

# 2021 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	16658	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>	Indiana University Purdue University - Indianapolis		
<b>Unit:</b>	School of Education		

## Section 1. EPP 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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

<https://education.iupui.edu/academics/degrees-programs/bachelors/index.html>

## 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 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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.)<sup>2</sup>

**Total number of program completers** 277

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 2019-2020 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

The EPP received approval to offer a program for licensure for district-level administrators.

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



Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

Link: <https://education.iupui.edu/about/caep-accreditation/report-measures.html>

Description of data accessible via link: Teacher Survey data from the state, case study, EPP one-year out survey of program completers (initial and advanced programs)

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <https://education.iupui.edu/about/caep-accreditation/report-measures.html>

Description of data accessible via link: Graduation rates for initial and advanced programs

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6

Link: <https://education.iupui.edu/about/caep-accreditation/report-measures.html>

Description of data accessible via link: Title II Reports with licensure test passrates

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7

Link: <https://education.iupui.edu/about/caep-accreditation/report-measures.html>

Description of data accessible via link: Job related to major 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8

Link: <https://education.iupui.edu/about/caep-accreditation/report-measures.html>

Description of data accessible via link: loan default rates

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 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?*

The EPP noted the strength of the mathematical content knowledge for elementary majors compared to their peers throughout the state. However, the content knowledge of the elementary majors in reading and language arts declined over the last three years. Possible contributing factors are the retirement of two key language arts faculty and a hiring freeze that is university-wide because of the pandemic.

The secondary faculty also noted concerns about how well the program completers perform on the secondary licensure tests in English and Social Studies. An examination of the degree maps for these two programs revealed that candidates were being allowed to take a number of substitute courses toward their major which often did not relate to the content they would be teaching. The degree map gave candidates a wide range of choices for courses to fulfil certain required content requirements. Also advisors were allowing candidates to substitute a large number of content courses not listed on the degree map because many of the degree map courses were not being offered by the major departments on a regular basis. The EPP met with advisors and faculty from the English and social studies departments and restructure the degree maps for these programs. There are less electives and the departments have committed to offering the required courses on a regular schedule to afford candidates the opportunity to take these courses in a timely manner.

Target levels have been established for each indicator for all benchmark assessments used by the EPP. Data are shared with administrators, program chairs, and program coordinators. Graduate programs also share the data with faculty and other stakeholders. The undergraduate (initial) programs are currently working to reconfigure their stakeholders group to make it more functional.

## 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?

A review team for the EPP looked at the pass rates on licensing tests for secondary program completers as well as data from graduate and employer surveys. The grades in content courses were also reviewed. The grades and pass rates for the physical education and visual arts education majors were strong. These program completers ranked near the top state-wide when their scores and pass rates on licensure tests were considered. However, the English and social studies completers are not doing as well. The social studies students often took courses that did not prepare them well for the subjects they would teach. The licensure test data supported that these graduates did not have a strong and broad background in social studies topics taught in the secondary schools.

Meetings with EPP administrators, program chairs, and advisors revealed that candidates were being given a board range of courses for the social studies major and often other social studies courses not related to the P-12 academic standards were accepted in place of courses listed on the degree map. Examination of the degree maps revealed that candidates were given a "laundry list" of courses to fulfil each element of the major. The advisors also admitted that they allowed students to substitute other social studies courses not on the degree map because the listed courses were not being offered often enough to allow candidates to graduate in 4 years. The review team found that both concerns were true for the English program as well although to a lesser degree.

The review team met with faculty from the English and then the social studies department and shared the data and the concerns. During the first meeting the representatives from the major departments decided to go back to their individual faculty to discuss the data and brainstorm possible solutions. The representatives then returned and met with the review team to discuss options. After several such meetings it was decided that the program maps would be redesigned and there would no longer be lists of courses for key elements of the major. Candidates will be required to take designated courses for the key elements of the major. The representatives of the departments also committed to modification of the upcoming schedule of classes to insure that these required courses would be offered in a timely manner. As a result of reviewing the SPA, state licensure tests, and the P-12 state academic standards, the department faculty have committed to modifying the curriculum of many of the courses, education major are going to be required to take, to better reflect what the future teachers will be teaching. The revised degree maps have been approved, posted, and will be in effect for fall 2021. Pass rates and courses grades will be monitored over the next 3-4 years to determine the effectiveness of the changes.

One change made several years ago was to increase the number of math content courses elementary majors were required to take. Normally elementary majors took 1-2 math content courses. After reviewing the pass rates of candidates on the math basic skills test and the licensure sub-test in mathematics, the faculty decided to increase the number of required math content courses to three through the math department and an additional math content course through the EPP which focused on the conceptual understanding of mathematics. The pass rates from our Title II reports on the math licensure sub-test for elementary majors were: 2019-2020 - 85% 2018-2019 - 86% and 2017-2018 - 94% which exceeded the earlier rates (example 2014-2015 - 72%).

The School Counseling program has created a stakeholder advisory group which meets twice a year. A constitution was created and adopted to institutionalize this group and its mission. During the first meeting of the academic year, the group reviewed program data from the prior data cycle. Based on this review, the group made recommendations for programmatic changes to the program faculty. The faculty then review the recommendations and develop an annual report which outlined action items for the upcoming year to address areas of concern and to document progress on former action items. This report is shared with the stakeholders group during its second meeting in the spring.

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

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge  
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

A.5.3 Continuous Improvement

A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

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 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 2021 EPP Annual Report.

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete 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 review 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**