improvement will be developed with implementation anticipated by the site visit.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity (Initial Programs)

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

1 📎 1.1.1 - Key Assessment 1 - Professional Disposition

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

2 📎 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

3 📎 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession

4 📎 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

5 📎 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan.docx

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

6 📎 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs.docx

3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

7 📎 3.1.1 - All Program Demographic Data.docx
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
8 📎 3.3.1 - TOTAL De-identified Professional Growth Plan.docx
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
9 📎 3.6.1 - 2018 Law Workshop - Relevant Laws and Policies.pdf
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
10 📎 3.6.2 - SPED 226 Law Assignment - Relevant Laws and Policies.doc
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
11 📎 3.6.3 - CIMT 400 Law Advice Assignment - Relevant Laws and Policies.doc
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
12 📎 3.6.5 - Eled 400 syllabus - Professional Standards of Practice.docx
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
13 📎 3.6.6 - Responsibilities and Expectations of Interns - Professional Standards of Practice..docx
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
14 📎 3.6.7- TEC Minutes to approve Code of Ethics.docx
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
15 📎 3.6.8 - CIMT 400 Syllabus.doc
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession

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

Standard 3.1 - Teacher Education Recruitment
The provider is well-situated to recruit racially and ethnically diverse candidates into teacher education, with an emphasis on high-need areas. First, the provider has existing curricular offerings that facilitate licensure in nearly all identified teacher shortage areas. Several such shortage areas (e.g., special education, English as a Second Language, Early Childhood) are available as minors or certificates that can be added to other teacher preparation majors). In addition, Program Demographic Data (Evidence 3.1.1) indicate that the diversity of teacher education candidates already reflects the racial and ethnic diversity of the current teacher workforce and of the state and local area.

A formal Teacher Education Recruitment Plan has been developed to build upon existing recruitment initiatives, maintain the provider's emphasis on relationship-building, and focus on individualized recruitment and candidate support. The restructuring of the Education Student Services (ESS) office to include a Coordinator of Recruitment and Advising will allow more focused attention to be devoted to formal recruitment efforts through improved coordination with on-campus (e.g., Admissions, University College) and off-campus (e.g., community colleges, local and regional high schools) streams of high-quality candidates. The creation of a Coordinator of Retention and Completion position will support candidates' matriculation through the teacher education curriculum and ensure program

milestones are completed on schedule. This position will facilitate individualized support when needed. Finally, the Coordinator of Scholarships and Partnerships will facilitate greater diversity in field placements, mentorship of high-quality candidates who receive financial assistance, and evaluation of novice teachers' experiences in the field. (Evidence 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan)

Despite a context conducive to recruitment in target areas, the provider has not formerly engaged in formal and strategic recruitment efforts. The Teacher Education Recruitment Plan is newly written, and the ESS office began its restructured operations in Fall 2018. Therefore, the effectiveness of planned efforts will need to be evaluated and strategies may need to be revised in response to outcome data. In particular, trends in racial/ethnic diversity and gender diversity will need to be examined for impacts on both new candidate enrollment and candidate retention and completion.

Standard 3.2 - Candidate Demonstrated Overall Academic Achievement
Evidence 2.3.1 outlines the provider's admission requirements for teacher education programs. Candidates are admitted to the teacher preparation program once the minimum admission requirements have been met. (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements - ALL Programs)

The EPP has established a minimum GPA of 2.5 for admission to teacher education programs. The actual academic achievement of candidates entering teacher education, however, reflects average GPAs of 3.35 and higher (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements - ALL Programs, Data Table 1). The provider therefore meets the CAEP threshold for a group average GPA of 3.0 of higher at the time of admission. Disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.50 and 3.0.

With respect to nationally normed or state-normed assessments, the State of Indiana sets thresholds for admission to teacher preparations programs (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs). The Core Academic Skills Assessment (CASA) is the primary assessment used to document basic skills proficiency, with scores of 220 or higher required in each of the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Indiana also allows basic skills to be demonstrated based on pre-established performance on a number of nationally normed assessments, including the ACT (scores of 24 or higher), SAT (scores of 1170 or higher), and GRE (scores of 151 or higher). Evidence 2.3.1, Data Table 2 reflects that the majority of teacher education candidates are admitted on the basis of CASA scores, which are state-approved but not state-normed.

Overall, only about one-third of candidates are admitted to teacher education with nationally normed test performance above the state-approved threshold. Nevertheless, candidates enter the program with GPAs well above the provider-established threshold of 2.50 and are successful in maintaining GPAs above 3.0 throughout their matriculation through the program (Evidence 2.3.1, Data Table 1).

The provider may wish to consider its admissions criteria to more closely align with

CAEP requirements, with particular examination of the current minimum GPA requirement of 2.50. Given the current average GPA above 3.3 at the time of admission, it may be worthwhile to consider whether raising the threshold for admission to 3.0 would cause significant changes in (a) the number, or (b) the quality of admitted candidates.

Standard 3.3 - Additional Selectivity Evidence Packet

After admittance into the Becoming a Complete Professional (BCP) I and prior to any field experiences, candidates are required to pass a FBI and Child Protective Services (CPS) criminal background check. If a candidate is flagged or does not clear the background check, the Director of Education Student Services (ESS) will meet with the candidate to discuss the impact of the results on a candidate's ability to complete required field experiences, potential implications of the results for future employment, and/or viable alternatives to the teacher education majors.

The provider also utilizes the professional disposition assessment as an additional selectivity factor throughout candidates' matriculation (Evidence 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 - Professional Disposition). The Professional Disposition is first introduced in an introductory course prior to admission into the teacher education program and is administered at multiple time points throughout the program. Assessments are completed by EPP faculty during coursework and by university supervisors during student teaching.

Data for the six identified dispositions (as described above and highlighted in the Evidence 1.1.1 data tables) indicate that the majority of candidates scored in the adequate to proficient range during course-based assessment, at which point candidates are engaged in pedagogical coursework and are completing initial fieldwork experiences. Across programs and cohorts, a significant positive shift in ratings may be observed from assessments completed during coursework to those completed during student teaching. During the culminating student teaching experience, the majority of candidates were rated as performing in the "proficient" to "exceeds expectations" range. Less than 10% of candidates received a rating of "adequate," and no candidates received a rating of "below expectations". Overall it appears that candidates showed improvement in these six areas from the disposition during coursework to the disposition during student teaching.

It is notable that the stated criterion for acceptable performance on this measure according to Evidence 1.1.1 is a rating of "proficient" or higher on each element of the rubric. It would be beneficial to describe and track any remediation efforts and final outcomes for candidates who are rated in the "adequate" range or below during a culminating experience.

Given the emphasis on professional disposition assessment throughout course-based and field-based experiences, the provider may wish to consider the ideal timing and appropriate persons for completion of the assessments. For instance, the provider may consider (a) whether the rubric may be applied equally to course-based and field-based experiences; (b) whether university faculty or host teachers are the most suitable raters; and (c) whether a dispositional assessment should be included as

part of the admissions criteria for teacher education programs. In addition, the provider may wish to consider the proper alignment of items on the Professional Disposition rubric with the InTASC Standards.

Standard 3.4 Program Progression and Monitoring of Candidate Advancement
PROGRAM PROGRESSION
Candidates progress through the teacher education program in three stages (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs). Additionally, candidates must maintain a 2.5 GPA and a grade of C in every required teacher education course. Candidates may repeat a teacher education course in order to achieve a C grade. Candidates' GPA and course grades are monitored by the Education Student Services Office throughout their program. If a candidate's GPA drops below a 2.5, Education Student Services meets with the candidate to discuss alternatives to teacher education and potential consequences of the GPA below 2.5 (i.e., being ineligible for licensure). Individual course grade and overall GPA requirements are one method used to ensure candidates are developing and appropriately mastering content and pedagogical content knowledge.

EVIDENCE OF DEVELOPING CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE
The Teacher Work Sample and Unit Report are used as key assessments documenting candidates' developing content and pedagogical content knowledge. In conjunction with continual monitoring of course grades and GPA, the Teacher Work Sample and Unit Report represent significant performance-based assessments that reflect candidates' ability to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge in the classroom setting.

EVIDENCE OF PEDAGOGICAL SKILL
Candidates' pedagogical skills are also monitored at various points in the program using multiple measures. Professional dispositions (Evidence 1.1.1) are part of the overall evaluation of candidates through each field experience component, to ensure intervention can take place as needed at any time during a candidate's program progression. For example, candidates in the TOTAL, Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning, semester who receive a rating of "does not meet expectations" on the Professional Disposition assessment are placed on a professional growth plan. (Evidence 3.3.1 - TOTAL Professional Growth Plan)

The Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence 1.1.3) is also administered at multiple time points during candidate preparation, including during the TOTAL experience and during each student teaching placement. Candidates who are rated as falling below the "proficient" level on any of the elements of the evaluation receive individualized feedback and may be required to complete additional activities or the entire clinical experience.

COLLEGE AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS
College and career-ready standards are explicitly addressed within the Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample, "College and Career Ready"), Unit Report (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 Unit Report, "Planning Instruction to Meet Curriculum Goals"). Teacher Work Sample data reflect that candidates in special education demonstrated adequate ability to teach to

college and career-ready standards across three rounds of data (Mean range 3.00 - 3.75); candidates in elementary education have exhibited more variability (Mean range 2.55 - 3.22), with 20% of candidates rated as "Developing" in Fall 2018. In secondary education, across three rounds of data, 172/175 (98%) of candidates have been rated as meeting expectations or higher on the Unit Report item that encompasses teaching to college and career-ready standards.

Given the emphasis on college and career-ready standards, the provider may wish to examine the relatively high proportion of candidates in elementary education who were rated as "developing" on this criterion in Fall 2018, and be vigilant for any trends that may reflect a need for curricular adjustments. In addition, the provider may consider additional metrics to evaluate candidates' pedagogical knowledge and skills in this area, as college and career-ready language is not explicitly included in the Unit Report rubric and is not explicitly evaluated as part of the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching.

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION
Technology integration is explicitly assessed within the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching, Items 4c, 6c, and 9c). Data across programs and over time reflects that when rated, candidates are nearly always rated as meeting or exceeding expectations in technology integration. However, there is a significant number of circumstances in which one or more of the items relating to technology integration is rated as "No Basis for Judgment." This pattern may reflect that candidates lack opportunities to integrate technology into their teaching, or that there is a lack of shared understanding about the definition of "technology."

It may be appropriate to consider additional methods for evaluating candidates' use and integration of technology, to ensure data are collected by multiple sources and at multiple time points. Additionally, it may be beneficial to examine both coursework and field experiences to ensure candidates have adequate access to and opportunity to integrate technology into their instructional practice.

Standard 3.5 - Candidate Licensure/BCP III
CONTENT KNOWLEDGE
Program progression requirements of a minimum GPA of 2.50 in the major area of study and a grade of "C" or higher in all Professional Education coursework. In addition, candidates' overall performance on the Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample) or the Unit Report (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report) are used as summative indicators of adequate content knowledge in the major area of study.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING
Candidates' ability to design and deliver instruction is assessed within the Teacher Work Sample by the "Instructional Strategies, Activities, and Assessments" element and within the Unit Report by the "Instructional Variety" element. More global assessments of effective teaching are provided in the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, which emphasizes candidates' preparedness to effectively design and

deliver instruction on a daily basis. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample) and (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report) and (Evidence 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching)

The Final Evaluation of Student Teaching data reflect over 95% of candidates were rated at the "Meets" or "Exceeds" level across items. The Teacher Work Sample and Unit Report also exhibit high levels of positive evaluations of candidates' pedagogical skill on the relevant rubric items, with the exception of elementary education candidates in Fall 2018 (44% of candidates were rated as "Developing" on the relevant rubric item). These data should be monitored closely to identify any emerging trends or the need for curricular adjustments.

P-12 STUDENT IMPACT
Candidates' ability to impact P-12 student learning is assessed within the Teacher Work Sample on the "Pre and Post-Test Analysis" rubric element and within the Unit Report on the "Assessment of Learning" rubric element. The pre and post-test assessment data collected by candidates to meet the assignment requirements are presented in graph form at the end of Evidence 1.1.2 and 1.1.4. (Evidence 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample) and (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 Unit Report)

Results indicate a high level of proficiency among secondary candidates based on the Unit Report rubric evaluation. There was a slight decline in overall proficiency for elementary and special education candidates in Fall 2018 on the Teacher Work Sample rubric evaluation; these data should be monitored to determine whether instructional or curricular adjustments may be necessary. Graphed pre and post-test data indicate that positive P-12 student impact in the form of overall pre and post-test growth was evident in approximately 95% of the classrooms for which data are available. Similarly, over 95% of candidates are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds" expectations on the relevant items on the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching.

Overall, the provider uses multiple measures to verify candidate content knowledge, effective teaching, and impact on student learning prior to recommending candidates for licensure. It may benefit the provider to consider developing measures of P-12 student impact that require candidates to submit and analyze student impact data in a more standardized format. In addition, because the provider does not require candidates to complete state licensure exams, it may be beneficial to consider alternative summative metrics in addition to GPA and course grades for verifying candidates' overall content knowledge.

Standard 3.6 - Expectations of the Profession
CODE OF ETHICS
Formal adoption of the Association of American Educators (AAE) Code of Ethics was recently approved by the provider (Evidence 3.6.7 - TEC Minutes to Approve Code of Ethics). Nevertheless, ethical practice is assessed using multiple measures at multiple points during the program. Two key assessments that assess this area are Professional Dispositions (Evidence 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 - Professional Disposition) and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching).

The Professional Disposition rubric assesses commitment to ethical practice using the "Integrity and "Empathetic/Responsive" rubric elements, which reflect consistently high ratings across time and programs. Overall, over 99% of candidates are rated as proficient or higher in both areas at the time of student teaching, and a significant increase in proficiency is observed between course-based evaluations and evaluations completed during student teaching.

The Final Evaluation of Student Teaching assesses ethical practice on item 9c "demonstrates legal and ethical use of information and technology." It would be advisable for the provider to consider a more global item or a greater number of items related to ethical practice. At this time, however, all candidates who were rated on the available item received ratings of "proficient" or higher.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF PRACTICE
Professional Standards of Practice are covered in multiple courses throughout the program. The syllabus for ELED 400 (Evidence 3.6.5 - ELED 400 Syllabus - Professional Standards of Practice) outlines the professional standards (InTASC and ISTE) pre-service teachers are expected to demonstrate; professional practice standards are also covered in CIMT 400 (Evidence 3.6.8 - CIMT 400 Syllabus). Elementary pre-service teachers sign a Responsibilities and Expectations of Interns form during the TOTAL semester, which outlines the professional standards for their behavior in the schools (Evidence 3.6.6 - Responsibilities and Expectations of Interns).

Professional practice standards are also assessed on the Professional Disposition assessment, which incorporates various elements of professional behavior (e.g., professional dress, punctuality, and preparedness) and professional practice (e.g., self-reflection, collegiality, learner focus). A thorough analysis of candidate professional disposition is provided in Evidence 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 - Professional Disposition, which provides evidence that candidates' professional practice dispositions are regularly assessed at multiple progression points. Data demonstrate the vast majority of candidates exhibit proficiency with respect to these dispositions by the end of the student teaching experience.

RELEVANT LAWS AND POLICIES
Candidates are introduced to Relevant Laws and Policies at multiple points throughout the teacher preparation program. Elementary education candidates attend a one hour presentation on school law in the semester prior to student teaching (Evidence 3.6.1 - 2018 Law Workshop). Secondary and all-grade candidates are introduced to relevant laws and policies through various activities including completion of law packets, case studies and law reviews, and modules that consist of relevant school policies (Evidence 3.6.3 - CIMT 400 Law Advice Assignment). All candidates complete an assignment focused on school law regarding special education while enrolled in SPED 226 (Evidence 3.6.2 - SPED 226 Law Assignment). The assignment is designed to meet InTASC Standards 2 (Learner Differences), 3 (Learning Environments), 6 (Assessment), and 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), and CEC Standards 1 (Learner Development and Individual Learner Differences, 2 (Learning Environments), 4 (Assessment), and 6 (Professional

Learning and Ethical Practice).

Presently, candidate knowledge of law and policy is limited to course-based assessment. It would be advisable for the provider to consider a method for formally assessing candidates' knowledge of relevant law and policy within the context of relevant field experiences.

OTHER MANDATED REQUIREMENTS

Indiana requires all teachers to hold a valid certification in CPR, the Heimlich maneuver, and automated external defibrillator (AED) use. Candidates may choose where they obtain their certification training. Certifications must be issued by the American Red Cross, American Heart Association or other providers approved by the Department of Education.

Indiana mandates that all pre-service teacher candidates receive suicide prevention training before licensure to obtain a Suicide Prevention Certificate. The EPP provides this training for pre-service teachers.

Standard 3 Summary and Future Use

The provider maintains a feasible and consistent process for admission to teacher education and for monitoring candidates' academic performance and professional dispositions from admission through completion. The provider uses course grades, in addition to its key assessments, to evaluate candidates' development and proficiency in the competencies identified within this standard. The self-study process has, nevertheless, revealed a number of areas in which further development may be considered.

1. The provider may wish to evaluate its current admissions criteria, particularly the minimum GPA requirement of 2.5, which is below the CAEP required standard of 3.0.

2. In addition, careful consideration should be given to ways in which the CAEP requirement for above-average performance on nationally or state-normed standardized assessments may be satisfied within the context of current state requirements.

3. Each stated goal within the newly written and implemented Teacher Education Recruitment Plan should be systematically evaluated, and the plan should be revised as necessary.

4. Enrollment and completion trends should be continuously evaluated for gender and ethnic/racial diversity, with a goal of increasing the recruitment and successful completion of underrepresented groups. The recruitment plan may require revision to increase specific aspects of candidate diversity.

5. Within existing Key Assessment data, a large majority of candidates are rated as meeting proficiency standards; however, no information is available to document remediation efforts or final outcomes for candidates who do not meet such standards. The provider may consider ways in which such remedial action can be reliably documented.

6. Several of the indicators defined within this Standard are captured by single Key Assessment items, making it difficult to thoroughly assess candidates' mastery of skills across settings or across time. It may be beneficial for the provider to consider revising portions of their Key Assessments to more intentionally assess targeted skills, including (a) college and career-ready standards, (b) technology integration, (c) student impact, (d) knowledge of relevant law, and (e) ethical practice.

7. Provider efforts to assess developing content knowledge across time are currently limited to monitoring of course grades and evaluation of a relatively small number of summative experiences (i.e., student teaching evaluations and either the Teacher Work Sample or the Unit Report). It may be to the provider's benefit to consider additional assessments that may be formally used to evaluate candidate performance. For example, formal evaluation of early field experiences, performance-based assessments completed prior to student teaching, and/or summative evaluations of content knowledge other than the state licensing exams may be appropriate options to consider.

8. An advisory committee may be helpful in determining how the Code of Ethics will be infused in all teacher education courses. This committee may present recommendations to the TEC, with at least partial implementation prior to the site visit.

Standard 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   A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

2   A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

3   A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

4   A1.1.5 - District Level Key Assessment 3 - Professional Disposition.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

5   A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment 4 - Final Evaluation.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

6   A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

7   A1.1.8 - Building Level Key Assessment 3 - Community Relations.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

8   A1.1.9 - Building Level Key Assessment 4 - Professional Disposition.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

9   A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

10 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs.docx

A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.3.4 Selection at Completion

11 A2.1.3 - SPSY Handbook 2018.pdf

A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

12 📎 3.1.1 - All Program Demographic Data.docx

A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

13 📎 A3.1.1 - SPSY recruitment Material.docx

A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

14 📎 A3.2.1 - SPSY Performance Improvement Plans.docx

A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

15 📎 A3.2.2 - SPSY Evaluation Form.docx

A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

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

School Psychology Ed.S.

DIVERSITY IN RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS
Evidence Overview: The data tables include candidates' self-identified gender, race, and ability status for the three previous admissions cycles. The supporting documentation provides representative evidence of program recruitment efforts, including:
(Evidence A3.1.1 - SPSY Recruitment Material)
- Efforts targeted at undergraduates within the University as ISU is the most ethnically diverse state institution in Indiana (refer to presentation for undergraduates in Careers in Psychology course)
- Efforts to directly contact undergraduate institutions in Indiana and institutions that historically serve students underrepresented in school psychology (e.g., HBCU's, HSI's). Psychology and education programs are specifically targeted within these universities. They are sent our program materials and information regarding special events (refer to list of colleges contacted for recruitment)
- Potential candidates (both locally and at a distance) were contacted through Learning Connection and lists of those who took the GRE to offer webinars and presentations to describe school psychology and our program (refer to webinar announcement and presentation)
- Sample language used in response to individual student inquiries about flexible program options
- Efforts by program faculty to engage practitioners in a discussion about the needs of the field.

Analysis and Interpretation
For the three cycles reported, the diversity of our program admissions is reflective overall of the profession of school psychology. According to a survey conducted by our national organization (NASP) in 2015, approximately 83% of school psychologists identify as female and 13% identify as either African American, Asian, or Hispanic. Averaging student demographic data across the three cycles reflects similar compositions evident in our program in relation to gender (80% female at program

level and 83% at the national level) and ethnicity (73% identify as White at program level and 87% at the national level). As our national organization has highlighted the importance of contributing to the diverse composition of practitioners, we demonstrate ongoing efforts to recruit students from underrepresented groups, including recruitment from HBCU's and candidates of non-traditional age (e.g., practicing teachers). We have observed some improvements in recruiting candidates of color, and we will continue our efforts to increase both racial and gender diversity in future cohorts, to better reflect the needs and growing diversity of P-12 schools. (Evidence 3.1.1 - All Program Demographic Data)

SELECTIVITY AND PROGRESSION
(Evidence 2.3.1 -Admission Requirements and GPA- ALL Programs)
In addition, the program has established minimum course grade and GPA requirements. Student progress is evaluated annually for all enrolled students, using a specific annual review process and standardized form that incorporates evaluation of both academic progress and candidate dispositions. The annual review provides students with feedback regarding their performance and progress in relation to academic and professional expectations of the program. It also allows program faculty to initiate a plan for supporting students who are not demonstrating adequate performance and progress (Evidence A2.1.3 - SPSY Program Handbook and Evidence A3.2.1 - SPSY Performance Improvement Plan). In 2016, the annual review rating was completed in a rubric format, with descriptors that aligned with three anchor points (i.e., 1=Does not Meet Expectations; 2=Meets Expectations; 3=Exceeds Expectations). In 2017, the evaluation system was revised to use four common anchor points and descriptors (i.e., 1=Unsatisfactory; 2=Developing; 3=Meets Expectations; 4=Exceeds Expectations); faculty believed the revised form would be more user-friendly and would better capture candidate growth across time. The relevant program policies and evaluation forms are provided as supporting documentation. We also provide a sample Performance Improvement Plan as evidence of supporting students who do not demonstrate adequate progress. The data gathered from the annual evaluation allows us to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. Further, Performance Improvement Plans that result from candidates' demonstration of less-than-adequate progress allows us to provide appropriate support, increasing the likelihood that they will successfully complete the program. Refer to (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs) Data Table 3 for GPA at Admission for the School Psychology Ed.S program.

Analysis and Interpretation:
Our minimum GPA admissions requirement of 2.7 complies with the institutional minimum standard but does not align with the 3.0 articulated by CAEP, nor do our average candidate GRE scores per cohort exceed national averages. Admission decisions are made based upon a combination of applicants' academic history, letters of recommendation, statement of purpose, relevant work and/or volunteer experiences, and an individual interview to gauge applicants' interest in the field of school psychology and their ability to meet program expectations for independent problem-solving, respect for individual differences, and interpersonal communication. Our data reflect that only one candidate in three admissions cycles has earned an undergraduate GPA lower than 3.0, and that particular candidate was from an

historically underrepresented group within the field of school psychology.

Annual review data demonstrate our ongoing monitoring of candidate performance, both with respect to academic performance and professional dispositions. We also offer evidence of supporting candidates who demonstrate inadequate progress or performance in one or more domains.

We have not observed a clear correlation between any particular admissions criterion and the need for supplemental support. The majority of supplemental supports are related to inadequate development of appropriate professional dispositions (e.g., dependability, reflective practice), which also frequently impact candidates' academic success. Given our candidates' high success rates in both program completion and national certification exam results, we are not considering a change to our admissions criteria at this time; we will continue to explore additional factors that may reliably predict successful student outcomes.

School Administration - District Level, Ed.S. and Building Level M.Ed.

ADMISSION STANDARDS - District Level Ed.S.
Academic standards for admission call for an undergraduate GPA of 2.5 and a graduate GPA of 3.25 with no deficiencies, thus evidencing that it has goals set for the admission of high-quality advanced program candidates. Note the additional information in supporting evidence below that calls for letters of recommendation, personal narrative, and transcripts, that all factor into a decision to enroll the highest quality candidates with diverse experiences that can support our mission and provide the best educational leadership to a diverse audience of students in schools reflecting American need and opportunity. (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admission Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs, Data Table 4). 98% of candidates met the minimum graduate GPA at admission. The graduate GPA was not available for one candidate; however, that candidate's undergraduate GPA met the minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.5 or higher.

ADMISSION STANDARDS - Building Level, M.Ed
Academic standards for admission call for an undergraduate GPA of 2.5, hold or be eligible for an Indiana teaching license, and a minimum of two years full-time teaching experience, thus evidencing that it has goals set for the admission of high-quality advanced program candidates. Note the additional admission requirements that calls for letters of recommendation, personal narrative, and transcripts, that all factor into a decision to enroll the highest quality candidates with diverse experiences that can support our mission and provide the best educational leadership to a diverse audience of students in schools reflecting American need and opportunity. (Evidence 2.3.1 - Admissions Requirements and GPA- ALL Programs, Data Table 5). Across three cycles of data, 98% of candidates met the minimum required undergraduate GPA of 2.5. One candidate was below the required 2.5 GPA. Additional documents may have been factored into the admission process for this candidate however it is difficult to determine if that was the case due to limited tracking data for this program.

DIVERSITY IN RECRUITMENT - District, Ed.S. and Building Level, M.Ed.
The Department of Educational Leadership encourages all candidates working in P-12 schools who meet the academic and experiential qualifications to apply for the Ed.S. program, in order to ensure that our enrolling pool reflects the diversity of American's teacher pool and the P-12 student demographic. The reality of those applying is that the typical teacher and administrator demographic reflects the American Midwest/Indiana, and is thus, disproportionally of Anglo descent (Caucasian), and is more reflective of rural and suburban America than it is of those in more urban environments. The Department of Educational Leadership makes continual effort at state conferences to recruit diverse candidates to its graduate program. Hybrid/distance options in course delivery are available to attract a broad range of diverse individuals that are not necessarily close in geographic proximity to the campus. In recent years, increased effort has been placed in recruitment efforts in Evansville, Indianapolis, and the Gary, Indiana regions in order to attract a more diverse leadership candidate pool.

Future Directions:
The school administration Ed.S., and M.Ed. programs may benefit from the creation of a spreadsheet to track and monitor candidates from admission to completion. This spreadsheet could also be helpful to maintain demographic data of both applicants and candidates.

The school administration programs may benefit from a structured recruitment plan or identified annual recruitment activities that focus on recruiting more diverse candidates, or increasing knowledge of diversity within our candidate pool, to better meet the needs of the students and schools they serve.
- Develop relationships with urban-area school districts that have diverse faculty and staff
- Improve marketing of the hybrid and distance education options to reach diverse candidates who may not have availability for a full time program.
- Increase efforts to diversify K-12 program faculty. Diversifying the faculty will help to attract a diverse candidate pool.
- Revitalize the educational leadership website to attract a diverse pool of candidates and faculty.
- Utilize the university's communication and marketing departments for more strategic marketing strategies such as geo-tracking and event attendance tracking.
- Continue ongoing classroom cultural competence training for faculty
- Consider creating an ad hoc task force for K-12 administrative licensure diversification.

Standard 4: Program Impact (Initial Programs)

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

1 📎 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project.docx

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4.3 Employer satisfaction

4.4 Completer satisfaction

2 📎 4.1.2 - Satisfaction Survey Process.docx

4.3 Employer satisfaction 4.4 Completer satisfaction

3 📎 4.2.1 - State Provided Teacher Evaluation Data.docx

4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

4 📎 4.3.1 - EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey.docx

4.3 Employer satisfaction

5 📎 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Survey Results Fall 2018.pdf

4.3 Employer satisfaction

6 📎 4.3.3 - State Provided Principal Survey Data.pdf

4.3 Employer satisfaction

7 📎 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey.docx

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.4 Completer satisfaction

8 📎 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - Fall 2018.pdf

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.4 Completer satisfaction

9 📎 4.4.3 - State Provided Completer Survey Data.pdf

4.4 Completer satisfaction

10 📎 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - December 2017.pdf

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.4 Completer satisfaction

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

Multiple measures are used by this EPP to document completer and employer satisfaction with the education preparation program, teacher effectiveness, and impact on P-12 learners. These measures include; the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey, the EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey, State provided data, and the Case Study Pilot Project.

4.1 IMPACT ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING
Two measures are used to demonstrate the completers' impact on P-12 student learning, the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey and the Case Study Pilot Project.
(Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)
(Evidence 4.4.2 and 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey Results, Open-Ended Question #26)

The first piece of evidence is an example from the Case Study Pilot Project. As part of participation in the case study pilot project, completers were asked to provide an example of how he or she measured student growth. The first example is from an elementary education completer who used Lexile scores in reading to measure student growth. The completer shared the following data: August 2017 scores (pretest), May 2018 scores (post-test), and an Expected Growth score. For the purpose of analysis, we focused on 13 students for which we had scores for August 2017, May 2018, and expected growth data. All students showed growth from August 2017 to May 2018. The overall mean for actual growth was a Lexile score of 205. When comparing the students' post-test scores to the expected growth scores, 12 out of 13 students exceeded the expected growth score. Complete results can be found in Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study, pg 22. The second example from the Case Study Pilot Project is from a special education completer who used an informal assessment to measure P-12 student impact. The informal assessment focused on four reading skills and four math skills for one student. Based upon the data provided, the student showed substantial gains in all eight skill areas, indicating that the completer demonstrated significant impact on student learning. Details of this evidence can be found in the full case study report (Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study, pg 31).

The second piece of evidence is the responses to the open-ended question #26 (How do you know you are having a positive impact on P-12 student learning?) on the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey. Twenty out of 21 completers identified both formal and informal measures of student impact. Responses not only identified student growth and success, but also the positive impact the teacher-student relationship has on P-12 student success. All completer responses can be found in Evidence 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data, pg 13.

4.2 INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
Three pieces of evidence are used to demonstrate the completers' indicators of teaching effectiveness: open-ended questions from the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey, State provided data, and the Case Study Pilot Project.
(Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)
(Evidence 4.4.2 and 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey Results, Open-Ended Question #25)
(Evidence 4.2.1 - State Provided Teacher Evaluation Data)

Several measures were used during the Case Study Pilot Project to measure teacher effectiveness. The first tool used during the Case Study Pilot Project is the Student Teaching Observation Tool (STOT). This tool was used for all three programs Elementary, Special, and Secondary Education. For Elementary candidates the two highest areas were InTASC 2 Learning Differences (3.50) and InTASC 3 Learning Environments (3.40). The two lowest areas were InTASC 8 Instructional Strategies (3.00) and InTASC 7 Planning for Instruction (3.09). For Special education candidates, the two highest rated areas were InTASC 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (3.34) and InTASC 3 Learning Environments (3.20). The lowest two areas were InTASC 5 Application of Content (2.27) and InTASC 8 Instructional Strategies. For secondary education candidates the two highest rated areas were InTASC 7 Planning for Instruction (3.17) and InTASC 9 Professional Learning and

Ethical Practice (3.17). The lowest two areas were InTASC 6 Assessment (2.25) and InTASC 10 Leadership and Collaboration (2.50). The data show quite a bit of variance in strengths and weaknesses across the three programs on this measure. (Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)

The second tool used during the Case Study Pilot Project was the Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (ELEOT 2.0). Again, this tool was used for all three programs Elementary, Special, and Secondary Education. For Elementary candidates the highest rated elements were Active Learning (3.67) and Well-managed (3.67). The lowest two areas were High Expectations (3.20) and Progress Monitoring and Feedback (3.25). For Special education candidates the highest rated elements were Equitable Learning (3.58) and Supportive Learning (3.42). The lowest two areas were Digital Learning Environment (1.33) and Progress Monitoring and Feedback (2.00). For Secondary education candidates, the highest two areas were Well-managed (3.27) and Digital Learning Environment (3.22). The lowest two areas were High Expectations (1.73) and Progress Monitoring and Feedback (1.93). (Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)

When comparing the data on these two measures for all three programs, special education candidates were rated significantly lower on all elements on both measures. There are several possible contributing factors: differences in raters between the three programs, lack of training on the instruments prior to use, or the composition of P-12 learners in the classrooms for the special education completers.

Another measure of teacher effectiveness is the open-ended question #25 (How do you know you are an effective teacher?) on the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey. Through qualitative analysis, 12 out of 25 completers' responses demonstrated their belief they were effective teachers by specifically identifying student growth and success. All completer responses can be found in Evidence 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data, pg 11-12.

The final measure of teacher effectiveness is the State Provided Teacher Evaluation Data. Data show that over 93% of our completers are rated as effective or highly effective by their employers. One exception is 88% of first year completers in 2015-16 were rated as effective or highly effective. See complete results in Evidence 4.2.1 - State Provided Teacher Evaluation Data.

4.3 SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS
Employer satisfaction was collected through several different methods: EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey, State Provided Employer data, and the Case Study Pilot Project.
(Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)
(Evidence 4.3.1 - EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey)
(Evidence 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Satisfaction Survey Data Fall 2018)
(Evidence 4.3.3 - State Provided Principal Survey Data)

Summarize the Key Findings:
The first piece of evidence is from the Case Study Pilot Project. The EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey was given to the principals of completers who

participated in the Case Study Pilot Project. This survey was only completed by the principals of the elementary education and special education completers. For elementary education completers, all 10 InTASC principles were rated as a 3 "mostly satisfied" or 4 "extremely satisfied" with six of the 10 principles rated at the "extremely satisfied" level. For the special education completers, all 10 InTASC principles were rated as a 3 "mostly satisfied" or 4 "extremely satisfied". The average across all 10 InTASC principles was 3.47. The secondary completers were rated using the state instrument, which is based on three domains, assessed on a four-point scale. The average across all three domains for secondary completers was 3.3. (Results can be found in Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project, pg 19, pg 28, and pg 36)

The second piece of evidence is the EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey. This survey is based on the 10 InTASC principles. This survey was distributed in Fall 2018 and there were eight surveys completed. Results indicate that overall employers were "somewhat satisfied" or "extremely satisfied" with ISU completers. The three highest areas were: Learner Development, Content Knowledge, and Planning for Instruction. The lowest rated area was Application of Content with a mean of 3.38. (A summary of data can be found in Evidence 4.3.1,Table 1. Full results can be found in Evidence 4.3.2)

The third piece of evidence is the State Provided Principal Survey data. Surveys are sent to principals annually by the Indiana Department of Education. Principals are asked to rate completers on the three categories: Knowledge Preparation of Teacher (4 questions), Pedagogical Preparation of Teacher (10 questions), and Professional Disposition of Teacher (6 questions). Principals are asked rate their satisfaction of the completer's level of preparation using the following choices: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree. Additionally, there is an Overall Assessment with rating indicators of very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, and very satisfied.

In 2017 three elements were identified as potential areas for improvement based on the percentage of "disagree" or "strongly disagree" ratings: Differentiation (19%), Analyzing student assessment to improve instruction (19%) and Provides rigorous learning environments (17%). 91% of principals rated their overall satisfaction with completers from this EPP as Satisfied or Very Satisfied.

In 2018 three elements were identified as potential areas for improvement based on the percentage of "disagree" or "strongly disagree" ratings: Differentiation (13%), Effective strategies to manage the learning environment (10%), and Provides rigorous learning environments (8%). Open-ended responses on this survey also indicated additional areas for improvement including: differentiation, classroom management, and integration and use of technology. 97% of principals rated their overall satisfaction with completers from this EPP as Satisfied or Very Satisfied. (Evidence 4.3.3 - State Provided Principal Survey Data)

4.4 SATISFACTION OF COMPLETERS
Completer satisfaction was collected through several different methods; EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey, state provided completer data, and the case study pilot project.

(Evidence 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project)
(Evidence 4.4.1 - Completer Satisfaction Survey)
(Evidence 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey Data - Fall 2018)
(Evidence 4.4.3 - State Provided Completer Survey Data)
(Evidence 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey Data - December 2017)

Summarize the Key Findings
The first piece of supportive evidence is from the Case Study Pilot Project (Evidence 4.1.1). The Completer Satisfaction Survey was distributed as a paper copy and completed by all nine participants in the case study. Completers rated each principle on the four-point scale described above. The average scores across all 10 principles were: 3.67 for elementary education completers, 3.80 for special education completers, and 3.85 for secondary education completers. The highest ranked area was InTASC 8 (instructional strategies) at 4.0. Tied for second place ranking at 3.89 were InTASC 3 (learning environments), InTASC 4 (content knowledge), InTASC 6 (assessment), and InTASC 7 (planning for instruction). The lowest ranked areas were InTASC 9 (professional learning and ethical practice) and InTASC 10 (leadership and collaboration), both at 3.5. No items were scored below 3.0.

The next piece of evidence was results from the EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey. These surveys were distributed through Qualtrics to completers in December, 2017 and Fall 2018. In December, 2017, there were 10 surveys completed. Completers rated their overall satisfaction with the preparation from this EPP as somewhat satisfied or extremely satisfied. The three highest rated areas (averages of 3.9 on the 4.0 scale) were InTASC 3 (learning environments), InTASC 6 (assessment), and InTASC 7 (instructional strategies). The lowest rated area (average of 3.4) was InTASC 4 (content knowledge). Only 1% of the items were scored as a 2, somewhat dissatisfied.

In Fall 2018 there were 39 surveys completed. Thirty-two of 39 completers rated their overall satisfaction with their preparation at ISU as "somewhat satisfied" or "extremely satisfied". The three highest rated areas were for InTASC 3 (learning environments with average of 3.69), InTASC 6 (assessment with average of 3.74), and InTASC 8 (instructional strategies with average of 3.64). The lowest rated area was InTASC 5 (application of content with average of 3.46) and InTASC 10 (leadership and collaboration with an average of 3.41). InTASC 10 had the highest number of responses of "somewhat dissatisfied". A summary of the completer survey results can be found in Evidence 4.4.1, Tables 1 and 2. Full completer survey results can be found in Evidence 4.4.2 and 4.4.4.

The final piece of evidence was the State Provided Completer Survey data (Evidence 4.4.3). State Surveys are sent to completers annually by the Indiana Department of Education. Data are reported in early September (2016, 2017, and 2018). There are three categories: Knowledge Preparation (5 questions), Performance Preparation (10 questions), and Dispositional Preparation (7 questions). Completers are asked to answer the questions using the following choices: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree. Additionally, there is an Overall Assessment with rating indicators of poor, fair, good, excellent.

In 2016, there were 74 respondents. For Knowledge Preparation 96% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. For Performance Preparation 90%-96% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. One element that had the highest percentage of disagree or strongly disagree was "working effectively with students with all exceptionalities". For Dispositional Preparation 90%-96% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. The element that had the highest percentage of disagree or strongly disagree was "working effectively with parents/guardians". Lower ratings on this element are consistent with responses relating to parental/community involvement when assessed on other measures. On the Overall Assessment 100% of completers rated their overall satisfaction with the EPP as good or excellent.

In 2017, there were 80 respondents. For Knowledge Preparation 91-94% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. For Performance Preparation 91% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. In 2017 there was a higher percentage of completers who rated elements on the Performance Preparation section as disagree or strongly disagree than in the other two years. For Dispositional Preparation 91% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. Again, the element that had the highest percentage of disagree or strongly disagree was "working effectively with parents/guardians". Lower ratings on this element are consistent with responses relating to parental/community involvement when assessed on other measures. On the Overall Assessment 96% of completers rated their overall satisfaction with the EPP as good or excellent.

In 2018, there were 18 completers who responded. For Knowledge Preparation 94% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. For Performance Preparation 88-94% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. For Dispositional Preparation 83-94% of completers responded with Agree or Strongly Agree. Again, the element that had the highest percentage of disagree or strongly disagree was "working effectively with parents/guardians". Lower ratings on this element are consistent with responses relating to parental/community involvement when assessed on other measures. On the Overall Assessment 88% of completers rated their overall satisfaction with the EPP as good or excellent.

Limitations of Findings:
One of the limitations is that our sample size for the Case Study Pilot Project was small, which led to a small sample size to measure student impact. There were only two completers who shared examples of student data to demonstrate their impact on student learning.

The second limitation is that the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) does not have a systematic process for identifying a specific completers' direct impact on student achievement and growth. Each school district has a somewhat different teacher evaluation system and student assessment process, creating a non-consistent alignment between student growth and teacher instruction. School districts and the IDOE protect the identity of students' scores of district assessments and state-mandated tests. Additionally, the IDOE does not disaggregate the data by

programs (elementary, special, and secondary education) so it is difficult to use the data for informing individual program needs.

Overall Analysis:
Looking at the data as a whole, across all measures and across all programs, completers report satisfaction in their preparation from ISU. Additionally, employers report being satisfied with those completers. There are some emerging themes that were identified in multiple measures, the first being classroom management. Similar feedback has been provided by stakeholder groups. Efforts have been made to make this a priority. This EPP acknowledges the challenges educators face in today's classroom and strives to provide our completers with the necessary skills to face those challenges. The second theme is technology. This EPP is working on new ways to model and integrate technology into the classroom by offering additional workshops and exploring partnerships that will advance the application of technology in the field. The third theme, which was not only identified from completers in standard four, but through other measures during the candidates program, is "Collaboration/work with communities and families".

Future Directions:
1. A process was developed to routinely and consistently gather completer and employer satisfaction data. The first baseline administration occurred in November 2018. The Completer Survey will be emailed to those completers in the Fall 2019. The Education Student Services Office will be utilized to help track and follow completers. (Evidence 4.1.2 - Satisfaction Survey Process)

2. Add a question to the EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Survey asking completers to provide or upload specific examples demonstrating how they positively impacted student learning (such as pre-test/post-test scores). Consideration should be given to add a question regarding completers Overall Satisfaction of their preparation from this EPP.

3. Structured Employer Focus Groups who have ISU first, second, and third year completers should be interviewed by a trained evaluator. At least one group of 10 - 15 principals should be interviewed, and the group should represent employers of completers from each of our three programs. Interview protocol for employers will need to be developed and validated. Employer Focus Groups would be beneficial to occur once per year. Focus Group questions should include questions related to employer's knowledge of completer impact on P-12 student learning and evidence of effective teaching.

4. Annual structured Completer Focus Groups would be beneficial. Multiple observations of the completers may be beneficial. Suggested protocol for Focus Group questions are provided in Appendix C of the Case Study Pilot Project report. Interviewers should ask completers for specific examples to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning. (Evidence 4.4.1 - Case Study Pilot Project, pg. 53-54)

5. Focus group facilitators must be identified and trained. To ensure consistency in observing and scoring, observers should work toward a high level of inter-rater reliability prior to observations.

6. To ensure representation of a more diverse sample pool, consideration should be given to conducting case studies or focus groups in additional school districts with diverse student and teacher populations.

Standard A.4. Program Impact (Advanced Programs)

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

1 📎 A4.1.1 - SPSY Employer Survey and Data.docx

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

2 📎 A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx

A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

3 📎 A4.2.2 - District and Building Level Employer_Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

4 📎 A4.2.3 - Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process.docx

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

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

School Psychology - Ed.S.
A.4.1 - Employer Satisfaction

Evidence Overview:
(Evidence 4.1.1 - SPSY Employer Survey and Data)
This employer satisfaction survey assesses the satisfaction of immediate supervisors/employers with completers of the School Psychology Ed.S. program who are within two years of program completion. The assessment was created in Qualtrics; a link is distributed via e-mail during the late Spring semester (the next survey will be sent out late April/early May of 2019). Completers are contacted directly, provided the link, and asked to either (a) forward it to their supervisors, or (b) send the School Psychology program coordinator the name and e-mail address of the supervisor. The program coordinator distributes the link to supervisors directly if and when contact information is provided by the completer. In either case, the link is accompanied by a brief explanatory message, which also appears at the beginning of the Qualtrics survey.

Supervisors first complete two items related to overall satisfaction and the likelihood of retaining the completer for the upcoming school year, on a scale of 1-5. Then, the supervisor is asked to rate nine items on a scale of 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 4 (Exceeds Expectations), with an option to select "Does not apply to role." Finally, the supervisor is asked to rate 12 additional items on the same 1-4 scale with no option to select "Does not apply to role." Each item has been linked to one or more professional standards of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Ratings of 3 (Meets Expectations) or higher would be considered adequate

performance for recent completers. Assessment items are provided below and tagged to the relevant standard(s)

Analysis and Interpretation: Through two cycles of data, employers indicate that our recent program completers are meeting or exceeding expectations in all domains of practice. Just one employer gave a rating of "Developing" in the area "Use of Technology." We will continue to monitor this item and look for trends. In all, this reflects that completers are adequately prepared for the complex demands of practice at the time of program completion, according to the perceptions of their immediate supervisors.

A.4.2 - Completer Satisfaction
Evidence Overview:
(Evidence 4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Survey and Data)
This completer satisfaction survey assesses the satisfaction of completers of the School Psychology Ed.S. program who are within two years of program completion. The assessment was created in Qualtrics; a link is distributed via e-mail during the late Spring semester (the next survey will be sent out late April/early May of 2019). Completers are contacted directly and asked to follow the link and complete the survey. The link is accompanied by a brief explanatory message, which also appears at the beginning of the Qualtrics survey.

Completers are first asked for basic information about their current employment setting and license/certification status. Then, completers respond to 21 items (each item has been linked to one or more professional standards of NASP) based on (a) the frequency with which they complete the activity (i.e., never, less than monthly, at least monthly but less than weekly, at least weekly but less than daily, every day or nearly every day) and (b) how well prepared they felt to complete the activity at the time of program completion (i.e., 1=Unprepared; 2=Somewhat Prepared; 3=Adequately Prepared; 4=Well Prepared). Ratings of 3 (Adequately Prepared) or higher for 75% of activities and ratings of 2 (Somewhat Prepared) for all activities would be considered acceptable for recent completers. Assessment items are provided below and tagged to relevant standard(s)

Analysis and Interpretation:
In comparison to their employers (who rated them as meeting expectations across domains of practice), recent completers reporting feeling adequately prepared or well prepared on about 75% of total items rated. All completers felt adequately or well prepared to complete evaluations, and the vast majority reported adequate preparation or better in items that assessed professional dispositions (e.g., collaboration, legal/ethical practice, clear communication, respect for diversity). The areas in which completers reported the greatest lack of preparedness at the time of completion was related to knowledge of social, emotional, and behavioral interventions and progress-monitoring at both the school-wide and the individual levels. This is an area in which the program has made recent adjustments, including adding a course in social, emotional, and behavioral intervention and altering the content of an advanced seminar course to focus more on crisis prevention and intervention. We suspect many candidates have limited experience engaging in social, emotional, or behavioral intervention activities during both their practicum

and internship experiences. We will continue to monitor completer feedback and will consider ways to bolster candidates' applied experiences in these area of practice prior to program completion.

School Administration District Level, Ed.S. and Building Level, M.Ed.

A4.1 Employer Satisfaction and A4.2 Completer Satisfaction
(Evidence 4.2.2 - District Level and Building Level Employer and Completer Survey and Data)

Analysis and Interpretation:
Round 1: The first attempt at gathering satisfaction survey data was problematic as one survey was distributed to both the completers and employers of both the Ed.S. and M.Ed programs at the same time. This combined attempt made it difficult to distinguish which response belonged to a completer or employer and for which program. This first attempt yielded a sample of responses from 2 teachers, 2 assistant principals, 8 principals, 6 assistant superintendents, 1 other and 13 superintendents, for a total of 32 respondents. Thirteen respondents in the sample were within the three-year window of completion from ISU. It should be noted that although there were 32 respondents, only 28 respondents went on to answer the questions.

Responses show the highest three areas were: Exhibits Integrity with a mean of 3.51, Protects the welfare and safety of all stakeholders with a mean of 3.39, and Understands the importance of school vision with a mean of 3.36. The lowest three areas were: Acts to influence all political decisions affecting student learning with a mean of 2.93, Develops relationships with community partners with a mean of 3.11, and Promotes the most appropriate technologies to support the culture with a mean of 3.14. All other components on the survey had means between 3.22 and 3.32 Although there were several areas that were rated lower than others it is difficult to determine which program these completers belong to due to the issues noted above with the distribution of the survey. Complete responses can be found in Evidence 4.4.2, Appendix B, Table 1.

Round 2: The second attempt at gathering satisfaction survey data was a qualitative survey distributed at the Superintendents' breakfast. This attempt yielded a low "n". Feedback received indicated that the Ed.S. completers are well-equipped to deal with school district visioning, able to shape and lead school culture development, equipped to manage school district operations, and are equipped to work in partnerships and value those opportunities. Complete responses can be found in Evidence A4.2.2, Appendix D on page 28.

Results also included two employer respondents speaking on behalf of the capabilities of five completers in the Building Level M.Ed. program. Feedback received indicated that M.Ed. completers were on balance, equipped or well-equipped to handle the job-specific responsibilities of building-level leadership, with exceptions more specific to individual completers.

Round 3: Efforts were made in Fall 2018 to reach Ed.S. and M.Ed. completers from the past three years who were employed in school districts and buildings which this EPP prepared them. Three Ed.S. completers and 21 M.Ed. completers responded. One employer satisfaction survey was completed for Ed.S. completers. This employer rated their completer at the exceeds expectations level on 11 components and meets expectations on seven of the components. Seven employer satisfaction surveys were completed for M.Ed. completers, with all categories noting exceeds or meets expectations, except for two categories responded to as "developing," for all respondents. Elements identified as Developing were "the completer promotes the most appropriate technologies to support the culture" and "the completer acts to influence all political decisions affecting student learning". These two areas were also rated lower on the first round of surveys.

Completer surveys were completed for three completes at the Ed.S. level and for six completers at the M.Ed. level. Of Ed.S. completers, all categories were rated as "exceeding expectations" or "meeting expectations". Of the M.Ed. completers, all elements were rated at the Meets or Exceeds Expectations level with one exception, 33% of M.Ed. completers rated their experience at Developing on "I have adequate knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment".

Future Directions:
To improve the collection of program impact data from Ed.S. and M.Ed. program completers and employers, the Department of Educational Leadership developed a systematic process to collect data on a consistent basis. (Evidence 4.2.3 - Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process). This process will be implemented in the Spring of 2019 for M.Ed. completers and the Summer 2019 for Ed.S. completers. Baseline data for both programs will be collected and made available to the Department of Educational Leadership in Fall 2019. One round of completer and employer satisfaction data will be available for the M.Ed. program by the site visit.

The actual satisfaction surveys will be reviewed to determine if the Likert scale/indicators are the most appropriate.

Although there was a limited number of responses across all three rounds, technology continues to be an emerging them. The Ed.S. and M.Ed programs may benefit from additional focus on technology use for candidates in a leadership role.

Standards 5 and A.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

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

1 📎 2.1.3 - PDS Taskforce Documents.pdf

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

2 📎 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes.pdf

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

3 📎 2.1.7 - TEC Bylaws and Member Directory.doc

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation	
4 📎 2.1.8 - Co-Constructed Observation Tool.docx	
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation	
5 📎 2.1.9 - Educational Assessment Committee.docx	
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data. 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
6 📎 A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships.docx	
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement	
7 📎 A2.1.3 - SPSY Handbook 2018.pdf	
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement	
8 📎 3.6.7- TEC Minutes to approve Code of Ethics.docx	
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation	
9 📎 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project.docx	
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
10 📎 4.1.2 - Satisfaction Survey Process.docx	
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
11 📎 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Survey Results Fall 2018.pdf	
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
12 📎 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey.docx	
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
13 📎 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - Fall 2018.pdf	
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making	
14 📎 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - December 2017.pdf	
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
15 📎 A4.1.1 - SPSY Employer Survey and Data.docx	
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
16 📎 A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx	
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
17 📎 A4.2.2 - District and Building Level Employer_Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx	
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
18 📎 A4.2.3 - Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process.docx	
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
19 📎 5.1.1 - QAS System.docx	
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple	

measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

20 📎 5.1.2 - Rubric Evaluation Tool.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

21 📎 5.1.3 - Fall 2018 Rubric Review Results.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

22 📎 5.5.1 - Departmental Advisory Boards.pdf

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

23 📎 7 - Evidence of Infusion of Technology.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

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

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM
The provider's quality assurance system was revised in Fall 2017 to address several gaps that were identified during the early stages of the self-study process. Specifically, the current quality assurance system (a) identifies key assessments, (b) specifies a timeline and individuals responsible for data collection, (c) outlines a three-step plan for establishing the validity and reliability of key assessment measures, and (d) incorporates a continuous improvement process that involves ongoing self-evaluation and improvement efforts, with review and feedback from key stakeholders. (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System). Each of the Key Assessment evidence packets demonstrates that the assessments identified by the QAS system provide evidence in support of the Provider meeting CAEP Standards.

DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION
The provider's internal quality assurance system was previously managed by a faculty member with a half-time assignment to focus on assessment and accreditation. During Summer 2018, the provider created a full-time Director of Assessment and Accreditation (DAA) position, which has been a foundational step toward ensuring implementation of the quality assurance system and monitoring operational effectiveness.

INSTITUTIONAL AND EXTERNAL REVIEWS
In addition to CAEP related data reporting, the DAA facilitates and monitors completion of other reviews of program quality, including those completed externally (e.g., SPA reviews, state reviews, other accrediting organizations) and internally (e.g., annual reports completed for Higher Learning Commission accreditation, periodic peer review of graduate programs). These additional layers of review ensure the provider maintains operational effectiveness and acceptable program quality according to the expectations of key institutional, professional, and legislative stakeholders. (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, pp. 11-18)

Standards 5.2 and A.5.2: Valid and Reliable Measures
The QAS outlines a provider-wide plan for the construction, validation, implementation, and verification of CAEP Key Assessments (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, pp. 2-4). The plan was approved by relevant stakeholders in Spring 2018.

The initial stages of validation for pre-existing Key Assessments was implemented during Spring 2018 for the School Psychology Case Study rubric, including evaluation with the CAEP Assessment Rubric and a Lawshe rating by three independent raters (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 16-21).

During Fall 2018, the Unit Report rubric was determined to be in need of revision prior to beginning the validation process. The rubric will be revised during Spring 2019, with rubric review completed by the end of Summer 2019.

Two teams of three raters each independently applied the CAEP Assessment Rubric to evaluate the quality of the remaining Key Assessment rubrics and rating scales. Following review, the following Key Assessments were determined to meet CAEP quality standards:
SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Experiences Evaluation (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 13-15)
Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 25-27)
Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 28-30)
These measures will undergo Lawshe validation during Spring 2019. The second phase of assessment validation - implementation - will be planned for Summer/Fall 2019 and will include rater training (Evidence 5.1.1. - QAS System, p. 3).

The following Key Assessments were determined to require revision following the rubric review:
M.Ed. Building Level - Action Research Project (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 1-4)
Ed.S. District Level - Long-term Project (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 5-8)
M.Ed Building Level - Management & Community Relations Interview (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 9-12)
Professional Disposition (Evidence 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 22-24)

M.Ed. Building Level and Ed.S. District Level Rubrics. After consulting with program

faculty, it was determined that the professional standards upon which the Building-level and District-level rubrics were originally based have been revised, with new standards set for implementation in the next 18-24 months. Therefore, we will continue to collect data using the existing rubrics and plan to incorporate the rubric review feedback in the creation of new assessments that will align to the revised professional standards. Rubric development, validation, and implementation are scheduled for Fall 2020.
Professional Disposition. A focus group will be created to revise the rubric during Spring 2019.

Additional rubric review will occur during Spring 2019 for the following additional Key Assessments that were not identified for the Fall 2018 review:
Ed.S. District Level and M.Ed. Building Level Final Evaluation
Add-on program rubrics (Special Education, Gifted & Talented, Teaching English as a Second Language, Visual Impairment Certificate)

Standards 5.3 and A.5.3: Continuous Improvement

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW
Prior to implementation of an internal system of continuous improvement, all programs were required to submit annual Student Learning Outcome Summary (SLO) reports to the ISU Office of Assessment. The SLO reports were required to demonstrate alignment of program assessments with generalized learning outcomes, analyze aggregated data relative to achieving those outcomes, and articulate any plans for improvement from one year to the next. (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, pp. 16-17, 27). This process ensured at least annual program-level review of student learning outcomes and attention to trends, areas of strength, and potential targets for growth.

Additionally, prior to 2018-2019, all undergraduate programs created and submitted a Student Success plan, which included data analysis, goals, and strategies to improve operational effectiveness, with specific attention to candidate recruitment, retention, persistence, and completion. Beginning in 2018-2019, Student Success Plans were required of all graduate and undergraduate programs, and are now submitted in conjunction with the SLO reports described above (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 28). This process also ensures programs remain attentive to important metrics of effectiveness, including candidate quality and success.

INTERNAL REVIEW
An ongoing continuous improvement loop for internal program-level review was approved in Spring 2018 (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, pp. 7-8, 24-25).

As of the writing of this report, we are behind our specified review timeline. Programs - due to other CAEP reporting priorities - have not been pressed to return their summary report templates. We will aim to have these submitted by February 1 and proceed with committee and Dean review during the remainder of Spring 2019.

In addition, outcome data have not been posted to the College website or shared with stakeholders as of the proposed November 1 timeline. We are currently still

working to identify the specific metrics that will be used to report outcome data (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 9); we anticipate posting two cycles of data (2016-2017 and 2017-2018) by the end of Spring 2019, with a third cycle (2018-2019) to be added by December 1, 2019.

Standards 5.4 and A.5.4: Use and Dissemination of Completer Outcomes and Impact Data

DATA COLLECTION
The evidence provided in support of CAEP Standards 4 and A.4 document that the provider has collected and analyzed data related to completer and employer satisfaction, completer outcomes, and completer impact. Two cycles of completer (Evidence 4.4.1, A4.1.1, A4.2.2) and employer (Evidence 4.3.1, A4.2.1, A4.2.2) satisfaction surveys have been completed, state-level data has been accessed and compiled (Evidence 4.3.2, 4.4.2, 4.4.4), and a case study provides additional support for completer satisfaction, outcomes, and impact for completers in elementary, secondary, and special education (Evidence 4.1.1). Processes for ensuring ongoing data collection of employer and completer satisfaction surveys for initial programs and school administration Ed.S. and M.Ed. programs have also been developed (Evidence 4.1.2 and A4.2.3).

DATA DISSEMINATION
A selection of completer outcome data is currently presented on the provider's website: https://www.indstate.edu/education/deans-office/outcomedata. In addition, the provider is developing a plan for expanding these data to include all eight required CAEP indicators of completer outcomes and impact (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 9). It is anticipated the data will be posted by the end of Spring 2019 for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 for all required indicators, with 2018-2019 data added by December 1, 2019.

Program coordinators will be requested by the Dean's office and the Director of Assessment and Accreditation to share program-level data with key stakeholders, including candidates, alumni, clinical supervisors, employers, and advisory board members. Sources of data to be shared will include program-level data for the eight required indicators, as well as the outcome of the 2018-2019 implementation of the continuous improvement cycle (i.e., analysis and identified goals for improvement in the areas of dispositions, diversity, and technology).

DATA USE
Use of completer outcome and impact data for program improvement purposes continues to be an area for future growth. The provider is still working to establish a routine for regular, successful data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Within the approved continuous improvement plan, however, completer outcomes, effectiveness, impact, and satisfaction are specifically identified as areas on which strategic planning will be focused in Year 3 of the three-year cycle (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 8). This ensures that, once several years of quality data are available for analysis, they will be used to guide strategic improvement at the program and provider levels.

Standard 5.5 and A.5.5: Stakeholder Involvement
Each of the preparation programs within the EPP is actively involved in ongoing and relevant partnerships with key stakeholders. Many times, stakeholders have multiple associations with the EPP (e.g., alumni who also serve as employers and/or clinical supervisors). In addition, some partnerships are more stable and ongoing, while others occur on a short-term basis to accomplish a specific task or initiative.

COMMITTEES AND ADVISORY BOARDS
Several standing committees and advisory groups form the foundation of collaboration between the EPP and its relevant stakeholders. Many members of such groups have multiple associations with EPP programs (e.g., alumni, practitioner, employer and/or clinical supervisor).

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC), a standing committee of the institutional governance system, is comprised of faculty within the Bayh College of Education, representatives from the Education Student Services office, and faculty who represent secondary education content areas in other colleges across campus (Evidence 2.1.7 - TEC Bylaws and Member Directory). Its charge is to "assist in planning, approving, and coordinating the various changes in programs which prepare licensed educators for preschool through high school settings. The committee shall make certain the University is in compliance with the regulations of the Department of Education and the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and other relevant accrediting bodies. All curricular and other academic items which would have a modifying effect on educator preparation at the University are the purview of the TEC....This committee may also initiate proposals on behalf of interdepartmental and extra departmental programs which prepare licensed educators and proposals on such matters as admission and retention standards and the evaluation of students in educator preparation programs." TEC thus involves key faculty and staff across campus in a range of decisions related to academic quality (Evidence 3.6.7 - TEC Minutes to approve Code of Ethics), including review of programs' continuous improvement review reports (Evidence 5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 7).

The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) meets regularly with staff from Education Student Services and faculty in the Department of Teaching and Learning. The overarching purpose of TEAC is to provide a mechanism for two-way communication between the EPP teacher education programs and prospective employers in the region. Advisory Council members provide feedback to the EPP regarding the strengths and needs of candidates and completers, current needs in the field, and potential changes or supplements to the teacher education curriculum (Evidence 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes).

The Educational Development Council (EDC) is a bi-annual collaborative meeting between Educational Leadership faculty (i.e., Ed.S. District Level) and key community stakeholders (i.e., alumni, employers, practitioners). The meetings serve to communicate outcomes and needs of alumni and practitioners, as well as to gather feedback about training needs in the field. Historically, the meetings have been informal and unstructured; however, future efforts will be directed toward more formalized efforts to engage stakeholders in program evaluation and improvement

efforts. (Evidence A2.1.3)

Finally, each of the Departments within the Bayh College of Education has constructed an Advisory Board, comprised of key stakeholders (i.e., program alumni, practitioners, clinical supervisors). The advisory boards are intended to meet at least annually to engage in discussions about program and departmental outcomes and initiatives, as well as emerging needs in the community (Evidence 5.5.1 - Departmental Advisory Boards).

ONGOING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND SPECIAL INITIATIVES
In addition to formalized committees and boards, the EPP maintains partnerships with several local school corporations. In particular, Vigo County School Corporation, Staunton Elementary School, Rosedale Elementary School, Washington Community Schools, and Covered Bridge Special Education District represent buildings, districts, and educational cooperatives through which many ongoing clinical experiences, program improvement efforts, and quality initiatives are developed and piloted. Several examples have been provided to demonstrate collaborative efforts to involve stakeholders in program evaluation, improvement, and models of excellence:
- Piloting of year-long internships (Rosedale and Staunton Elementary Schools) and an immersion program (Lena Dunn Elementary School -Washington Community Schools), which have been developed based on feedback from long-term partnerships and collaborative program evaluation and improvement efforts (see Standard 2 Summary for additional detail).
- Redesign of Professional Development Schools, with primary collaboration between the EPP, Vigo County School Corporation, and Rosedale Elementary School (Evidence 2.1.3 - PDS Taskforce Documents)
- Revision of Key Assessments, in collaboration between the EPP, Covered Bridge Special Education District (Evidence A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships), and other clinical supervisors (Evidence 2.1.8 - Co-constructed Observation Tool).
- An additional current initiative that focuses on developing models of excellence involves a collaborative exploration between the EPP and Vigo County School Corporation of potential partnerships to improve candidate training and P-12 student access to instructional technology. Apple and Google have been consulted extensively regarding available educational partnership programs to serve both the school district's and the EPP's instructional technology needs (Evidence 7 - Evidence of Infusion of Technology).

SPECIAL REQUESTS
In addition to the stable and active partnerships described above, the EPP regularly solicits evaluative feedback from completers and employers regarding the quality of training and the impact of completers on P-12 student success (see Standard 4 narrative and evidence for additional information). These efforts on the part of the provider will allow stakeholder input related to program evaluation and recommendations for program improvement, in particular.

III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Diversity

1 📎 5 - BCOE Conceptual Framework - Becoming a Complete Professional.pdf

2 📎 1.1.1 - Key Assessment 1 - Professional Disposition

3 📎 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

4 📎 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx

5 📎 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx

6 📎 A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx

7 📎 A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples.docx

8 📎 A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment 4 - Final Evaluation.docx

9 📎 A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx

10 📎 2.1.2 - Affiliation Agreements.pdf

11 📎 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan.docx

12 📎 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents.docx

13 📎 2.2.1 - Student Teaching Handbook 2018-2019.docx

14 📎 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences.docx

15 📎 A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi.docx

16 📎 3.1.1 - All Program Demographic Data.docx

17 📎 A3.1.1 - SPSY recruitment Material.docx

18 📎 4.3.1 - EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey.docx

19 📎 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Survey Results Fall 2018.pdf

20 📎 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey.docx

21 📎 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - Fall 2018.pdf

22 📎 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - December 2017.pdf

23 📎 A4.1.1 - SPSY Employer Survey and Data.docx

24 📎 A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx

25 📎 A4.2.2 - District and Building Level Employer_Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data.docx

26 📎 5.1.1 - QAS System.docx

27 📎 8 - Diversity Analysis and Future Directions.docx

i. Summarize the evidence that demonstrates that diversity is integrated across all standards.

The provider's commitment to diversity and inclusive excellence are evident throughout candidate recruitment, preparation, assessment of candidate performance, and evaluation of completer and employer satisfaction.

Standards 1 and A1: Assessment of candidate performance includes evaluation of dispositions and skills that are critical to working successfully with diverse populations. A summary of assessment items is presented below:

Evidence 1.1.1 - Professional Disposition. The "Courtesy, Respect, and Demeanor" and "Empathic/Responsive" rubric elements include criteria that reflect consideration and care for all persons, including those with diverse needs, perspectives, and values.

Evidence 1.1.2 - Teacher Work Sample. Rubric elements entitled "Understanding Learners," "Student Characteristics," "Adaptations for Diversity," and "Appreciations for Diversity" are reflective of the importance placed on candidates' thorough understanding of the classroom context, individual needs of students within the classroom, appropriate strategies to accommodate a diversity of learning and developmental needs, and appreciation for elements of diversity among students.

Evidence 1.1.3 - Final Evaluation of Student Teaching. Elements 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3b, 3c, 8a, 9b, and 10a are indicative of candidates' ability to understand, appreciate, respond to, and advocate for the educational needs of students with diverse characteristics.

Evidence 1.1.4 - Unit Report. Rubric elements entitled "Accommodation of Learner Development" and "Accommodation of Learner Diversity" reflect the importance placed on considering individual developmental and educational needs in planning, organizing, implementing, and assessing teaching activities.

Evidence A1.1.2 - SPSY Field Evaluations. Items in Domain 2.8 assess candidates' ability to understand and work effectively with individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Evidence A1.1.3 - SPSY Work Samples. Rubric Elements titled "Individual and Diversity Considerations" and "Problem Analysis and Prioritization" reflect the ability of candidates to identify relevant elements of diversity and appropriately consider them in developing an intervention plan.

Evidence A1.1.6 and A1.1.10 - EDLR Final Evaluations. Ratings in the ELCC Standards 2.1, 5.3, 5.5, and 6.1 explicitly address candidates' knowledge and skills relative to understanding elements of diversity at the individual and systems levels and effectively advocating for social justice.

Standards 2 and A2: The provider has worked within its geographic region to establish and build partnerships that ensure candidate exposure to diverse populations. The Standard 2 and A2 summaries provide more in-depth information, and additional details regarding the diversity of placements may be found within the TOTAL Program Documents (Evidence 2.1.6), Student Teaching Handbook (Evidence 2.2.1), Varied Clinical Experiences document (Evidence 2.3.2), and course syllabi (Evidence A2.1.2).

Standards 3 and A3: The provider's recruitment plan for teacher education (Evidence 2.1.4) reflects an intentional focus on increasing enrollment, persistence, and completion for candidates from diverse backgrounds. In addition, the Education Student Services office has been recently restructured to ensure staff are available to support the recruitment and successful matriculation of all candidates. The new structure will place special emphasis on candidates who are underrepresented or

historically underserved through teacher preparation, as well as non-traditional candidates (e.g., those transferring from junior or community colleges, those seeking education degrees as a second career). Advanced programs also engage in recruitment activities targeted toward recruiting candidates who are diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, and geographic region (Evidence A3.1.1 - SPSY Recruitment Material; Standard A3 Summary).

Standards 4 and A4: Assessment of completer performance includes evaluation of dispositions and skills that are critical to working successfully with diverse populations. A summary of how these data are reflected in measures of employer and completer satisfaction is provided below:
Evidence 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 - Employer and Completer Satisfaction Surveys. Items 1-3, aligned with INTASC Standards 1-3, ask completers and employers about completers' preparedness to recognized and respond to diverse student characteristics.
Evidence 4.3.2 and 4.4.2 - State Provided Principal and Completer Surveys. Items 6, 10, 11, and 12 on the Principal Survey and items 7, 10, 11, and 12 on the Completer Survey assess the preparedness of completers to provide inclusive learning environments, appropriately differentiate instruction, work effectively with students with exceptionalities, and effectively manage diverse behaviors in the classroom.
Evidence A4.1.1 and A4.2.1 - SPSY Employer and Completer Satisfaction Surveys. Respondents are asked to rate completer preparedness on the dimension of "Respect for Diversity."
Evidence A4.2.2 - District and Building Level Employer/Completer Survey and Data. Each survey asks respondents to rate the extent to which the completer "recognizes and supports the role of diversity" and "advocates for social justice."

Standards 5 and A5: Diversity is explicitly recognized within the quality assurance system as it pertains to ongoing collection of data (Evidence 5.1.1, Appendix A). Moreover, diversity is incorporated within the continuous improvement cycle and will be considered as part of the Year 1 evaluation cycle (Evidence 5.1.1, p. 8). Results of completer and employer surveys also include diversity metrics, which will be regularly shared with stakeholders (Evidence 5.1.1, p. 9).

b. Technology
(Places in which the cross-cutting themes of diversity and technology must be explicitly addressed through evidence)

1   📎 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

2   📎 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx

3   📎 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx

4   📎 A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx

5   📎 A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project.docx

6   📎 A1.1.6 - District Level Key Assessment 4 - Final Evaluation.docx

7   📎 A1.1.8 - Building Level Key Assessment 3 - Community Relations.docx

8   📎 A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx

9   📎 A1.1.11 - Visual Impairment Key Assessments Plan.docx

10 📎 A1.1.12 - TESL Key Assessment Plan.docx

11 📎 A1.1.13 - GT Key Assessment 1 - Unit Lesson Plan.docx

12 📎 A1.1.14 - GT Key Assessment 2 - Teacher Observation Form.docx

13 📎 A1.1.15 - GT Key Assessment 3 - Portfolio Project.docx

14 📎 A1.1.16 - SPED Key Assessment 1 - Teacher Work Sample.docx

15 📎 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents.docx

16 📎 2.2.2 - 2016 Professional Development.pdf

17 📎 2.2.3 - 2017 Professional Development.pdf

18 📎 2.2.4 - 2018 Professional Development.pdf

19 📎 7 - Evidence of Infusion of Technology.docx

i. Summarize the evidence that demonstrates that technology is integrated across all standards.

According to the BCOE Conceptual Framework: Becoming a Complete Professional. "Technology competencies have been infused into the educator preparation courses related to methodology and pedagogy through the use of facilitating activities. Although past technology integration activities have relied upon educational technology faculty for implementation, the philosophy behind the facilitating activities is to empower teacher education faculty, most of whom do not have a background in educational technology, to develop and implement the activities. By bringing the activities directly into the classroom, aligned with all course expectations and performance standards, technology is naturally presented as an integral piece of the conceptual framework to Becoming a Complete Professional. The educator as expert or mediator of learning uses technology as a powerful tool to support growth and innovation in the teaching and learning environment".

(Evidence 7 - Evidence of the Infusion of Technology)
Technology application is assessed in all educator preparation programs, initial and advanced, using multiple measures. Components that access for technology application are highlighted in pink in all key assessments in which technology is assessed.
Evidence 1.1.2 - Teacher Work Sample: Communication, Supplementary Resources, Use of Research to Build Content Knowledge
Evidence 1.1.3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching: 4c, 6E, 9c
Evidence 1.1.4 - Unit Report: Activities in the Unit

Evidence A1.1.2 - School Psychology, EdS - Field Supervisor Evaluations: Domain 2.1.g, Domain 2.5.g,h
Evidence A1.1.4 - School Administration - District Level - Organizational and Community Relations Skills: ELCC 3.2
Evidence A1.1.6 - School Administration - District Level - Final Mentor Evaluation: ELCC Standard Element 2.2, 2.4, 3.2
Evidence A1.1.8 - School Administration - Building Level - Community Relations Interview: ELCC 3.2
Evidence A1.1.10 - School Administration - Building Level Key Assessment #5 - Final Mentor Evaluation: ELCC Standard Element 2.2, 2.4, 3.2
Evidence A1.1.11 - Visual Impairment: CAEP 1.1E, CAEP 1.1A, 1.1B, and 1.1E, CAEP 1.1A, 1.1B, and 1.1E, CAEP 1.1A, 1.1B, and 1.1E
Evidence A1.1.12 - TESL: "Standard 6"

Evidence A1.1.13 - GT - Unit Lesson Plans: "Technology"
Evidence A1.1.14 - GT - Teacher Observation Form: "Instructional Planning - Technology"
Evidence A1.1.15 - GT - Portfolio Project: Section IV
Evidence A1.1.16 - SPED - Teacher Work Sample: "Candidate plans instruction based upon student's background knowledge and learning needs", "Candidate sequences instructional strategies and learning activities"

In addition to on-going assessment for the use of technology, candidates are offered multiple technology workshops to help them learn new technology applications and techniques. (Evidence 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents, pg 16-26) and (Evidence 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 Professional Development)

The EPP acknowledges the use of technology in some P-12 classrooms is not always possible due to limited availability of technology in some school districts. Therefore, it is essential for the EPP to model technology during coursework and expose candidates to various technology techniques.

This EPP is engaged in active conversations with a local school district to enter a technology partnership. This will be a mutually beneficial partnership that benefits the P-12 learners, P-12 teachers, and EPP faculty and candidates.

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

Previous AFI(s)

(1) [NCATE STD4]Initial and advanced program candidates have limited opportunities to interact and collaborate with diverse peers. [Both]

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

From the 2018 Annual Report:
We have maintained attention on recruiting diverse candidates into our programs; however, we have had limited success. New plans to address this important issue are moving forward, including the following: (a) Our Education Student Services office is restructuring and adding a coordinator position that will be able to address the diversity of candidates. The Coordinator of Recruitment and Advising will focus on proactive ways to recruit diverse candidates to teaching. By establishing connections with secondary schools, community colleges, and our university's centralized first-year advising programs, the Coordinator will be able to forge relationships with prospective candidates. In addition, the Coordinator will work with the education learning communities in our residence halls to ensure that pre-candidates have a sense of belonging with the College of Education. (b) Our university has initiated a predoctoral fellowship program to bring minoritized doctoral students at the ABD level to campus; this program will support them in completing their dissertations and will provide mentorship and support for a future faculty career. We are fortunate to be sponsoring a predoc fellow in the Educational Leadership program, where the advanced candidates in school administration will have significant interactions. Having a more diverse faculty has proven to be the key in recruiting graduate students, and we are looking forward to working with this predoc fellow to make

connections with the K-12 administration candidates.

Referencing Standards 2 and A2: The provider has worked within its geographic region to establish and build partnerships that ensure candidate exposure to diverse populations. Additional opportunities for diverse clinical experiences were implemented in Fall 2018. One hallmark opportunity was the Immersion Program at Lena Dunn Elementary School. Candidates in this program were exposed to a diverse group of P-12 learners and ELL students.

Referencing Standards 3 and A3: The provider's recruitment plan for teacher education (Evidence 2.1.4) reflects an intentional focus on increasing enrollment, persistence, and completion for candidates from diverse backgrounds. In addition, the Education Student Services office has been recently restructured to ensure staff are available to support the recruitment and successful matriculation of all candidates. The new structure will place special emphasis on candidates who are underrepresented or historically underserved through teacher preparation, as well as non-traditional candidates (e.g., those transferring from junior or community colleges, those seeking education degrees as a second career). Advanced programs also engage in recruitment activities targeted toward recruiting candidates who are diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, and geographic region (Evidence A3.1.1 - SPSY Recruitment Material; Standard A3 Summary). School Administration, District level Ed.S. and Building level M.Ed programs have recognized the need for improved efforts in recruiting diverse candidates which will provide more opportunities with collaboration with diverse peers. New faculty searches are underway which will provide additional opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse groups.

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

1 📎 5 - BCOE Conceptual Framework - Becoming a Complete Professional.pdf

2 📎 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan.docx

3 📎 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes.pdf

4 📎 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents.docx

5 📎 2.2.1 - Student Teaching Handbook 2018-2019.docx

6 📎 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences.docx

7 📎 2.3.3 - Evidence of Varied Clinical Experiences.docx

8 📎 A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi.docx

9 📎 A3.1.1 - SPSY recruitment Material.docx

10 📎 8 - Diversity Analysis and Future Directions.docx

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.)

No Evidence found.

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.