2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	16658		AACTE SID:	
Institution:	Indiana University Purdue University - Indiana			
Unit:	School of Education			

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

_		
	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	(a)	0
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	(a)	0
1.1.3 Program listings	(<u>•</u>)	0

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure ¹	230
2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) ²	67
Total number of program completers	297

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

No Change / Not Applicable

 $3.5 \ \mathsf{A} \ \mathsf{contract} \ \mathsf{with} \ \mathsf{other} \ \mathsf{providers} \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{direct} \ \mathsf{instructional} \ \mathsf{services}, \ \mathsf{including} \ \mathsf{any} \ \mathsf{teach-out} \ \mathsf{agreements}$

No Change / Not Applicable

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

 $^{^2}$ For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

'''''''''''''''''''						
Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)						
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures					
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)					
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)					
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)					
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)					

nd prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's websi	te.							
Link: https://education.iupui.edu/about/accreditation.html								
Description of data accessible via link: CAEP Annual Report and Title II Reports								
Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure re-			ite pre	eparat	ion le	vel(s)	(initi	al
Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs						~		
Advanced-Level Programs								
Link: https://planning.iupui.edu/assessment/prac-files/school Description of data School of Education Annual PRAC Reports	l-report	s/prac	-schoo	ol-repo	orts.ht	ml		
Description of data accessible via link: School of Education Annual PRAC Reports Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure in	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le	evel(s)		
Description of data accessible via link: School of Education Annual PRAC Reports Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure reporting Measure	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le		(initial)	al 8.
Description of data accessible via link: School of Education Annual PRAC Reports Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure in	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le	evel(s)		
Description of data accessible via link: Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure responding Measure Level \ Annual Reporting Measure Initial-Licensure Programs Advanced-Level Programs	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le	evel(s)		
Description of data accessible via link: Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure result Level \ Annual Reporting Measure Initial-Licensure Programs Advanced-Level Programs Link: https://www.doe.in.gov/epps/epp-impact-program	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le	evel(s)		
Description of data accessible via link: Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure responding Measure Level \ Annual Reporting Measure Initial-Licensure Programs Advanced-Level Programs	the appumber.	propria	ite pre	eparat	ion le	evel(s)		
Description of data accessible via link: Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure result Level \ Annual Reporting Measure Initial-Licensure Programs Advanced-Level Programs Link: https://www.doe.in.gov/epps/epp-impact-program	the appumber.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.

 Initial-Licensure Programs	~	~	~	~		
Advanced-Level Programs						

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data? Are benchmarks available for comparison? Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Program Completers During the last four reporting cycles, enrollments in initial programs has declined with a high of 284 in 2014 compared to the current low of 201 in 2017. This trend has been noted across the entire state of Indiana and nationwide. The most recent enrollments for fall 2017 indicate that the enrollment is starting to turn around and the number of candidates enrolled in initial programs has shown a slight increase. Graduate program enrollments have also shown a decline over the four years. The high was in 2015 with 230 and the low was 79 in 2017. The state passed a law, which does not allow school corporations to increase a teacher's salary based solely on obtaining a master's degree like in the past. This has had an impact on the number of teachers seeking a master's degree. The enrollment in the counseling program is still strong while the enrollment in the educational leadership program is steady. . Licensure Tests: CORE (content) Tests: The EPP pass rates for elementary major for 2015-2016 was reading/language arts 88%, mathematics 91%, science 91% and social studies 88%. The IUPUI Average percent of correct answers for the reading/language arts, science, and social studies domains are comparable to the state averages. However, the EPP averages for the math domains far exceed the state averages. Secondary English candidates have an average pass rate on their licensure tests of 89% over the last 4 years. Their average percent correct for all domains are comparable to the state averages with some need for more emphasis on modes of writing. There was a .88 positive correlation between the EPP average percent correct and the state averages. The secondary mathematics candidates have a three-year average pass rate of 86% with 32 of the 37 candidates passing over the last four years. EPP candidates" average percent correct in the eight domains were comparable to those of the state. The pass rates for the secondary social studies candidates ranged from 80% - 96% except for the short time period that Pearson had problems with how they were scoring the test. The average EPP pass rate for 2012-2016 was 87% for the 75 secondary social studies program completers... There was a 75% positive correlation between the EPP average percent correct and the state average percent correct. The all- grade physical education test was the only content area test that did not move to Pearson. In 2013-2014. It remained with ETS until 2015. The EPP average pass rate for all-grade physical education candidates ranged from 94-100% for the four-year period. Domain data was not available from ETS. The candidates in the all-grade visual arts program had a 100% pass rate on the content tests from 2012-2016 with average percent correct across the domains that were comparable to the state average. Pedagogy Tests: For the three years from 2013-2016, the percent of EPP elementary candidates passing the pedagogy test ranged from 92-96%. The EPP average percent correct for the six domain were comparable to the state averages. During the same period, the EPP secondary candidates' pass rates had a range of 90-99% with comparable average percent correct for the questions over each domain to the state averages. The all-grade candidates had an average pass rate that ranged from 86% to 97% for the three-year period. Their average percent of answers correct in each domain were not significantly different from the state averages. These results support that candidates have acquired during their programs the pedagogical knowledge deemed by the state to be necessary for a beginning teacher. Results of Completers Surveys When asked if their program had helped them understand how learners grow and develop (InTASC 1), 64 of the 66 candidates agreed or strongly agreed. Program mean ranged from 3.00 to 3.59. All but one of the candidates agreed or strongly agreed that their program has helped them understand individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments (InTASC 2). The program means ranged from 3.38 to 3.80 for this guestion. When asked if they felt their program helped them understand how to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation (InTASC 3), 95% of the candidates agreed or strongly agreed. The range for program means was 3.00 – 3.68. Fifty-eight (58) of the candidates felt their program had helped them understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) they will teach (InTASC 4). Program means ranged from 2.71-283 for secondary social studies/English to 4.00 for all-grade physical education. Candidates were also asked if they agreed that their program had given them a good background in the content area(s) they would teach (InTASC 4). Results on this question were not as strong with 80% of the respondents agreeing. Program means ranged from 2.67 (secondary social studies) to 3.75 (all-grade visual arts). Most candidates agreed that their program had prepared them to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving (InTASC 5), with the overall mean being 3.55 and program means ranging from 3.00 to 4.00. When asked if they agreed or disagreed with the statement "My program has helped me understand and know how to use multiple methods of assessments" which addresses InTASC Standard #6, all but three candidates agreed or strongly agreed. Only one program mean fell below 3.00, which was a 2.83 for secondary English. The majority of candidates agreed or strongly agreed that their program prepared them to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals (InTASC 7). The overall mean was 3.30 with the program means ranging from 2.50/2.83 (secondary math/English) to 3.49 (elementary). Over 96% of the candidates agreed or strongly agreed that their program has prepared them to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections (InTASC 8). The program means ranged from 3.00 to 3.88. Overall results support that candidates agreed that their programs are preparing them with the skills, knowledge and dispositions to be an effective beginning teachers. The responses from the social studies candidates on the question concerning whether their program gave them a good background in their content areas they will teach, support the redesign of the secondary social studies program resulting in a stronger core of required content courses. Completer Performance During In-service - Impact on Student Learning In 2011, the state of Indiana passed legislation to require that each school

corporation develop a plan for annual performance evaluations for each certified staff member with the plan being implemented beginning with the 2012-2013 school year. During 2015-2016, 84% of EPP graduates with one year of teaching experience were rated highly effective or effective. The data proved from the state did not specify the status of the other 16%. For the same year, 94% of the EPP graduates were rated effective or highly effective with the same percentage for teachers with three years of experience. During this period, 91% of the teachers statewide were rated effective or highly effective while overall 92% of the EPP graduates were rated effective or highly effective. Results of Employer Surveys For 2016, principals rated all EPP first-year teacher as either "Agree" = 3 or Strong-Agree = 4 for each of the criteria with the strongest ratings being for adhering to the legal and ethical requirement of the teaching profession. Averages for the five first-year teachers ranged from 3.0 to 4.0. The ratings for the five second-year teachers from the EPP ranged from 3.2 -3.8. Sixty percent of the principals were very satisfied with the first-year teachers with the remaining 40 % of the principals satisfied. For the second year teachers, 40% of the principals were very satisfied with 60% satisfied. None of the EPP graduates was given ratings below "Agree" which denoted the principals' satisfaction with their skills, knowledge and dispositions. In 2017, means for the indicators ranged from 3.06 to 3.51. Like the first year of the survey, the results for adhering to the legal and ethical requirement of the teaching profession were strong with 98% of the principals agreeing or strongly agreeing that the EPP did an outstanding job of preparing the first-year teachers in this area. Ratings on indicators addressing knowledge preparation of the teachers ranged from 3.33 to 3.39, which supports that overall the principals agreed that the EPP did an outstanding job of supporting its graduates in obtaining knowledge about how children learn, the content they teach, as well as the ethical and legal requirements of the professional. For pedagogical knowledge, the means for the indicators ranged from 3.06 to 3.33. Overall the principals agreed that the EPP prepared its graduated in the skills need to be an effective teacher with assessment and differentiated instruction having the lowest means. When rating the first-year teachers on indicators addressing professional dispositions, the means ranged from 3.28-3.51. This supports that the principals agree that the EPP has done an outstanding job of preparing its graduate to effective work in an education environment. Eighty-five percent of the principals were satisfied or very satisfied with the first-year teachers' preparation overall All data are collected and compiled by the EPP's Assessment Committee. Results are shared with program faculty each semester or on a yearly basis depending on the collection cycle.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.

☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Linda Houser

Position: Assistant Dean

Phone: 317-278-3353

E-mail: Ihouser@iupui.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

- 1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
- 2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.

- 3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
- 4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
- 5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge