Formative Feedback Report

I: Introduction

1. Brief overview of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP): Context and unique characteristics; organization structure; vision, mission, and goals; shared values and beliefs; capacity tables

The Bayh College of Education is one of five academic colleges at Indiana State University, which was founded as a normal school and later became Indiana State Teachers College before becoming ISU. ISU is a state, doctoral/professional university and is the most diverse public university in the state with a majority of students drawn from Indiana and returning to careers in the state after graduation. The EPP reports that community engagement remains an identifying focus of the college and university. The Bayh COE is served by a Dean. The Dean's direct reports include the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean, as well as department Chairs in Communications Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology; Educational Leadership; and Teaching and Learning. Additionally, the Administrative Council, Dean's Advisory Board, and Bayh College of Education Congress report directly to the Dean. The Dean reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The mission of the COE is "To prepare, promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world." The vision of the COE as they move to the future, is that the College will be a rewarding learning community for students, faculty, and staff. The COE identifies eight goals which include: increase enrollment and student success, advance experiential learning, enhance community engagement, strengthen and level programs of strength and promise, diversify revenue, recruit and retain great faculty and staff, raise the profile of educator preparation, and promote long-range academic planning. Shared beliefs include student success, collegiality, caring for others, responsibility, honesty, openness to change, and social justice and diversity. The EPP is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

2. Summary of programs offered: Number, delivery mode, location(s)

Teacher preparation programs in the Bayh College of Education include elementary, early childhood education, and special education as well as graduate level programs in Educational Leadership, Counseling, School Psychology, Educational Psychology, and Speech-Language Pathology. The Bayh COE supports secondary and all-grade education programs housed within specific content departments. The School Counseling program is accredited by CACREP and the Speech-Language Pathology program is accredited by CAA-ASHA. The EPP offers twenty programs in educator preparation, with fourteen of those offered at the initial licensure level and six at the advanced level, in both face-to-face and online formats. Fifteen programs are offered exclusively face-to-face, three are offered exclusively online (Special Education-Graduate, Gifted and Talented Certification, and English as a New Language), and the remaining two are offered in both face-to-face and online formats (School Building Leadership and School District Leadership). Programs offered at the initial level include Science Education, Special Education - Undergraduate, Early Childhood Education Minor, Social Studies Education, Special Education - Graduate, Technology Education, English Education, World Languages, Math Education, Physical Education, Elementary Education, Art Education, Business Education, and Music Education.

Advanced programs include School Building Leadership, School Psychology, School District Leadership, Gifted and Talented Certification, English as a New Language, and School Counseling. All programs are offered at or through the main campus.

3. Special circumstances of the formative feedback review, if any

N/A

II: Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP provided evidence to support the "developing and assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions through submission Key Assessment #1 Professional Disposition in University classroom and clinical field experiences. The candidates in ELED, SECD, SPED are evaluated at three check points which provides information on progress and supports success.

Standard 1 Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions Monitoring

Key #1 Assessment has a focus on skills and knowledge and is tracked through the TWS and Student Teaching EPP created rubrics. These tools are aligned with to the 10 INTASC standards and provided in data reports section 4.4.1 EPP Completer Satisfaction Survey,4.2.1 State Provided teacher Evaluation Data,3.6.5, ELED 400 syllabus,3.3.1 Total Professional Growth Plan, 2.21,.2,.3, Professional Development.

1.3 EPP created assessments

It is important to report that EPP created rubrics throughout the program note the process in place for full rubric reviews, results for recommendations from the rubric teams and the proposed future revisions with the rubrics. A Reliability and Validity statement where applicable was included. EPP rubrics were aligned with InTASC, ACEI 2.2.

Key Assessment #2 TWS Assignment, Evaluation of Student Teaching, Technology, Diversity.
Content Knowledge is assessed through the program entry assessments, course work, licensure testing. Skills are assessed through the program during clinical experiences, Key Assessments Student Teaching 1.1.3, Unit Report 1.1.4, TWS 1.1.2, Disposition 1.1.1. A1.1.5, A1,1.9

1.3 Assessments submitted for the Program Review with Feedback option are at the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Evaluation Framework and Tool for EPP-Created Assessments.

The University provides evidence reflecting a consistent review system for their candidates supported by course work, clinical placements, testing and supervision. The tools applied are reviewed by faculty and revised with assistance from the field supervisors and community partners. Evidence provided includes meeting notes of

the Educational Assessment Committee.

The data/record management system provided has been collected and presented by the internal assessment data specialists. Employer Satisfaction, Completer data and Candidate success has been reported and provided as evidence in Key Assessments 1-4. The data collection model, interpretation and presentation are represented through charts and tables created by the EPP.

The system in place to review the candidate's practical application of professional knowledge and skills in the field is focused through the Key Assessment 1.1.2 TWS, 1.1.3 Student Teaching, and 1.1.4 Unit Report. The details of these academic and field experiences indicate that the candidates are required to provide organized curriculum, current instructional strategies in a unit planned to meet the standards of the state requirements. The supervisors and faculty monitor the development of this work through course work, field experiences, student teaching, observations, and consist of feedback as the evidence in the summary forms provided. The National Standards in Technology need to have a more prominent place in the curriculum for all candidates throughout the programs not only with personal skills but infused throughout the instructional curriculum in the TWS, Student Teaching, and Unit Report.

The University provides multiple programs both at the Undergraduate and graduate levels:
Elementary Education, Secondary Education (Math, English, Music, Physical Education, Social Studies, Language)

The evidence in general for standard 1 indicates that program candidates are required to meet clearly described entrance expectations, testing 1.1 Licensure Test, 2.21 Student Teaching Handbook 2018-19, Professional Development 2.2.3 for example. What is not clear is the location in the program for the review of this information with the candidates. (2.2.3 may be the focus point but needs review.)

Progress for Cross-Cutting Themes:

Throughout the evidence of the Key Assessments 1-4, the EPP highlighted the themes of Technology and Diversity from InTASC to provide a focus for these themes aligned with the Assessments.

In reviewing one of the rubrics for the TWS the quote provided below indicates the target sought for the level of cultural understanding. The evidence needed is the matching curriculum, instruction and assessment. Using this target provides the foundation for deeper experiences and application. The Social Justice and Diversity course represents an opportunity for educators to experience deeper thinking. Do all students take this course?

Appreciations for Diversity
INTASC 2(d)

The teacher brings multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners' personal, family, and community experiences and cultural

norms.

Standard 1
CAEP Standards, InTASC Standards

The EPP does not provide evidence for diversity proficiencies.

The demographics data indicates that the area lacks cultural diversity but opportunities to research and experience may be available to broaden this learning. A clear diversity statement for the program needs to be a part of the future. This may be an opportunity to include Diversity in the Conceptual Framework- Becoming a Complete Professional. This link was not available to view but appears to have a notation that Diversity was noted as an area that needed more focus from a previous evaluation. What steps have been taken since that evaluation? Is there data to provide some evidence for progress?

The demographic data indicates that this area is challenged economically for recruitment of students. What steps are in place to provide assistance, especially to teacher education candidates as they prepare for the future? Career-readiness is sited in the rubrics for Student Teaching, but opportunity to prepare resumes, letters of introduction and interview question responses is not defined.

1.1 Developing and revising assessments

The assessments are standard REPA Indiana Educator Standards CORE assessments. The data is reported by the State to the institution and the candidates. The licensure test is aligned with the standards for educators. These results provide a clear picture for the EPP to review curriculum and instruction in future preparation. As reported by the EPP the data is reviewed in the summer (2018 Visual Impairment) which may be too late to adjust curriculum. The data is available, however a coordinated review and future revision was not submitted. 1.3.

1.4 Career readiness

Although this may be a focus for action research, the idea of embedded topics is not noted.1.5
Technology may also be a focus for action research but is not noted.

The University provides multiple programs both at the Undergraduate and graduate levels:
Elementary Education
Secondary Education (Math, English, Music, Physical Education)

a. Analysis of program-level data

The evidence in general for initial level candidates indicates that program candidates are required to meet clearly described entrance expectations, testing 1.1 Licensure Test, 2.21 Student Teaching Handbook 2018-19, Professional Development 2.2.3, for example. What is not clear is the location in the program for the review this information with the candidates.

1.1 Developing and revising assessments
The general theme for data collection and reporting provides references that the data indicates a need for review in those courses with specific content indicating candidates are below appropriate levels.

Career readiness
National Career Readiness requirements are noted in the assessment rubrics in several courses (TWS Page 13)

1.5
Technology application is required for candidate course work, included in instructional curriculum in lesson plans for TWS.

The demographics data indicates that the area lacks cultural diversity but opportunities to research and experience is available to prepare candidates for teaching. A clear diversity statement for the program will direct plans for experiences in cultural diversity. Including opportunities to strengthen Diversity in the Conceptual Framework- Becoming a Complete Professional. Although this link was not available to view it appears to have a notation that Diversity is an area needing more focus noted in a previous evaluation. What steps have been taken since that evaluation? Is there data to provide some evidence for progress?

The demographic data indicates that this area is challenged economically for recruitment of students. What steps are in place to provide assistance, especially to teacher education candidates as they prepare for the future? Career-readiness is sited in the rubrics for Student Teaching, but opportunity to prepare resumes, letters of introduction and interview question responses is not defined.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

| 1. | Entrance requirements (Handbook) Professional Disposition (evidence to measure students' progress) Understanding InTASC standard 10 (Rubrics EPP) Teacher Work Sample (Rubric EPP) Evaluation of Student Teaching (Rubric EPP) Evaluation of Disposition |

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

| 1. | Diversity embedded in curriculum, instruction and experiences. Technology application for instruction in curriculum. Career and career ready standards |

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Tasks

Title: Diversity	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Evidence of "applying understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards."
B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed	
1 (1)	. Describe specific diversities present within the classroom (acknowledge diversities including, but not limited to, skin color, exceptionalities, culture, socio-economic background, and family composition). . Describes provisions for teaching AND differentiating for EACH difference AND includes different ways for diverse students to DEMONSTRATE their learning . Describe the impact these adaptations have on the learners.

.	*page 10 TWS Assignment #1 Intasc 3/f

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	Provide details of the strategies and applications of understanding that impact candidate learning.
(2)	How do you know that your candidates are ready to teach diverse learners and diverse students under different situations they may encounter on the job?
(3)	What steps have been taken since that evaluation? Is there data to provide some evidence for progress?

Title: Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2.	(1)	Data to indicate technology standards required in the program.
	(2)	Supplementary Resources INTASC 4(g) The teacher uses supplementary resources and technologies effectively to ensure accessibility and relevance for all learners.
	(3)	Data Based Instructional Adjustments INTASC 8 ACEI 5.1 The teacher effectively uses multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify each student's learning needs and to develop differentiated learning experiences.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	Provide details/data to demonstrate application standards and instructional standards for technology. "Extract from instructional practice evidence relative to candidate capacities in data literacy and use of assessments with diverse students."

Title: Career and College Readiness

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

3.	(1)	Data to support College and career readiness preparation in categories 1.4.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

	(1)	College and Career Ready All lesson plans include Indiana Academic College and Career Ready standards with standards aligned and evident throughout objectives and procedures.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	Provide the data for this requirement.

3. Preliminary recommendations for new areas for improvement (AFIs) including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Standard 1.4 There is limited systematic data collection that provides the regular reviewing and monitoring of candidate progress in CAEP cross-cutting themes for diversity and application of Technology.	The EPP fails to provide sufficient data for monitoring candidates that specifically demonstrates their preparation for diverse classrooms and students.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
Standard 1.5 The EPP provided insufficient evidence to demonstrate that existing candidates model and apply technology standards (ISTE) in course work and clinical experiences.	The EPP fails to provide evidence that demonstrates that candidates meet technology standards.

II: Standard A.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

A.1 Programs
The EPP provided evidence for the programs offered at the Advanced level, which includes School Psychology, School Administration/Leadership, Special Education, Visual Impairment, Teachers of Second Languages, Gifted and Talented. They provided a three-year cycle of data indicating candidate requirements, population, clinical placements, field supervisions and recommendations for the future.

A.1 Functioning Process
There is a process in place for developing and revising assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

A.1 Collect, store and review data
Data is provided for a three-year cycle including an "Analysis and Interpretation of data findings."

The University provides evidence reflecting a consistent review system for their candidates supported by course work, clinical placements, testing and supervision. The tools applied are reviewed by faculty and revised with assistance from the field supervisors and community partners. Evidence provided includes meeting notes from the Educational Assessment Committee. The data/record management system provided has been collected and presented by the internal assessment data specialists. Employer Satisfaction, Completer data and Candidate success has been reported and provided as evidence in Key Assessments 1-4 of A.1. The data collection model, interpretation and presentation are represented through charts and tables created by the EPP.

A.1 Regular reviewing

The quote that follows is from page 6 Advanced Programs Leadership. This provides an example of similar comments offered by the EPP in response to data.

"Continued effort and focus in areas of strength, including Domains I, II, III, and V, with particularized focus on what we CAN control in the area of Culture of Achievement (IV). The first thing we might do here is to examine our own assumptions, values, and beliefs about the efficacy of school district leaders in making change and engage our partnering candidates in some critical conversations

about what we can to do garner more success in these areas, while leveraging the many positive preparatory experiences that have brought this program great success."

a. Analysis of program-level data

Progress for Cross-Cutting Themes:
Throughout the evidence of the Key Assessments 1-4, the EPP highlighted the themes of Technology and Diversity from InTASC to provide a focus for these themes aligned with the Assessments. Noted in the sections of Analysis and Interpretation of School Administration the assignments guided by EPP created rubrics particularly Community Relations focus on the challenges of data collection for the Crosscutting themes. (Key Assesment #3 1.8)

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Professional Disposition (evidence to measure students' progress) InTASC standard 10 (Rubrics EPP) Evaluation of Disposition Application of Appendix A where required.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Diversity embedded in curriculum, instruction and experiences. Technology application for instruction in curriculum. Career and career ready standards

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Tasks

	Title: Diversity
1.	**A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**
	(1) Evidence of "applying understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards."
	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
	(1) Interview's demonstration that you can understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community in the context of positive community relations (ELCC 4.2). Page 6 (Advanced programs EDS)
	(2) "Reliability and Validity: Initial Validation Work: For this assessment, program faculty and K-12 leader/partners participated in face validation and content validity activities by identifying item-level connections with professional and accreditation standards during the summer of 2017. Assessment items (item indicators at four levels of proficiency) were then revised ("tagged") for connection to content, professional, and accreditation standards. Consultant assistance was sought in the review and revision of item-level indicators to ensure an appropriate developmental sequence from a score of a 1 (does not meet expectations) to a score of a 4 (exceeds expectations). The work of program faculty in this area was overseen by an Assessment Coordinator, as well as the Program Coordinator and Department Chairperson."
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Provide evidence to support data collection, review and revision of assessment.

Title: Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Evidence needed from SPA requirements and data.

(2) Interview's demonstration that you can understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations in the context of positive community relations (ELCC 3.2).

2.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) "More attentiveness needs to be placed in prioritizing the focus on and assessment of a building leader's capabilities with technology, as well as this program's ability and desire to measure it in terms of its continual improvement system. Evidence suggest it is rather scant in terms of the programmatic attention given, at present."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What progress has been made toward proficiency?

Title: Cross-cutting Themes

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Evidence of program progress.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

3.

(1) "The cross-cutting standards of technology are difficult to assess because the data seem unusable from 2016 and 2017 (ELCC 3.2, as it is in part a technology assessment of using human fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations in the context of positive community relations). Data from 2018 yield a finding that generally, candidates are only "developing" in this area and have a way to go toward." (page 9)

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Have you set benchmarks for success for these candidates in technology application and use of data for application?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new areas for improvement (AFIs) including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
A.1 There is insufficient evidence that candidates model and apply technology standards to improve the effectiveness of school and district functions, enhance instruction, and manage student assessment data while engaging students in the applications of technology to learning experiences.	The EPP fails to provide sufficient evidence that candidates engage in experiences during their preparation to become proficient in applications of digital media and technological capabilities. There is insufficient evidence that candidates have the opportunities apply technology appropriately in their field of specialization. (Page 13 CAEP Handbook)
A.1 The EPP lacks sufficient documentation that the assessment tools have been developed for reliability and validity when they are applied to measure candidates' progress and their professional practice.	The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence that instruments meet professional research and data analysis standards for reliability and consistency.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings.

The EPP collaborates with P-12 partners and stakeholders to ensure mutually beneficial clinical placements for candidates (2.1). The EPP has a general contract agreement with all schools where candidates are placed. Although this contract was not included in the evidence, there is an Affiliation Agreement between the EPP and Southwest Park Community School Corporation which states that the placement process for student teachers and practicum students is a cooperative venture involving both parties. The document outlines some responsibilities for each party. (Exhibit 2.1.2)

The EPP had a 20-year history with professional development schools (PDS). The relationship ceased in 2016 due to numerous changes in leadership. (Exhibit 2.1.3) Recently, a PDS relationship has been established with Rosedale Elementary School resulting in two pilot programs implemented in Fall 2018. The Immersion Pilot Program was initiated based on feedback from exit interviews and completer satisfaction surveys that stated it would be beneficial for a candidate to experience the opening of a classroom. Subsequently, this pilot gives elementary candidates the opportunity to partake in setting up a classroom, attending Open House, and establishing the culture of the classroom from the first day of school. It is anticipated that this program will extend to the middle and high school candidates. (Exhibit 2.3.2)

As a result of the Immersion Pilot Program, school administrators expressed interest in piloting a year-long internship program. This pilot program was opened to elementary education candidates and combined the TOTAL experience (consisting of 300 hours of field work) with student teaching to equal the Year-Long Internship. Feedback from administration is positive with the majority expressing interest in continuing this program. (Exhibit 2.1.5)

During the 2018 summer training, university supervisors provided input into a new Student Teaching Observation Tool. Based on their feedback, a group consisting of university supervisors, a host teacher, and building administrators developed the Student Teaching Observation Tool which was piloted in Spring 2019. Data will be available at the site visit.

The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) is a stakeholder group comprised of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and human resource directors. The group meets two or three times a year and is instrumental in providing guidance and feedback on current and potential programs. As a result of meeting, the TEAC encouraged faculty to develop a special education minor that would be available for elementary or secondary education majors. Based on feedback from the Council, faculty designed and had approved two new majors, one in middle school math and one in middle school science. (Evidence 2.1.5)

As a result of feedback from schools and community, a reorganization of the education student services was added to the Recruitment Plan to include new positions responsible for recruitment and advising of candidates, another for retention and completion, and another to manage scholarships and partnerships such

as PDS. It is the hope that this will help attract a more diverse candidate pool who would receive support from admission through completion. (Exhibit 2.1.4)

A collaborative effort was used in developing the Student Teaching Handbook which is a main resource for host teachers, candidates, and university supervisors. The handbook, which includes roles and responsibilities, was created with institutional and state guided information along with information gathered from clinical partnerships. It is reviewed and updated regularly to reflect changes recommended by stakeholders. (Exhibit 2.2.1)

The Educational Assessment Committee, which includes the Director of Accreditation and Assessment, CAEP standard 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, reviews rubrics, assessment processes, and accreditation and assessments needs. Items developed within this committee are presented to the Teacher Education Committee for voting and approval. (Exhibit 2.1.9)

Evidence and the narrative reveal that partners prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates and P-12 student learning and development (2.2). As stated in the narrative, host teachers are selected by building principals who ensure the teachers have the required license and ability to mentor candidates. (Exhibit2.2.5) Collaboration is key for the placement of candidates during the TOTAL semester. Candidates have the opportunity to interview and share their teaching interests and needs with faculty. Interview responses are shared with the principal who matches the candidate with a clinical educator based on these interests and needs. (Exhibit 2.1.6)

University supervisors hold a master's degree, however, there is no mention of other qualifications. A role of the university supervisor is to act as the liaison between the EPP, candidate, and P-12 school. They visit the school site at least four times during each student teaching experience and provide support and supervision to the candidate as well as on-going support to host teachers. University supervisors attend a one-day training each summer. Agendas show topics such as roles and responsibilities, licensing tests and strategies, interrater reliability training, and placement information. (Exhibit 2.2.6)

Professional development is offered to candidates, EPP faculty, and P-12 teachers. Three years of evidence was provided. Topics for the 2018 year included Behavior Management: Classroom Management and Discipline and Infant and Toddler Development and Early Intervention in Indiana. The SSR stated that another professional development, the 2018 Duke Energy Power of Reading Summit, brought in 450 attendees. Additionally, the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Special Education which is housed in the College of Education offers several workshops each year. An EduTECH Conference was developed based on feedback from clinical educators, faculty, and candidates who felt there was a strong need for candidates to learn effective use of technology. Topics for this conference included Using Tech. in a Way that Matters and Tech. Enhanced Games for Higher Order

Thinking. All of these workshops are presented free of charge. (Exhibit 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4)

Although host teachers are not formally evaluated, a process is in place to either provide them with additional support or to no longer use them if they prove to be an ineffective mentor. The process includes candidate feedback and field supervisor observation. Host teachers are informally rated by candidates and the field supervisor. University supervisors are evaluated annually by the Assistant Director of Education Student Services. An evaluation form was not provided. The department chairperson also evaluates university supervisors on their teaching and related academic responsibilities, scholarly research, and service. Candidates are encouraged to complete a short evaluation on the university supervisor; however, response rates are low.

The EPP has built partnerships in the community that provide candidates with opportunities to continue to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions (2.3). All student teaching placements are made in collaboration with the student teacher's home department, Education Student Services, and the host school. Student teachers have varied placements. Candidates are required to teach in two levels (middle school/high school, middle school/elementary, high school/elementary). (Exhibit 2.2.1) To ensure adequate depth of these experience, candidates student teach for a total of 16 weeks with a final goal of teaching a "full load" of classes. In terms of diversity, other than the example of the Lena Dunn Elementary School where there is a large percentage of English Language Learners, there are no other examples of diverse placements.

The only assessment that meets the sufficiency level for technology is the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching where candidates are asked to use technology to support assessment practices and to address learner needs. Additionally, they are rated on their legal and ethical use of information and technology. (Exhibit 1.1.3) The EPP recognizes technology as an area of needed improvement. Currently there are discussions with the local school district to enter a technology partnership that would increase the availability of technology in the P-12 classroom and provides candidates opportunities to use and apply technology in their coursework.

In terms of impact on student learning, candidates in the elementary and special education programs design and implement an assessment plan in the Teacher Work Sample. (Exhibit 1.1.6) This plan includes a pre and post test that measures daily objectives and includes formative daily assessments. Candidates analyze the results of the assessments and use the analysis to make educational decisions for the next day's lesson. Secondary candidates write a unit plan and describe the formal and informal assessment procedures and instruments used to determine whether students achieved the goals, objectives, or intended outcomes. They then do an analysis of the assessment to determine if adjustments need to be made in the implementation of the unit plans.

Data are used by the EPP to make changes in clinical experiences, such as:
.a revitalization of the PDS relationship;
.expansion of the Immersion program and Year-Long Internship;

.develop a co-constructed observation tool for candidates;
.develop a process to evaluate host teachers; and
.create videos to provide ongoing training to host teachers.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.3 - Key Assessment 3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching.docx
2. 2.1.1 - MOUs.pdf 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships 5
3. 2.1.2 - Affiliation Agreements.pdf
4. 2.1.3 - PDS Taskforce Documents.pdf
5. 2.1.4 - Teacher Education Recruitment Plan.docx
6. 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes.pdf
7. 2.1.6 - TOTAL Program Documents.docx
8. 2.1.7 - TEC Bylaws and Member Directory.doc
9. 2.1.8 - Co-Constructed Observation Tool.docx
10. 2.1.9 - Educational Assessment Committee.docx
11. 2.2.1 - Student Teaching Handbook 2018-2019.docx
12. 2.2.2 - 2016 Professional Development.pdf
13. 2.2.3 - 2017 Professional Development.pdf
14. 2.2.4 - 2018 Professional Development.pdf
15. 2.2.5 - Placement Form.doc
16. 2.2.6 - University Supervisor Meeting Agendas.pdf
17. 2.2.7 - University Supervisor Evaluation Form.docx
18. 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences.docx
19. 2.3.3 - Evidence of Varied Clinical Experiences.docx

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.4 - Key Assessment 4 - Unit Report.docx
2. 1.1.2 - Key Assessment 2 -Teacher Work Sample.docx

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

Title: University Supervisors

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Verify qualifications, evaluation, and the process for deficient performance.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. (1) Table 4. Qualification Table for EPP-based Clinical Educators and p. 32 "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What qualifications are needed to become a university supervisor? What process is in place if their performance is deficient? Please provide copies of evaluations of university supervisors completed by both the Assistant Director of Education Student Services and the department chairperson.

Title: Diversity in Clinical Experiences

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| (1) | Verify the diverse field experiences |

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

2. | (1) | p.33 "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." |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| (1) | Please provide the diversity demographics of the schools where candidates are placed for clinical experiences. What progress has been made in reference to Goal 3 of the Recruitment plan where candidates are expected to teach in a diverse or underserved school? |

Title: MOUs and Affiliation Agreements

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| (1) | Verification of partnerships |

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3. | (1) | p.26 "Additionally, Indiana State University may enter into a partnership by requesting a school complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)." And p.36 "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." |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| (1) | Please provide copies of MOUs and Affiliation agreements for student teaching. |

Title: Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| (1) | Progress in technology partnership |

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

4. | (1) | p. 33 "Discussions are underway with the local school district to enter a technology partnership. 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. " |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| (1) | What updates are available on the technology partnership with the local school district? How else will you ensure that candidates are using technology in their practice and teaching their students technology? |

Title: Future Direction

5.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) | Verify updates on future directions |

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) | p. 34 Standard 2 Future Directions |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) | Since writing the SSR, are there any current updates on the seven future directions that were presented in the Self Study Report? |

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Component 2.3: The EPP does not ensure that clinical experiences include technology-enhanced learning opportunities.	There is limited evidence that candidates have the ability to demonstrate technology application.
Component 2.3: The EPP does not ensure that candidates demonstrate developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development.	There is limited evidence that clinical experiences engage diverse P-12 learners.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard A.2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings.

The EPP's advanced programs include School Psychology-Ed.S, School Administration Building Level M.Ed, and School Administration District Level Ed.S. The EPP describes faculty and supervisors as using a shared responsibility model that includes co-construction of instruments, clinical experiences, and evaluation of candidates.

The EPP provides evidence that the school psychology program has an affiliation agreement form for candidate practicum and internship that outlines joint responsibilities as well as individual duties of the university, agency, and candidate. (Evidence 2.1.1) However, no formally signed agreements were presented as evidence.

Agendas of supervisor meeting were accessible and showed ongoing collaboration and discussions on candidate successes and struggles, dialogues on providing a sufficient breadth of experience, program revision, and arranging diverse placements. Besides giving feedback, these meetings also give supervisors regular access to program faculty, information about program requirements, and an opportunity to discuss candidate performance and collaboratively problem-solve when needed. (Evidence A2.1.1)

There is additional evidence of both the supervisor and candidate providing feedback to the EPP. It was felt that the field evaluation instrument was not yielding data useful to the program, to supervisors, or to the candidates. Subsequently, the EPP engaged faculty, field supervisors, and candidates to provide feedback on the form. Evidence reveals that meetings were held to discuss the feedback and make revisions to the evaluation form. After the pilot, the EPP followed up with supervisors and

requested input on the new form. (Evidence 5.1.3)

Further collaboration takes place when a candidate has a Performance Improvement Plan during field placement. A plan may be put in place if a candidate is not meeting program academic requirements or demonstrating the professional skills or dispositions necessary to successfully complete field experiences. Supervisors and faculty have the opportunity to collaborate on the plan to help ensure candidate success. (Evidence A3.2.1)

Collaboration was also displayed when a site with a large cohort felt overwhelmed by the amount of shadowing hours required of candidates. Site supervisors additionally expressed concern about the time demands of shadowing. A series of emails concerning this was sent to faculty. Through collaboration, the problem was quickly resolved by reducing the hours of the shadowing and adding three additional psychologists in other districts who were willing to help out.

The program relies heavily on practicum and internship experiences to ensure candidates have sufficient opportunities to apply their acquired content knowledge in practical settings. During these experiences, candidates are evaluated on their ability to use research, to apply professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards, and to use available technology to enhance interventions and consulting activities. Candidates also must complete two comprehensive case studies. Evaluations of the studies includes, in part, use of research, data-based decision making and accountability, application of technology, and interventions and instructional support. (A1.1.3)

Going forward, the EPP stated they will continue to maintain regular communication with all supervisors to identify any potential areas of growth at the candidate and program levels. Additionally, they will implement program-level changes to improve candidates' preparedness for clinical experiences.

Specific to the School Administration District Level Ed.S. program, the Educational Development Council (EDC) meets twice a year and serves as the K-12 Educational Leadership Advisory Group. This group provides feedback on pre-service superintendent training as well as on services offered to practicing superintendents. Evidence was provided showing the activities of the EDC which include professional discussions, trainings, feedback, current issues information, legislative updates, and strategic planning opportunities for the EPP and its partnering schools. (Evidence A2.1.6)

Faculty and site supervisors have an ongoing collaborative relationship. Ed.S candidates participate in a summer superintendence internship and are observed and evaluated by supervisors. (Evidence A1.1.4) An evaluation form could not be located.

Coursework includes roles and functions of leadership that complies with the Indiana Professional Standards for School Leaders and the licensing requirements for the Indiana certification for superintendents, as well as the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. The courses focus on district-level management knowledge and skills and includes understanding all management

systems as well as operational systems within the district-level. During coursework, candidates focus on meeting the diverse interests and needs of the community, strategies for collaboration with stakeholders to improve community climate and culture, moral and ethical skills necessary to provide a safe and effective school district, and evaluating decisions in terms of legality and morality. (A2.1.5)

Candidates also complete an action research project which is an assessment of their leadership skills in organizational management and community relations in the district. (Evidence A1.1.7) Several of the items candidates are evaluated on include, developing an overall strategic plan of the district, improving and implementing district policies and procedures for safe and secure central office and school-work environments, and using technology to manage district operational systems.

The EPP articulates that 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."

Specific to the School Administration - Building Level, M.Ed. program, the 300-hour principal internships are collaboratively created. The Principal Internship Handbook offers a description of the shared responsibilities of all involved in the experience. (A2.1.7)

Pre-service principal trainees receive guidance from members of the Department of Educational Leadership who oversee the intern's experiences and facilitate seminars. University supervisors complete face to face site visits to the principal intern settings at least twice each semester with an option of online meetings. Additionally, the intern receives ongoing training and support under the guidance of a building-level school leader. In the event that a candidate receives unfavorable reports or feedback of concern, the university supervisor and principal meet to design a plan for remediation.

Principal Internship requirements as well as coursework and assignments are articulated in the Principal Intern Handbook. (Evidence A2.1.7) Candidates are required to do an extensive long-term Action Research Project where they identify a school wide need. They then collect and analyze data, develop a plan, and share their data and plan with stakeholders.

Interns are also assessed on their use of technology to augment learning, maintain productive relationships, solve problems, and to improve instructional use of technology. Rubrics for all assignments and experiences are available in the Handbook.

The EPP commented that the yearly summative evaluation for their principal intern yields a limited amount of data. It is their plan, through employer and completer surveys and district and school partner dialogue, to design a system that serves as a robust measure of partner evaluation of the building-level preparation program. The EPP feels that additional input on pre-internship activities in terms of meeting the needs of candidates and clinical partners, and clinical partners' perspectives on the

appropriateness of internship requirements would provide heightened feedback. The EPP stated that with the additional feedback, program improvement will be developed with implementation anticipated by the site visit.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. A1.1.2 - SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Evaluations.docx
2. A1.1.3 - SPSY Key Assessment #2 - Work Samples.docx
3. A1.1.4 - District Level Key Assessment 2 - Community Relations Project.docx
4. A1.1.7 - Building Level Key Assessment 2 - Action Research Project.docx
5. A1.1.10 - Building Level Key Assessment 5 - Final Evaluation.docx
6. A2.1.1 - SPSY Co-creation of Partnerships.docx
7. A2.1.2 - SPSY Course Syllabi.docx
8. A2.1.3 - SPSY Handbook 2018.pdf
9. A2.1.4 - District Level - Application for Central Office Internship.docx
10. A2.1.5 - District Level Course Syllabi.docx
11. A2.1.7 - Building Level Principal Intern Handbook.pdf
12. A2.1.6 - EDC Meeting Minutes.docx
13. A2.1.8 - Building Level Course Syllabi.doc
14. A3.2.1 - SPSY Performance Improvement Plans.docx
15. 5.1.3 - Fall 2018 Rubric Review Results.docx

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

1.	**Title**: Clinical placements **A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration** (1) Data on varied clinical experiences **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed** (1) 2.3.2 - Varied Clinical Experiences.docx **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews** (1) For all advanced programs, how does the EPP ensure varied and developmental clinical experiences for all candidates?
2.	**Title**: Affiliation Agreements **A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration** (1) Verification of signed affiliation agreements **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed** (1) p. 36 "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." **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews** (1) What is the current status of your partnership arrangements? Please

provide copies of signed Affiliation Agreements for advanced programs.

Title: Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

3.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Verification of collaboration on PIP

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 37 "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Can you provide examples of faculty/supervisor collaboration on the Performance Improvement Plan?

Title: Case Studies

4.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) See examples of project

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 37 "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Can you provide examples of the Specialist Project and data on candidate performance on the project?

Title: Program Improvements

5.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Confirm changes are being implemented.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 38 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

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What program level changes have been made? Can you provide data on the effectiveness of these changes?

Title: Action Research Project

6.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Verify candidates work.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 40 "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Can you provide examples of the Action Research Project and data on candidate performance on this project?

Title: Eds district level internship

7.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Evaluation of internship

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 38 "Ed.S candidates participate in a summer superintendency internship and complete an action research project."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) How are candidates evaluated during their internship? Is there a form that university supervisors use to rate them?

Title: School Administration - Building Level

8.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Survey feedback and program improvement

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) p. 42 "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.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What are the results of the additional feedback from the surveys? What program improvements have or will be put in place?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Component A.2.2: The EPP does not provide evidence of opportunities in which candidates practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize.	The EPP has not provided sufficient evidence of candidate work. There is limited evidence of candidates' work on projects (i.e. Master's Case, Work Samples, Specialist Project, Community Relations Project, Action Research Project) that are required to successfully complete the advanced programs.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs. The EPP provides a comparison of national, local, and the EPP's racial and ethnic demographics (Evidence File 3.1.1. All Program Demographic Data). The EPP provided three cycles of data as it relates to the recruitment of Black or African - American candidates. However, the EPP provided no evidence as it relates to the recruitment of candidates from other diverse backgrounds. Although the EPP presented evidence (Evidence File 3.1.1) that disaggregated data on applicants by race/ethnicity and sex, the EPP does not provide evidence of as to how the EPP analyzes the data for trends and patterns across the EPP to support continuous improvement. The EPP evidenced a Teacher Recruitment Plan has been developed based upon existing recruitment initiatives" (p.43) (Evidence File: 2.1.4- Teacher Education Recruitment Plan). In the SSR, the EPP identifies the steps and processes created to support the recruitment of diverse candidates and candidates to meet the needs of STEM, ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff schools needs. The EPP acknowledges that they" have not formerly engaged in the formal and strategic recruitment efforts as the Teacher Education Recruitment Plan is newly written" (p.44). Additional evidence is needed.

3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement. The EPP has established a minimum GPA of 2.5 for admission to teacher education programs that is below the CAEP minimum requirement of a GPA of 3.0, the EPP evidenced that candidates in the initial and advanced programs admission GPA's are above the CAEP minimum for academic achievement years of '15-16,'16'17, and 17-18 reflect GPA's of 3.0 or higher EPP wide (Evidenced File 2.3.1- Admission Requirements and GPA-All Programs). The EPP acknowledges that "disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.5 and 3.0 "(p.44). Additionally, data addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria for its initial certification programs and data addressing whether or not the cohort of candidates are in the top 50% from 2016-2017 or the top 40% from 2018-2019 by specialty for initial licensure areas are not evidenced and three cycles of data are not evidenced for the following national normed tests, (ACT '16-17',17-18'; SAT '16-17',17-18', and Praxis I). The EPP evidenced the following Admission to Teacher Education Requirement for the initial and advanced programs. Admission criteria for initial and advanced programs are evidenced (Evidence File File 2.3.1- Admission Requirements and GPA-All Programs).

3.3 Additional Selectivity Factors. As evidenced in the SSR the EPP requires candidates pass an FBI and Child Protective Services (CPS) Background check after admittance into the Becoming a Complete Professional (BCP), and prior to field

experiences. In the SSR (p.45), processes are in place should a candidate not clear the FBI or CPs background checks (i.e., candidates meet with Director of Education Services to discuss potential implications of the results for future employment and or viable alternatives to the teaching education majors).The EPP evidenced (File 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1- Professional Development) which is used in "introductory courses prior to admission into the teacher education program (TEP) and is administered at multiple points throughout the program to monitor..dispositions beyond academic ability (p,45). (Evidenced File 1.1.1-Key Asssessment#1 - Professional-Development) indicates that Elementary Education candidates are assessed in ELED250, ELED 400, and ELED 451; Secondary Candidates CIMT 200, mid-way point by content area faculty, and in CIMT401; Special Education Candidates ELED250, and SPED 405). While the EPP evidence in the SSR that 90% of the candidates were rated as performing in the "proficient or exceeding expectation range "(p.45) and 10% of the candidates received a rating of adequate three cycles of data are not provided for all programs (Evidenced File 1.1.1-Key Asssessment#1 - Professional Development).The EPP provides a limited analysis as it relates to how the association/correlation of non-academic factors predict candidates performance in the program and effective teaching. The EPP (Evidence File 1.1.1 -Key Asssessment#1 -Professional Development-Reliability and Validity Section) that the Professional Development Rubric under a full "rubric review in fall 2018 and... identified several limitations to the assessment... and that future revision to the rubric will include more general components of professional disposition that can apply to both course work and field placement and that the Professional Disposition Rubric will be revised Spring 2018, and anticipated for use in Fall 2019." The EPP does not provide evidence that describes the measure used to secure reliability and validity as it relates to the Professional Disposition Rubric. The EPP needs to provide additional details on the timeline and process.

3.4 Selectivity During Preparation. The EPP creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates advancement from admissions through completion (Evidence File 2.3.1 Admissions Requirements and GPA - ALL Programs). As evidenced in the SSR, candidates progress through the teacher education program in three stages and that candidates must maintain a 2.5 GPA and a C in every required course. If candidates fall below a 2.5 GPA, they meet with Education Student Services to discuss "alternatives to teacher education and potential consequences of the GPA below 2.5"(p.46). Clarification is needed as the advanced program GPA requirement as evidenced (File 2.3.1) indicates that the "graduate grade point average of 3.25 or above with no deficiencies in the area chosen for advanced graduate study."The EPP, as evidenced in the SSR, identified key assessments to "ensure candidates are ... mastering the content and pedagogical skills" (p.46) (Evidenced File 1.1.1-Key Asssessment#1 -Professional; Evidence 3.3.1 - Total Professional Growth Plan; Evidence 1.13; Final Evaluation of Student Teaching). While the EPP notes that The Teacher Work Sample and Unit reports reflect the candidate's ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge, no evidence has been provided. As evidenced in the SSR, candidates that who are rated as falling below the "proficient" level on any element on the final evaluation may be required to complete additional activities or the entire clinical experiences (p.46). The EPP (Evidence Files 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample, "College and Career Ready" Unit Report ; 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 Unit Report, and "Planning Instruction to Meet Curriculum Goals") to evidence that College and Career -Ready

Standards (CCRS). Three cycles of data are evidence and revealed that special education and secondary education score either at the adequate or proficient level, whereas 20% of the elementary candidates rated as developing in Fall 2018. The EPP does not " explicitly include college and career-ready language in the Unit Report rubric and is not explicitly evaluated as part of the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching" (p.47). The EPP (Evidence File 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching, Items 4c, 6c, and 9c) provides limited evidence as three cycles of data are not presented for all programs and as it relates to candidates ability to integrate technology as ... one or more items related to technology integration are rated as "No Basis for Judgement" (p.47).

3.5 Selection at Completion. The EPP (Evidences Files 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample or the Unit Report (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report) that evidenced teacher candidates have adequate content knowledge in their major areas of study. As evidenced in the SSR, the EPP indicates that candidates demonstrate the ability to "design and deliver instruction via a variety of activities ... during Student Teaching" (p.48), additional evidence is needed. The EPP, as evidenced in the SSR, identifies that in Fall, 2018, 44 % of elementary education candidates were rated as "Developing" on the relevant rubric item). While the EPP evidence that candidates' ability to impact student learning is within the Teacher Work Sample on the "Pre and Post Test Analysis rubric and within the Unit Report on the "Assessment of Learning" rubric element"(p.48), the EPP provides a limited an analysis of the P-12 impact data that documents how the teacher candidates had a positive impact on student learning and development. Three cycles of data are not presented for all programs, as evidenced in the SSR "available data" were analyzed P.48). Evidence File 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample evidence that pre-post test data were not available for Fall 2017.The EPP evidence in the SSR that the EPP does not require "candidates to complete state licensure exams" (p.48) Clarification is needed.3.6 Provider ensures that candidates understand the expectations of the profession. As evidenced in the SSR, the EPP adopted the Association of American Educators (AAE) Code of ethics (Evidence File 3.6.7 - TEC Minutes to Approve Code of Ethics), and assess students ethical practices using multiple measures throughout the program. (Evidence Files 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 - Professional Disposition and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (Evidence File 1.1.3 - Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching) are not aligned to the AAE Code of Ethics.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1.	3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs. The following is evidence consistent with Standard 3, Component 1: (Evidence File 3.1.1. All Program Demographic Data) (Evidence File: 2.1.4- Teacher Education Recruitment Plan).
2.	3.2. Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability The following evidence is consistent with Standard 3, Component 2: (Evidence File 2.3.1. All Program Demographic Data) offers average GPA's for candidates in all programs.
3.	3.3 Provider established and monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability. The following evidence is consistent with Standard 3, Component 3: (File 1.1.1 -Key Assessment #1- Professional Development) As evidenced in the SSR the Epp requires candidates pass an FBI and Child Protective Services (CPS) Background check after admittance into the Becoming a Completed Professional (BCP), and prior to any field experiences. As evidenced in the SSR (p.45), processes are in place should a candidate no clear the FBI or CPs background checks (i.e., candidates meet with Director of Education Services to discuss potential implications of the results for future employment and or viable alternatives to the teaching education majors).
4.	3.4 Provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidate's advancement. The following evidence is consistent with Standard 3, Component 4(Evidence File 2.3.1 Admissions Requirements, and GPA - ALL Programs). (Evidenced File 1.1.1-Key Asssessment#1 -Professional; Evidence File 3.3.1 - TOTAL Professional Growth Plan; Evidence File1.1.3 Final Evaluation of Student Teaching), (Evidence Files 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample, "College and Career Ready" Unit Rep
5.	3.5 Provider documents that the candidate has reached a high standard. The following evidence is consistent with Standard 3 Component 5 the EPP (Evidences Files 1.1.2 - Key Assessment #2 - Teacher Work Sample or the Unit Report (Evidence 1.1.4 - Key Assessment #4 - Unit Report)
6.	3.6 Provider ensures that candidates understand the expectations of the profession. The following evidence is consistent with Standard 3 Component 6 (Evidence File 3.6.7 - TEC Minutes to Approve Code of Ethics), (Evidence Files 1.1.1 - Key Assessment #1 - Professional Disposition and the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching), (Evidence Files 3.6.5 - ELED 400 Syllabus - Professional Standards of Practice ;Evidence 3.6.8 - CIMT 400 Syllabus; and Evidence 3.6.6 - Responsibility and Expectations of Interns),) (Evidence File 3.6.2 - SPED 226 Law Assignment).

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1.	(3.1)Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs. The following evidence is inconsistent with Standard 3, Component 1. Statement 1 The EPP evidenced a Teacher Recruitment Plan has been developed based upon existing recruitment initiatives" (p.43) (Evidence File: 2.1.4- Teacher Education Recruitment Plan). As evidenced in the SSR, the EPP identifies the steps and processes created to support the recruitment of diverse candidates and candidates to meet the needs
2.	(3.2.) Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability.The following evidence is inconsistent with Standard 3, Component 2. Statement 1. The EPP has established a minimum GPA of 2.5 for admission to teacher education programs is below the CAEP minimum requirement of a GPA of 3.0, the EPP evidenced that candidates in the initial and advanced programs admission GPA's are above the CAEP minimum for academic achievement years of '15-16,'16'17, & 17-18
3.	(3.2) The EPP acknowledges that "disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.5 and 3.0 "(p.44). Additionally, data addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria for its initial and advanced certification programs and data addressing whether or not the cohort of candidates are in the top 50% from 2016-2017 or the top 40% from 2018-2019 by specialty for initial licensure areas are not evidenced, three cycles of data are not evidenced.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

1.	**Title**: (3.3) Provider establishes and monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) What evidence can the EPP provide that describes the measures used and evidence reliability and validity across those measures, and report data that shows how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching?
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Can the EPP provide additional details on timeline and process related to the Professional Development Rubric that underwent a full review in Fall of 2018?

2.	**Title**: (3.4) Provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidate's advancement
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) What evidence can the EPP provide that demonstrates that candidates are able to integrate and effectively use technology in a P-12 setting?
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) What training is provided to teacher candidate, and when are they informed about the Professional Growth Plan?

	Title: (3.5) Provider documents that the candidate has reached a high standard.
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) Although the SSR evidenced that candidates ability to impact student learning is within the Teacher Work Sample on the "Pre and Post Test Analysis rubric and within the Unit Report on the "Assessment of Learning" rubric element"(p.48), the EPP provides a limited an analysis of the P-12 impact data that documents how the teacher candidates had a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. What additional evidence can the EPP provide?

3.	(2)	Can the EPP provide additional evidence as it relates to how they are monitoring candidates who are rated as "developing" during their clinical experiences?

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

	(1)	The EPP evidence in the SSR that the EPP does not require "candidates to complete state licensure exams" (p.48) Clarification is needed.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

	(1)	When and how frequently are EPP Staff/Faculty and candidates trained on Key Assessment #3 - Evaluation of Student Teaching criteria /rubric indicators?

Title: (3.6) Provider ensures that candidates understand the expectations of the profession

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

4.	(1)	What additional evidence/ examples can the EPP provide to demonstrate that candidates are knowledgeable on relevant laws and policies for students with disabilities, and 504 disability provisions, and bullying?

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

---

Title: . (3.1) Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

5.	**C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**	
	(1)	Can the EPP provide additional details as it relates to when the Teacher Education Recruitment Plan will be implemented? Also, can the EPP provide additional details as it relates to how they are recruiting candidates from diverse backgrounds?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Component 3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates. There is limited or no evidence of a recruitment plan based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs for five years).	EPP presented a Recruitment Plan. However, there was no evidence of a recruitment plan in which results are being recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategy presented. EPP included limited evidence of knowledge and actions that address employment opportunities in school districts/ regions where completers are likely to seek employment and did not explicitly address in the analysis the shortage areas in P- 12 education.
Component 3.2 The EPP provided limited evidence related to the investigation of admission selection criteria that indicates that candidates have high academic achievement and ability.	The EPP has established a minimum GPA of 2.5 for admission to teacher education programs is below the CAEP minimum requirement of 3.0. acknowledges that "disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.5 and 3.0 "(p.44). Data are addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria for its initial licensure areas and data addressing whether or not the cohort of candidates are in the top 50% from 2016-2017 or the top 40% from 2018-2019.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
Component 3.2. Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability. The EPP provided limited evidence related to the investigation of admission selection criteria that indicates that candidates have high academic achievement and ability.	The EPP's admission GPA to their teacher education programs is below the CAEP minimum requirement of 3.0. The EPP acknowledges that "disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.5 and 3.0 "(p.44). Data addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria for its initial licensure areas and data addressing

whether or not the cohort of candidates are in the top 50% 2016-2017; top 40% 2018-2019 by specialty areas is not presented.

II: Standard A.3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

3.1Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs. The EPP indicates that diversity is lacking in the geographic area. The EPP provides a comparison of national, local, and the EPP's racial and ethnic demographics (Evidence File 3.1.1. All Program Demographic Data). The EPP provided three cycles of data as it relates to the recruitment of Black or African -American candidates. However, the EPP provided no evidence as it relates to the recruitment of candidates from other diverse backgrounds. Although the EPP presented evidence (Evidence File 3.1.1) that disaggregated data on applicants by race/ethnicity and sex, the EPP does not provide evidence of as to how the EPP analyzes the data for trends and patterns across the EPP to support continuous improvement. (Evidence File A3.1.1.-SPSY Recruitment Material) evidence that the EPP is recruiting candidates from HBCU's and HIS's SSR (p.52).

The EPP evidenced a Teacher Recruitment Plan has been developed based upon existing recruitment initiatives" (p.43) (Evidence File: 2.1.4- Teacher Education Recruitment Plan). As evidenced in the SSR, the EPP identifies the steps and processes created to support the recruitment of diverse candidates and candidates to meet the needs of STEM, ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff schools needs. The EPP acknowledges that they" have not formerly engaged in the formal and strategic recruitment efforts as the Teacher Education Recruitment Plan is newly written" (p.44). Additional evidence is needed.

3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement. The EPP has established a minimum GPA of 2.7 for advanced programs is below the CAEP minimum requirement of a GPA if 3.0, the EPP evidenced that candidates in the initial and advanced programs admission GPA's are above the CAEP minimum for academic achievement years of '15-16,'16'17, and 17-18 reflect GPA's of 3.0 or higher EPP wide (Evidenced File 2.3.1- Admission Requirements and GPA-All Programs). The EPP acknowledges that "disaggregated data are not available to document the number of candidates with GPA's between 2.5 and 3.0 "(p.44). Additionally, data addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria (candidates academic history, letters of recommendation, statement of purpose, work experiences, and interviews) are used in addition to a candidate GPA to determine admission in the Schol Psychology Ed.S Progam (p.53) is not evidenced. The EPP also did not provide three cycles of data of the nationally normed test (GRE).

Because the EPP either provides insufficient or no data to address all Standard (3) components for the advance program, additional evidence is needed. Additionally, the EPP does not clearly identify which advanced programs are to be reviewed. Clarification is needed.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 3.1. Advanced Programs Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs The following is evidence is consistent with StandardA 3, Component 1: (Evidence File 3.1.1. All Program Demographic Data) (Evidence File A3.1.1.-SPSY Recruitment Material).

2. 3.2 Advanced Programs. Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability The following evidence is consistent with Standard A3, Component 2: (Evidence File 2.3.1. All Program Demographic Data) offers average GPA's for candidates in all programs.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. The EPP evidenced in the SSR that their minimum GPA admissions requirement of 2.7 complies with the minimum institutional standard but does not align with the 3.0 articulated by CAEP, nor do our average candidate GRE scores per cohort exceed national averages (SSR,p. 53).

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

1.

> **Title**: Standard 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
>
> ## A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
>
> (1) What evidence can the EPP provide that addresses all standard three components for their advanced programs?
>
> ## B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
>
> (1) Can the EPP identify which programs met CAEP's scope to review? How did the EPP determine which programs met CAEP's scope?
>
> ## C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates.There is limited or no evidence of a recruitment plan based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs for five years).	EPP presented a Recruitment Plan. However, there was no evidence of a recruitment plan in which results are being recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategy presented. EPP included limited evidence of knowledge and actions that address employment opportunities in school districts/ regions where completers are likely to seek employment and did not explicitly address in the analysis the shortage areas in P- 12 education.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
3.2. Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability. The EPP provided limited evidence related to the investigation of admission selection criteria that indicates that candidates have high academic achievement and ability.	The EPP's admission GPA to their advanced programs is below the CAEP minimum requirement of 3.0. Data addressing the EPP's use of multiple admissions criteria for its licensure areas and data addressing whether or not the cohort of candidates are in the top 50% 2016-2017 or top 40% 2018-2019 by specialty areas are not presented.

II: Standard 4. Program Impact

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

4.1 There is limited evidence that the EPP monitors the impact completers have on P-12 student learning growth. Two evidence files were provided by the EPP as evidence of completer impact on student learning growth. The first consisted of a Case Study Pilot Project that was conducted on 9 EPP completers in 3 program areas, elementary education, special education, and secondary education. The evidence specifically indicated to address 4.1 was student growth data from 2 of the 9 completers. The other piece of evidence was an open-ended question on the EPP's Completer Survey that asked completers how they knew they had a positive impact on student learning growth. There are limitations with this evidence as it is self-reported data and there is no analysis of themes that arose from the responses to the open-ended questions to determine the strength of the responses. Some responses did reference tangible evidence of student learning growth such as formal and informal assessments, while others did not. While this evidence taken with additional direct measures of completer impact on student learning growth could be useful in establishing the claim that the EPP's completers positively impact P-12 student learning growth, alone it is not sufficient. A three-year plan for an impact study was included in the case study document, however, it did not meet the CAEP Guidelines for Plans. The plan was

vague, and did not include all of the required components for plans. A timeline showing when assessment measures/instruments will be developed, when researchers will be trained, when full implementation will begin, and so on is not provided. There is no indication of what data will be available by the time of the site visit or in calendar years following accreditation. Further, there is no description of resources needed. The EPP included a statement that IRB review is not needed, since the study will be on program improvement, but children/P-12 students are included as potential subjects, therefore, it would seem IRB is required. There is no discussion of EPP access to data compilation and analysis capability. The plan states that instruments to be used in the study are to be developed and, therefore, they are not included. Finally, there is no discussion of how data quality will be ensured, and no process to analyze and interpret findings and make use of them for continuous improvement is described.

4.2 The EPP provided three pieces of evidence to support its claim that its completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. The first piece of evidence provided was the Case Study Pilot Project. Specifically, the data obtained from observations of the 9 selected completers using the Student Teaching Observation Tool and the Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool. Results of the observations are provided with analysis by preparation area with noted variances in strengths and weaknesses across the areas. While the EPP reported in the Case Study Pilot Project that each of three researchers took the lead on the case studies for each preparation area, it is not clear how the researchers were calibrated on the observation instruments to ensure interrater reliability. Therefore, it is possible that differences in areas of strength or weaknesses could be attributed to differences among researchers' use of the instrument in conducting observations. The EPP notes this in discussion of the findings. The second piece of evidence that was used to determine teaching effectiveness was an open-ended question on the EPP Created Completer Satisfaction survey that asked completers how they know they are effective teachers. The EPP notes that 12 of 25 responses to that question included references identifying student growth and success. Though it is not addressed in the narrative, the response rate on the survey for the last administration year was reported on the evidence file as 22% with 39:178 completers responding. While the response rate on the first administration is not provided, the N for that year was 10 respondents. There is no disaggregation of survey data by licensure/program area. The final evidence of teaching effectiveness provided included results of the State Provided Teacher Evaluation data. Overall, principals rate the EPP's completers as effective over the 3 cycles. Information on the response rate and representativeness of the sample are not provided. No benchmarks are provided to indicate how the EPP's completers compare to completers statewide or from other institutions and data are not disaggregated by program area. The EPP has not provided discussion on the limitations of this data. While there are deficiencies in the evidence provided for 4.2, taken together these pieces of evidence do provide overall support for the EPP's claim that its completers are effective.

4.3 The EPP provided 4 files including 3 separate pieces of evidence to support its claims that employers are satisfied with the relevance and effectiveness of the preparation of its completers. The case study pilot project included EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey information from 6 of the 9 completers' employers. The employers of the elementary and special education program completers responded to

the EPP created survey aligned to the 10 InTASC standards, whereas the employers of the secondary program completers responded to the state provided survey that measured satisfaction of preparation across four domains. While the EPP indicated that mean scores for most completers, with the exception of a high school math teacher, showed that the employers were satisfied with their preparation overall, the surveys were not parallel in form and it is not clear why different surveys were used. Discussion identifies themes reflected in the preparation program for each area, but does not include any discussion of trends across program areas or disaggregation of data by licensure area. Additional evidence related to the EPP created survey of employer satisfaction was provided in two files. The first described the process that was used to administer the survey and the second included data from one administration of the survey in 2018 sent to employers of those who had completed initial programs over three years. Again, overall, employers reported satisfaction with the effectiveness of the preparation program in preparing completers. The response rate for the survey is reported at 21.6%, 8 responses received out of 37 surveys sent, but no information is provided on the representativeness of this data on the EPP's programs. It should be noted that the final piece of evidence provided in support of 4.3 includes results from a state administered survey of employers of the EPP's completers over a three-year period and the number of responses for each year is significantly higher than that reported on the EPP created survey. The state provided data does not include information on the response rate and data are not disaggregated by licensure area, further one administration of data omitted completers that were 2 years out. The results of the survey indicated that employers are satisfied with the preparation of the EPPs completers across all four domains. There is some discussion of the use of the results in targeting areas for program improvement, but specific information on how the EPP plans to improve in those areas is not provided. Taken together, the evidence does provide limited support for the EPP's claims that employers are satisfied with the effectiveness and preparation of the EPP's completers. The claims are limited by the insufficiency of information on data quality and representativeness.

4.4 Evidence provided in support of 4.4 included results from three data sources. Evidence from the Case Study Pilot Project consisted of surveys given to the 9 completers included in the case study pilot. Mean scores provided indicate that initial program completers are satisfied with their preparation relative to the 10 InTASC standards. The second piece of evidence in support of 4.4 includes results from the EPP created survey of completers for two cycles of administration (2017 and 2018). The results from each administration are reported separately with no discussion of trends that emerge across administration cycles. Further, the response rate for the most recent administration is reported at 22% (39:178 surveys sent), but no information is provided on the response rate for the first administration and data are not disaggregated by licensure area. The final piece of evidence provided in support of 4.4 included the results of the state administered survey of completers over a three-year period. In each administration of the survey, completers responses were included for completers who were 1 to 3 years out of the preparation program. While completer responses indicate that they believe their preparation was effective, no response rate is reported for any administration cycle and data are not disaggregated by program/licensure area. The EPP notes this limitation in its discussion of completer satisfaction data. Discussion includes recommendations for what the EPP should do to address limitations in the data, but does not provide a clear explanation of what the

EPP will do and has done thus far to ensure high quality data on completer effectiveness.

Taken together, the evidence provided in support of standard 4 documents the EPP's attempt to measure the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning, their teaching effectiveness, their satisfaction with the preparation they received, and the satisfaction of their employers. However, the evidence is not sufficient to support the EPP's claims overall, due to limitations in the data presented; and while a plan for future data collection relative to standard 4 is provided, the plan is vague and does not meet CAEP's guidelines.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project
2. 4.2.1 - State Provided Teacher Evaluation Data
3. 4.3.1 - EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey
4. 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Survey Results Fall 2018
5. 4.3.3 - State Provided Principal Survey Data
6. 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey
7. 4.4.2 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - Fall 2018
8. 4.4.3 - State Provided Completer Survey Data
9. 4.4.4 - EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data - December 2017

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project -Insufficient for 4.1 - data limited to an observation tool that measures student engagement, rather than student learning, and submission of a few artifacts.
2. 4.1.2 - Satisfaction Survey Process - Describes process, does not include survey instruments or actual data. Completer satisfaction survey is administered at the end of student teaching, for baseline and then 1 year out. Baseline would not be a measure of completer satisfaction, since candidates are not yet employed. Employer survey sent to employers identified on the completer survey.
3. 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey - No response rate reported for first administration, but 10 responses on first administration. No disaggregation by licensure area.
4. 4.4.3 - State Provided Completer Survey Data - No response rate reported (18 respondents in 2018, 80 in 2017, 74 in 2016), no disaggregation of data by program/licensure area.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

1.

Title: Representativeness of data sample

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project, 4.4.1 - EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey, 4.4.3 - State Provided Completer Survey Data

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What is the total number of EPP program completers who are 1 - 3 years out and have been employed in their certification areas for at least one year?

(2) How are the samples included in the data sets provided in support of standard 4 representative of the EPP's completers?

(3) How are the data representative of the employers of the EPP's completers?

Title: Completer impact on P-12 learning growth

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) 4.1.1 - Case Study Pilot Project

2.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	What evidence does the EPP have to demonstrate that its program completers have a positive impact on P-12 student learning growth.
(2)	What evidence does the EPP have to demonstrate that it compares the effectiveness of its program completer against benchmarks?
(3)	What progress has been made on implementing the plan for monitoring program impact since the SSR was submitted?

Title: Employment milestones

3.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| (1) | How does the EPP monitor completers' achievement of employment milestones? What evidence demonstrates this? |

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
4.1 There are gaps in the EPP's argument that it is informed about impact indicators for completers employed in positions for which they were prepared.	The EPP does not include three cycles of data, and instead a phase-in plan is provided, but it does not meet CAEP guidelines for plans. Further, the EPP provides no information on the representativeness of the data on program completers submitted in support of standard 4.
4.3 There is insufficient evidence that the EPP monitors the achievement of employment milestones by its completers.	The EPP does not provide evidence that employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention are documented for at least some completers.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard A.4. Program Impact

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence
A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

A.4.1 The EPP provided evidence of employer satisfaction with the preparation of program completers for three advanced programs, School Psychology, District-level School Leadership, and Building-level School Leadership, in 3 evidence files. Each program used a survey of employers to gauge employer satisfaction. While there were problems with data quality noted by the EPP regarding the District and School-level Educational Leaders programs, overall, employers rate the completers as meeting or exceeding the expectations aligned to preparation standards. Two cycles of data are presented for each program. Additionally, a plan for future data collection is provided for the District and Building-Level Leadership programs, however, the plan is vague and does not meet the CAEP guidelines for plans, it does not include timeline, resources, methods for evaluating/assessing effectiveness of plan, or steps to be taken to ensure data quality. Surveys are not included (to be developed). Data specific to high-needs schools are not included or discussed.

A.4.2 The EPP provided evidence of completer satisfaction with the preparation they received for three advanced programs, School Psychology, District-level School

Leadership, and Building-level School Leadership, in 3 evidence files. Each program used a survey of completers to document satisfaction. While there were problems with data quality noted by the EPP regarding the District and School-level Educational Leaders programs; overall, completers rate themselves as meeting or exceeding the expectations aligned to preparation standards. Two cycles of data are presented for each program. Additionally, a plan for future data collection is provided for the District and Building-Level Leadership programs, however as noted in the narrative on A.4.1, the plan is vague and does not meet the CAEP guidelines for plans) does not include timeline, resources, methods for evaluating/assessing effectiveness of plan, or steps to be taken to ensure data quality. Surveys are not included (to be developed). Analysis noted areas for improvement, and changes made to the School Psychology program to address areas for improvement were discussed. However, the areas noted for educational leadership programs provided recommendations for what should be done, but not specific steps or actions to be taken. Further, there is no discussion of how the analysis of trends relative to advanced program data is examined by stakeholders as part of the EPP's continuous improvement steps. Overall, the evidence provided in support of standard A.4 documents the EPP's attempt to create processes for collecting data on the satisfaction of advanced program completers and their employers with the effectiveness and relevance of their preparation. Taken together the evidence provides limited support for the EPP's assertion that it meets the standard. There is evidence to support that program faculty have grappled with the processes for collecting the data; however, the EPP does not describe a system for gathering this data and the program-level processes described for future data collection do not include fully developed plans for doing so as no timelines, resources, or measures to ensure data quality are provided. Further, the EPP does not include discussion of how program data is examined by stakeholders as part of the EPP's continuous improvement process.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. A4.1.1 - SPSY Employer Survey and Data
2. A4.2.1 - SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data
3. A4.2.2 - District and Building Level Employer Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. A4.2.3 - Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process - Plan does not include timeline, resources, methods for evaluating/assessing effectiveness of plan, or steps to be taken to ensure data quality. Surveys are not included (to be developed).

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

	Title: Process for collecting data on advanced program completers
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) A4.2.3 - Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
1.	(1) "...first be administered by course instructors during the final capstone course, in April for the M.Ed. program and in June for the Ed.S. program. The first administration will serve as an internal data point and will be used to obtain completer demographic data. The Assessment Office will then send the same completer satisfaction survey to program completers six months after graduation."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	How does the EPP define program completers? CAEP indicates that completers must be employed in positions for which they were prepared for 1 to 5 years.
(2)	What is the timeline for implementing the data collection plan? What processes will the EPP employ to ensure data quality?

Title: Sharing data analysis and trends with statekholders

2.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	What evidence does the EPP have to document how the analysis of trends relative to advanced program data is examined by stakeholders as part of the EPP's continuous improvement steps?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
A.4.2 There is insufficient evidence that the EPP involves stakeholders in the examination of advanced program data.	The EPP does not provide evidence to demonstrate that advanced program data is examined by stakeholders as part of the EPP's continuous improvement process.
A.4.2/A.4.3 The EPP's process for monitoring the satisfaction of advanced program completers and their employers with their preparation is insufficient.	The EPP fails to describe a process that it uses to collect completer data on advance programs. Two cycles of data on completer and employer satisfaction are provided for advanced programs, and a process plan is provided for some programs, but the plan does not meet the CAEP guidelines for plans.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 5. Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor
candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.

The SSR described the EPP's Quality Assurance System (#5.11 Quality Assurance System). Multiple measures are used in each program to monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The EPP utilizes a decentralized model of data collection and reporting, in which much of the responsibility for assessment is assumed by program coordinators and course instructors. There are policies and procedures governing the creation and implementation of assessment measures, ongoing data collection and review, and reporting assessment and outcome data for all programs. A full-time Director of Assessment and Accreditation (DAA) ensured implementation of the Quality Assurance System and monitoring operational effectiveness. 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).

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative,
cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of
data are valid and consistent.

The SSR outlines the construction, validation, implementation, and verification of key assessment measures (#5.11 Quality Assurance System). The EPP-created assessments have established content validity and inter-rater reliability. Assessments were aligned to standards and reviewed by faculty. Reliability of scores is assured in terms of adequacy of rubrics, training of raters, internal consistency, and inter-rater reliability. Validity of instruments is focused on establishing a) connection of assessment items with standards, b) demonstrating content validity of instruments, and c) striving to establish predictive validity of instruments when possible. A rubric (#5.1.2 Rubric Evaluation Tool) was used to evaluate the administration and purpose (informs relevancy), content of assessment (informs relevancy), and scoring (informs reliability and actionability) of EPP-created assessments.

The following key assessments were determined to meet CAEP quality standards (#5.1.3 Rubric Review Results): Teacher Work Sample (#5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 25-27); Final Evaluation of Student Teaching (# 5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp.28-30). These measures were validated by the Lawshe method in Spring 2019, and would be implemented in Summer/Fall 2019. Less than 75% of EPP created assessments are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency. The following Key Assessment was determined to require revision following the rubric review and the new rubric was reviewed in Spring/Summer 2019: Professional Disposition (#5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 22-24).

5.3 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

The SSR stated that an ongoing continuous improvement loop for internal program-level review was approved in Spring 2018 (# 5.1.1 - Quality Assurance System). The EPP outlined the development of assessment tools; and the timeline of data collection, data reporting, program review, and program improvement efforts. Programs have submitted the summary reports and have proceeded with the review in Spring 2019. In addition, two cycles of outcome data from 2016-2018 have been posted to the College website or shared with stakeholders and the third cycle (2018-2019) would be posted by the end of 2019. Not enough evidence was provided to show that most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to data.

Prior to implementation of the ongoing continuous improvement loop, all programs submitted annual Student Learning Outcome Summary (SLO) reports and Student Success plans to the Office of Assessment at Indiana State University (#5.1.1 - Quality Assurance System). The SLO reports 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 (#5.1.1 - QAS System). The Student Success plan included data analysis, goals, and strategies to improve operational effectiveness, with specific attention to candidate recruitment, retention, persistence, and completion.

5.4 Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

The SSR states that the EPP is working to establish a routine for regular, successful data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Use of completer outcome and impact data for program improvement purposes continues to be an area for future growth.

The EPP has created Satisfaction Surveys to collect and analyze data related to completer and employer in 2017 and 2018 (#4.3.1, #4.4.1). State-level data has been accessed and compiled (#4.3.2, #4.4.2, #4.4.4), and a case study provides additional support (#4.1.1). Processes for ensuring ongoing data collection of employer and completer satisfaction surveys have been developed (#4.1.2).

The EPP is developing a plan to include all eight required CAEP indicators of completer outcomes and impact (#5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 9) on its website. 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.

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

The EPP involves appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, in program evaluation and improvement. Formalized committees and boards include the Teacher Education Committee (TEC, #2.17, #3.67, #5.1.1), the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) (#2.1.5), the Educational Development Council (EDC) (#A2.1.3), and the Advisory Boards in each of the Departments within the Bayh College of Education (#5.5.1).

In addition, the EPP maintains partnerships with several local school corporations and educational cooperatives through which many ongoing clinical experiences, program improvement efforts, and quality initiatives are developed and piloted (#2.1.3, #2.1.8).
The EPP also 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).

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 2.1.3 PDS Taskforce Documents 2.1.5 TEAC Agendas and Minutes 2.1.7 TEC Bylaws and Member Directory 2.1.8 CoConstructed Observation Tool 3.6.7 TEC Minutes to approve Code of Ethics 4.1.1 Case Study Pilot Project 4.1.2 Satisfaction Survey Process 4.3.1 EPP Created Employer Satisfaction Survey 4.3.2 EPP Distributed Employer Satisfaction Survey Results Fall 2018 4.4.1 EPP Created Completer Satisfaction Survey 4.4.2 EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data Fall 2018 4.4.4 EPP Distributed Completer Satisfaction Data December 2017 5.1.1 QAS System 5.1.2 Rubric Evaluation Tool 5.1.3 Fall 2018 Rubric Review Result 5.5.1 Departmental Advisory Boards

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

1.

Title: 5.1 Disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions.
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed** **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**
(1) Which evidence supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g,. over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.)?

2.

Title: 5.2 Assessments at the minimal level of sufficiency.
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed** **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**
(1) Provide validation results of key assessments (i.e., Teacher Work Sample, and Final evaluation of student teaching).
(2) Provide revision of the rubric: Professional Disposition.
(3) Provide review results of these rubrics: Professional disposition rubric, and the Unit Report rubric.

3.

Title: 5.3 Evidence to support program modifications.
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed** **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**
(1) Provide evidence that most (80%) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided from Standards 1 through 4.
(2) Provide documents that explicit and appropriate investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion.
(3) Provide evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance and/or innovations result in overall

	positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students.
(4)	Provide the program summary reports.

4.	**Title**: 5.4 CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures.
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	(1) What is the routine for regular, successful data collection, analysis, and dissemination?
	(2) What is the plan to use completer outcome and impact data for program improvement purposes?
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Post the eight CAEP indicators of completer outcomes and impact on the website.

5.	**Title**: 5.5 Stakeholders in program improvement
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Provide evidence for the Educational Development Council.

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each. AFIs related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Area for Improvement	Rationale
5.2 Some EPP created assessments are not scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.	CAEP requires that at least 75% of EPP created assessments are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.
5.3 Program modifications are not linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.	CAEP requires that most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.
5.4 CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures are not monitored and reported.	CAEP requires that 8 outcome and impact measures are monitored and reported on the EPP website.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each. Stipulations related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard A.5. Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor
candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.

The SSR described the EPP's Quality Assurance System (#5.11 Quality Assurance System). Multiple measures are used in each program to monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The EPP utilizes a

decentralized model of data collection and reporting, in which much of the responsibility for assessment is assumed by program coordinators and course instructors. There are policies and procedures governing the creation and implementation of assessment measures, ongoing data collection and review, and reporting assessment and outcome data for all programs. A full-time Director of Assessment and Accreditation (DAA) ensured implementation of the Quality Assurance System and monitoring operational effectiveness. 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).

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The SSR outlines the construction, validation, implementation, and verification of key assessment measures (#5.11 Quality Assurance System). The EPP-created assessments have established content validity and inter-rater reliability. Assessments were aligned to standards and reviewed by faculty. Reliability of scores is assured in terms of adequacy of rubrics, training of raters, internal consistency, and inter-rater reliability. Validity of instruments is focused on establishing a) connection of assessment items with standards, b) demonstrating content validity of instruments, and c) striving to establish predictive validity of instruments when possible. A rubric (#5.1.2 Rubric Evaluation Tool) was used to evaluate the administration and purpose (informs relevancy), content of assessment (informs relevancy), and scoring (informs reliability and actionability) of EPP-created assessments.

The following key assessment was determined to meet CAEP quality standards (#5.1.3 Rubric Review Results): SPSY Key Assessment #1 - Field Experiences Evaluation (#5.1.3 - Rubric Review Results, pp. 13-15). This measure was validated by the Lawshe method in Spring 2019, and would be implemented in Summer/Fall 2019. Less than 75% of EPP created assessments are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.

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

The following rubrics were reviewed in Spring/Summer 2019: Professional disposition rubric, 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), and the Unit Report rubric. M.Ed. Building Level and Ed.S. District Level Rubrics would be validated in Fall 2020.

5.3 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

The SSR stated that an ongoing continuous improvement loop for internal program-level review was approved in Spring 2018 (# 5.1.1 - Quality Assurance System). The EPP outlined the development of assessment tools; and the timeline of data collection, data reporting, program review, and program improvement efforts. Programs have submitted the summary reports and have proceeded with the review in Spring 2019. In addition, two cycles of outcome data from 2016-2018 have been posted to the College website or shared with stakeholders and the third cycle (2018-2019) would be posted by the end of 2019. Not enough evidence was provided to show that most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to data.

Prior to implementation of the ongoing continuous improvement loop, all programs submitted annual Student Learning Outcome Summary (SLO) reports and Student Success plans to the Office of Assessment at Indiana State University (#5.1.1 - Quality Assurance System). The SLO reports 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 (#5.1.1 - QAS System). The Student Success plan included data analysis, goals, and strategies to improve operational effectiveness, with specific attention to candidate recruitment, retention, persistence, and completion.

5.4 Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

The SSR states that the EPP is working to establish a routine for regular, successful data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Use of completer outcome and impact data for program improvement purposes continues to be an area for future growth.

The EPP has created Satisfaction Surveys to collect and analyze data related to completer and employer in 2017 and 2018 (#A4.1.1, #A4.2.1, #A4.2.2). Processes for ensuring ongoing data collection of employer and completer satisfaction surveys have been developed (#A4.2.3).

The EPP is developing a plan to include all eight required CAEP indicators of completer outcomes and impact (#5.1.1 - QAS System, p. 9) on its website. 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.

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of

excellence.

The EPP involves appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, in program evaluation and improvement. Formalized committees and boards include the Teacher Education Committee (TEC, #2.17, #3.67, #5.1.1), the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) (#2.1.5), the Educational Development Council (EDC) (#A2.1.3), and the Advisory Boards in each of the Departments within the Bayh College of Education (#5.5.1).

In addition, the EPP maintains partnerships with several local school corporations and educational cooperatives through which many ongoing clinical experiences, program improvement efforts, and quality initiatives are developed and piloted (#A2.1.1). The EPP also 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).

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1.	2.1.5 TEAC Agendas and Minutes 2.1.7 TEC Bylaws and Member Directory 3.6.7 TEC Minutes to approve Code of Ethics 5.1.1 QAS System 5.1.2 Rubric Evaluation Tool 5.1.3 Fall 2018 Rubric Review Result 5.5.1 Departmental Advisory Boards A2.1.1 SPSY Cocreation of Partnerships A4.1.1 SPSY Employer Survey and Data A4.2.1 SPSY Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data A4.2.2 District and Building Level Employer Completer Satisfaction Survey and Data A4.2.3 Educational Leadership Satisfaction Survey Process

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1.	A2.1.3 SPSY Handbook 2018

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

1.

Title: 5.1 Disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Which evidence supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g,. over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.)?

2.

Title: 5.2 Assessments at the minimal level of sufficiency.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Provide validation results of key assessments (i.e., SPSY Key Assessment #1-Field Experiences Evaluation).

(2) Provide revision of these rubrics: M.Ed. Building Level - Action Research Project, Ed.S. District Level - Long-term Project, M.Ed Building Level - Management & Community Relations Interview, and Professional Disposition.

Provide review results of these rubrics: Professional disposition rubric,

(3)	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), and the Unit Report rubric.

Title: 5.3 Evidence to support program modifications.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

3.

(1)	Provide evidence that most (80%) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided from Standards 1 through 4.
(2)	Provide documents that explicit and appropriate investigation of selection criteria is used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion.
(3)	Provide evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance and/or innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students.
(4)	Provide the program summary reports.

Title: 5.4 CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

4.

(1)	What is the routine for regular, successful data collection, analysis, and dissemination?
(2)	What is the plan to use completer outcome and impact data for program improvement purposes?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	Post the eight CAEP indicators of completer outcomes and impact on the website.

Title: 5.5 Stakeholders in program improvement

5.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	Provide evidence for the Educational Development Council.

---

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each. AFIs related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Area for Improvement	Rationale
5.2 Some EPP created assessments are not scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.	CAEP requires that at least 75% of EPP created assessments are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.
5.3 Program modifications are not linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.	CAEP requires that most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.
5.4 CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures are not monitored and reported.	CAEP requires that 8 outcome and impact measures are monitored and reported on the EPP website.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each. Stipulations related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Stipulation	Rationale

III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

DIVERSITY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from Self Study-Report (SSR)

A. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to diversity

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 and is the third largest EPP in the state. 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 (SSR,p.1) Indiana University is committed to "diversity and inclusive excellence" (SSR,p.74). Indiana University indicated that diversity and inclusive excellence is demonstrated through "candidate, recruitment, preparation, assessment of candidate performance, and completion (SSR,p.74). Candidates are required to demonstrate and have a basic understanding of culture in which they are located and sensitive to diverse student populations. Candidates in the initial and advanced programs also need to explore their own diversity and value systems in order to understand how their own ideologies may impact classrooms and schools.

B. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1.	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: (Confidential) Page 74 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.
2.	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).
3.	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 is available to support the recruitment and successful matriculation of all candidates. The new structure will place special emphasis on candidates who are underrepresented or (Confidential) Page 75 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

4. 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 Satisfact

C. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. While the EPP provides results of the (Evidence 4.3.2 - EPP Distributed Employer Satisfaction Survey Data Fall 2018; A4.1 - Employer Satisfaction and A4.2 - Completer Satisfaction District Level and Building Level). There is no analysis of the data that as it relates to how teacher candidates and program completers understand diversity and apply appropriate instructional strategies relative to student needs.

2. While a recruitment plan was provided, as evidenced in the SSR, for initial and advanced programs, the EPP identifies the steps and processes created to support the recruitment of diverse candidates and candidates to meet the needs of STEM,ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff schools needs. The EPP acknowledges that they" have not formerly engaged in the formal and strategic recruitment efforts as the Teacher Education Recruitment Plan is newly written" (p.44).

3. While the EPP indicated that diversity is "explicitly recognized within the quality assurance system as it pertains to ongoing data collection" (Evidence File: Evidence 5.1.1, Appendix A) no data is provided.

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

1. The EPP indicated that " results of completer and employer surveys also include diversity metrics, which will be regularly shared with stakeholders (Evidence 5.1.1, p. 9) (SSR,p.76). How often will the results of completer and employer surveys be shared with stakeholders? (Interview with P-12 Stakeholders)

2. How are faculty at both the initial and advanced programs involved in the recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employer needs? (Interview with EPP faculty)

3. The EPP evidenced in the SSR that "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)" (p.76). Can the EPP provide additional evidence/data for the Year 1 evaluation cycle?

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

TECHNOLOGY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from self-study report (SSR)

A. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to technology

The EPP provides evidence that technology is addressed throughout the program both at the initial and advanced levels. Across all programs, candidates are assessed using two different measures, the Teacher Work Sample (elementary candidates)/Unit Report (secondary candidates). As part of these projects, all candidates are required to keep an Excel spread sheet of pre-test and post-test data which provides evidence that they use technology to track and monitor student data.

Additionally, both groups are assessed on the Evaluation of Student Teaching. Evidence reveals that the vast majority (over 90%) of the candidates scored at the meets expectations or exceeds level on using or modifying resources or technologies for comprehensive accurate content mastery, using technology to support assessment practices and to fully address learner needs, and demonstrating legal and ethical use of information and technology.

All programs at the advanced level contain components of technology. For example, school psychology candidates are required to use available technology to enhance preventions, interventions and consulting activities and us computerized scoring software. School Administration candidates at the district level use technology to manage district operational systems as well as using performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate district data. Candidates in the School Administration - Building Level program are evaluated on their use of technology and information systems to support and monitor student learning and use technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data.

A review of several syllabi reveal that the use of technology is required in coursework. For example, in ELED 400 Theory of Practice, candidates adhere to the ISTE Standards for Teachers. They are asked to use their knowledge of subject matter, teaching and learning, and technology to facilitate experiences that advance

student learning, creativity, and innovation in both face-to-face and virtual environments. In CIMT 400 - Teaching III candidates use Blackboard to access course materials and participate in the class.

The EPP is committed to improving the integration and application of technology to enhance instruction and advance student learning. They are currently exploring technology partnerships with Apple. To date they have received suggestions and input from faculty, outlined instructional and technological needs, and discussed potential collaboration with local school partners. These partnerships would benefit the EPP, its candidates and the P-12 school by providing increased availability of technology in the P-12 classroom and affording 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. The EPP further states that they are exploring strategies to better model technology throughout coursework which may include additional training for EPP faculty on technology resources and exploring other EPP-wide technology applications. It is the hope of the EPP that with these measures as well as with additional workshops they will be able to advance the application of technology in the field.

B. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

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

C. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

1. Please describe the technology-based applications you use to establish, maintain and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings,

2. -p. 16 ...exploring strategies to better model technology throughout coursework -additional training for EPP faculty on technology resources available to candidates and exploring other EPP-wide technology applications." -p. 17 ... lack of direct criteria to assess candidates' use of technology in the Teacher Work Sample, Unit Report, and Final Evaluation of Student Teaching." -p.46 "... consider additional methods for evaluating candidates' use and integration of technology, to ensure data are collected by multiple sources and at multiple time points." -p. 78 "... conversations with a local school district to enter a technology partnership." -7 Infusion Of Technology ... exploring technology partnerships with Apple during Fall 2018, with an emphasis on collaboration and involvement with Vigo County School Corporation. Provide an update on each measure listed above to provide technology-based program improvements.

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

IV: Preliminary findings related to Area(s) for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

1. Area for Improvement

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

A. Evidence that is consistent with retaining the AFI(s)

B. Evidence consistent with removing the AFI(s)

1. 2.1.5 - TEAC Agendas and Minutes
2. 8 - Diversity Analysis and Future Direction

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews

1. What additional documentation can the EPP provide to demonstrate that candidates in initial and advanced programs interact with diverse peers?

D. Site visit task(s) to complete

1. Clarify evidence collected to demonstrate that all initial and advanced program candidates have opportunities to interact with diverse peers through interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty.