2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11471	**AACTE SID:**	1603
Institution:	Indiana University Southeast		
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 <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

95

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]

65

Total number of program completers   160

---

[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

New Programs Added: ESL/ENL, Special Education

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

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)

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://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Impact on P-12 learning and Development (component 4.1)

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.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Indicators of Teaching effectiveness (component 4.2)

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	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Satisfaction of Employers (component 4.3, A.4.1)

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

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Satisfaction of completers (component 4.4, A.4.2)

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	▓	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Graduation Rates (outcome measure)

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	▓	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐

6

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Ability of completers to meet licensing (Alumni surveys) (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	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

7

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels) employer surveys

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	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐

8

Link: https://www.ius.edu/education/about-us/caep.php

Description of data accessible via link: Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)2

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
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?*

Continuous Improvement:
The EPP has been reviewing the data on annual reporting measures over the past three years. Results of the Alumni (completer) surveys: the University has been able to increase participation in survey from 3.1% in 2015 to 15.7% in 2016. And then there was a decrease in the employer survey response rate. We are taking some steps and strategies to track those graduates who are in service with schools. All questions
regarding education at Indiana University Southeast (IUS) received high marks from survey respondents, and disagreement was low. While there were 8 comments from the 2015 survey, in 2016, we received nine pages of comments – mostly positive. These surveys are distributed at one year, two years, and three years after graduation. Our graduating teachers were rated as highly effective. They rated their IUS experience and their preparedness as high. The concerns of the survey were: classroom management, communication, assessment strategies, and community engagement. Program teams are working on addressing these concerns and will be making changes to the courses taught in these areas. We have reviewed the data from 2017-18 and looking to see how we can make changes that can improve programs.
Besides alumni surveys, focus groups and case studies are also used for feedback. Employer surveys and state administered teacher effectiveness survey data were shared with programs and stakeholders and actions discussed. As a result, revisions has been made to the survey items and additional open ended questions have been added to the employer survey as to comply with CAEP standard 4. Purposeful measurement and analysis of candidate impact on P-12 student learning is ongoing. Pre- and posttest
analysis of lesson delivery and impact is conducted by all candidates. Elementary and secondary candidates' work is scored and stored in task stream. The EPP will utilize focus groups and a completer case study, designed in Fall of 2017, with the case study beginning Fall of 2018, as additional methods to measure program impact.
The number of teachers achieving Effective or Highly Effective rating 2016 increased to 100%. This data is provided by the state from each school corporation that determine percentage of teachers rated effective or highly effective. School corporations rate the teacher as Highly effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary and Ineffective. As determined by the state, in order for teachers to be rated as Effective or Highly Effective, they must show positive impact on student learning.
Data on candidate performance, teaching effectiveness, employers and alumni surveys, and licensure exam pass rate is shared with stakeholders (Council on Preparing Education Professionals - COPEP) on a quarterly basis. Program teams and the School of Education Council have identified ways to more fully involve stakeholders in their programs. P-12 Stakeholders have been invited to "Data Days" during which the aforementioned data points are discussed. Graduate Programs have transitioned to CAEP standards for Advanced programs after the standards were finalized in Fall of 2016.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. **Unit-wide data are not aggregated for review by the entire unit.**   **(ITP)   (ADV)**

A preponderance of evidence documents the EPP meets NCATE standard 2 which is CAEP standard 5.The EPP maintains a Quality Assurance system and uses multiple, formative and summative measures to inform program improvement. The nature of assessments ranges greatly, inclusive of unit wide assessments with extensive validity/reliability information and programmatic assessments which has gone through SPA. Stakeholders are involved at multiple levels and the EPP stays connected to employers through established channels. The EPP has systems in place to collect and analyze data; these systems are both inclusive and exclusive of stakeholder involvement. The absence of a state-wide data collection system hinders the ability to fully measure completer effectiveness and achievement. EPP has moved forward with having a regular connection between programmatic/departmental discussion, and data that are collected (as evidenced through existing minutes), will strengthen the EPP.

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 Quality Assurance Process utilizes decentralized program-specific groups to assess program outcomes and to make program changes. EPP reviews data from multiple sources and measures every year through Data Days where faculty look at data from key assessments, state data, licensure test data, and employer and alumni survey results. EPP uses Task stream to systematically store and enter data for reviews as a unit. In all programs, lead teachers work with instructional teams to cooperatively design, implement, evaluate and calibrate key course assessments measuring candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as they progress throughout the program. Assessments are plentiful, varied, developmental, and longitudinal. Student feedback is captured at multiple points. Candidates complete course evaluations each semester. Their proficiency is measured through Field Experience Evaluations and Student Teaching Evaluations. P-12 partners, completers, and advisory council members provide feedback during program/advisory council meetings and focus group sessions and through surveys (Completer Perceptions, Student Teacher Survey, Employer Perceptions, Meeting Minutes). Regular program and department meetings provide opportunities for the faculty to voice evaluative thoughts about unit operations. Program coordinators are part of the EPP leadership team; they bring forward discussion items. Faculty have the opportunity to evaluate data regularly and offer feedback to make programmatic changes if necessary.

.Data from the multiple measures described in 5.1 and 5.2 are in Task stream. Each fall and spring, EPP as a unit work with faculty and Advisory Councils to analyze data to inform program improvement (Meeting Minutes, Program Review). These discussions are an integral part of the continuous assessment process to ensure programs remain viable and relevant. Program meeting minutes are stored in the box and also it will be tagged as evidence for self study report.. Meeting minute formats changed over the years within programs and varied between programs. Turnover among program members and differing understanding of the required elements of minutes contributed to this variance. Meeting minutes provide evidence of databased discussions and decision-making. Program and advisory council meeting minutes and Program Review documents demonstrate strong evidence of stakeholder participation and continuous improvement discussions. Due to the lack of a current state wide system of measuring completer effectiveness and the positive impact on P-12 student learning the EPP has developed a proposal for a case study and got approved by the IRB and started conducting observations with the permission form the school districts. EPP has chosen the largest program which is the Elementary education for the first phase of this case study. We have also made progress with standard 3 for recruitment and admission and candidate progress throughout their time with the EPP. And efforts have been taken and had our first meeting for the recruitment of diverse candidates and to increase teachers in the STEM areas.

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

4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 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 s
activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

◉ **Yes** ○ **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe
transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r
regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo
information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress m
addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use
Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level
programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☐ **No identified gaps**

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be
prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text a

The switch from NCATE to CAEP was pretty stressful and time consuming. EPP took time to understand the standards and how we
meet those with evidence. EPP also had a hard time aligning the assessments to state standards and making changes to the
existing rubrics for SPA submissions. It has been a long road but definitely worth it. And CAEP taking the "required components"
from the standards definitely made it easier and kind of made sense that all components are important. And Meeting program
impact for standard was hard and now we have a case study approved to conduct in the schools.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC (Principles, as applicable.

⦿ **Yes** ◯ **No**

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Stand TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

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:	Rachel Star
Position:	CAEP/SPA Coordinator
Phone:	812-941-2641
E-mail:	rpstar@ius.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**