2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	16658	AACTE SID:	
Institution:	Indiana University Purdue University - Indianapolis		
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	⦿	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	○
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	○

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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]
222

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced 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]
78

Total number of program completers   300

---

[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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

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

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

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

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

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

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)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: https://education.iupui.edu/about/accreditation.html

Description of data accessible via link: These are data included in the CAEP Annual Report as well as Title II Reports.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐

2

Link: https://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/licensing/2017-18-formal-licensing-report-final-10-16-2018.pdf

Description of data accessible via link: IEPP Licensing Data

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	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: Over the last four reporting cycles, enrollments in initial programs has remained constant ranging from 201 to 230. The enrollment for the last two reporting years show a slight upturn with 2018 being the period high of 230 and 2019 being 222.

Graduate enrollments have shown a slight recovery from the 2018 low of 67. The 78 advanced program completers for reporting year 2019 is a 16% increase from the previous year. Advanced programs associated with additional licensure (school counseling

and educational leadership) have shown the most recovery. These data have been shared with EPP faculty and administration and a school-wide effort to increase enrollments is underway.

Pedagogy Licensure Tests: Program completers continue to perform well on the state pedagogy licensure tests. The EPP pass rates for elementary programs completers range from 90-95% for the 2015-16 thru 2017-18 academic years with average scaled scores ranging from 239-242 (220 needed to pass all Indiana licensure tests). During the same years, the secondary program completers had a pass rate ranging from 97-100% with average scaled scores ranging from 247-253. All-grade program completers' pass rates ranged from 94-100% while the average scaled scores ranged from 241-246.

CORE (content) Tests: Elementary program completers in the traditional programs had pass rates on the Reading and English Language Arts licensure test ranging from 81-94% over the last three academic years. Their average scaled scores ranged from 227-234 from the 2015-16 academic year thru the 2017-18 academic year. On the Mathematics licensure test, the same groups of program completers had pass rates ranging from 86-95% with average scaled scores ranging from 237-239. Both the pass rates and average scores were significantly above those of the state as a whole. The elementary program completers had pass rates ranging from 89-92% on the Science, Health and Physical Education test with average scaled scores ranging from 236-239 for the same period. On the Social Studies and Fine Arts test these program completes pass rates ranged from 88-92% with the range of average scaled scores being 232-234 for the three academic years. These data support that graduates are well-prepared in pedagogical content knowledge.

Graduation Rates: The graduation rates for bachelor degree seeking education majors has improved significantly over the last 8 years. From a low of 16.9% for 4-year Graduation Rates for the 2008 to a higher of 47.9% for the 2014 cohort, these rates have been on an upward trend. The 5-year graduation rates and the 6-year graduation rates have remained steady for the 8-year period with ranges of 45.2% - 52.1% and 51.8% - 59.2% respectively. The EPP continues to strive to improve these rates.

Results of State Teacher Survey: The following data represent three groups of graduates. The 2015 group are teachers who were just completing their first year of teaching, the 2014 group is at the end of their second year of teaching, while the 2013 group would be completing their 3rd year of teaching. Overall, graduates were pleased with their teacher education programs at IUPUI and felt they were prepared to be effective teachers. Of the three groups of teachers, between 49-67% rated their overall preparedness by their teacher education program as "Excellent" with the remainder of the 2015 and 2013 group members responding that their preparation was "Good". Eleven percent of the 2014 group gave a ranking of "Fair" or below. Overall, the second year teachers had the most concerns about their preparation.

When asked about their preparation in the area of learner development (InTASC #1), all but three of the 99 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared to understand how learners/students develop and grow. When asked about being prepared to provide an inclusive learning environment and work effectively with student with all exceptionalities (InTASC #2), the respondents agreed or strongly agreed between 92-96% of the time across all groups. When asked about being prepared by their teacher education program to provide appropriate and challenging learning experiences and to use appropriate strategies to effectively manage learning environments (InTASC #3), between 92– 98% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared. When asked if they were prepared to meet the content preparation and knowledge level expected of a beginning teacher (InTASC #4 & #5), 93% agreed they were prepared.

For being prepared to develop quality assessments to test for student understanding of lessons and to analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction (InTASC # 6), a little over 90% agree across the three groups. For being able to differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs (InTASC #7), 97% of the respondents agreed they were prepared. In the area of integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning (InTASC #8), 90% of the respondents agreed they felt prepared.

Several of the questions addressed the teachers' perceptions of how well they were prepared to be part of a professional learning and ethical practice (InTASC #9). On these questions, between 95– 99% agreed their teacher education program had prepared them. In the area of leadership and collaboration (InTASC #10), the teachers were asked if they were prepared to effectively work with other professionals, parents/guardians, and school leaders, and to work effectively within the school culture. All of the teachers felt they were prepared to work with other professionals. The teachers felt less prepared to work with parent (Disagree - 8%) than the other groups. Between 98-99% of the teacher felt, they were prepared to work within the school culture and with school leaders.

Results of this survey, along with other assessment data, noted the need for more emphasis on the use of technology in the classrooms to enhance student learning. The EPP has hired a new tenured-line professor.

Results of Principal Survey: The number of respondents have increased over the first year of the survey. However, it is still not possible to determine the return rate since the state to date has not provided employment information for EPP graduates and the data from the state are aggregated so respondents cannot be identified. Unlike the first survey, data were only collected by the state for first-year teachers. This survey was conducted over a twelve months unlike the first year that was used for a shorter period. Principals rated each indicator on a four-point scale of Strong Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (4) on whether the EPP did an outstanding job of preparing the first-year teacher in that area. Means for the indicators ranged from 3.06 to 3.51. Like the first year, 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

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

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement
CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 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.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The EPP collects data across programs from Benchmark I, Lesson Planning Rubrics, Benchmark IV, and Student Teaching Evaluations Parts A & B for each candidate. In addition, data from program completers' surveys, graduates one-year-out surveys, principal surveys, and state teachers' surveys are reviewed as well as teacher effectiveness data for our graduates. Pass rates on licensure tests and admission basic skills tests are reviewed and used by the faculty for candidate and programmatic assessment.

Benchmark I -
The Benchmark I Assessment has been a reliable tool that has indeed helped us to identify early struggles in the areas of Knowledge and Habits of Mind, Written and Oral Communication, Interactions with Teachers and Students, and Dispositions and Professional Behavior and now in the areas addressed by InTASC Standards 1, 2, 4, 9, and 10. However, we came to realize that we needed to more consistent in the use the results of this assessment to support our candidates. Longitudinal data have shown that interns with five or more negative indicators normally do not complete the program. In order to make better use of the Benchmark I data, we recently added a policy to follow up more rigorously with candidates when they receive a number of negative indicators or score below target in many areas. Our new policy requires that a candidates with three or more indicators below target will be assigned a mentor faculty member. The mentor then works with the candidate to help the candidate to address the areas of concern during the next one or two semesters. By providing this early intervention support, candidates are less likely to drop out of the program and are better prepared to enter and be successful in their student teaching experience and then go on to be successful in the teaching profession. The EPP has noted an improving completion rate for its cohorts. The graduation rates for bachelor degree seeking education majors has improved significantly over the last 8 years. From a low of 16.9% for 4-year Graduation Rates for the 2008 to a higher of 47.9% for the 2014 cohort, these rates have been on an upward trend. The EPP continues to strive to improve these rates but feel the follow-up approach has contributed to the increase.

Recently, more candidates scored below target for participation than any other criteria. The instructional team discussed the need to encourage some candidates to participate more in small-group and large-group discussions with this criteria being marked below target as a result. Over the years of using this Benchmark, the faculty have seen candidates improve in these non-academic areas from Block I through Block II. Most candidates strive to participate more in class during Block II if their Benchmark I –Block I feedback encouraged them to become more involved.

Student Teaching Rubrics -
Data from the new rubric support that candidates perform at target (level 3) for most criteria addressed in the rubric. For Learner Development (InTASC #1), the averages for candidates ranged from 2.50 – 4.00. Communication with families was the only criteria were the program average for all three programs was below target.

Data from the Student Teaching Part A rubric supports that candidates need more opportunities to learn about the class history prior to student teaching and need to be allowed to communicate more with the families of their students during the student teaching experience. Candidates are now required to visit the classrooms where they will student teach at the beginning of the school year no matter if they are student teaching in the fall or spring. This allows the candidates to observe how a classroom environment is established. The data suggest that having an activity associated with the class history might be appropriate during that time. Mentor teachers are encouraged to find opportunities for the student teacher to meet and interact with the families of the students in the class.

Licensure Tests (Content Tests)–
The EPP realized early on that the elementary candidates were struggling overall with the new Pearson content tests in math, science, and social studies. The School of Education faculty investigated ways to provide more support for these tests to the candidates. This included addressing more content within the education classes and providing free tutoring through the EPP's Curriculum Resource Center. The most dramatic results have been in mathematics were the elementary candidates have moved their pass rate on the math test from a low of 68% in 2012 on the ETS test and a 44% on the Pearson Test to 86% in 2017-2018.

State Teachers' Survey of our Graduates -
Despite the strong results from this survey over the years, the EPP still noted that the areas of integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning, developing quality assessment and analyzing student assessment data, and working with parents were the areas where the teachers overall felt less prepared. As noted earlier in this reports, the EPP has hired full-time faculty in the area of educational technology to support the integration of current technology into the curriculum. The topics addressed in EDUC W200, Introduction to Educational Technology, has been updated to focus on the use of technology in the classroom to enhance student learning rather than just technology as tools. These results also have prompted discussions about how the area of assessment is addressed in the programs and were supporting evidence for selecting the use of technology as our targeted area for improvement.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

⦿ **Yes** ◯ No

6.3 Optional Comments

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 2019 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:	lhouser@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**