

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11626	AACTE SID:	9145
Institution:	University of Saint Francis		
Unit:	Department 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 EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 23

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 9

Total number of program completers 32

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 2018-2019 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

The University of Saint Francis (USF) entered into a teach-out agreement with Indiana Institute of Technology (IT). The purpose of the agreement is to provide Indiana Institute of Technology students the opportunity to graduate with a Bachelor Science in Education from IT and then, having completed the appropriate requirements at University of Saint Francis to be recommended to the Indiana Department of Education for teacher licensure by USF.

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://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation/>

Description of data accessible via link: Link to USF Education Accreditation Page with HEA1388 Reports, Title II Reports, Survey of Graduating Students, USF Student Loan Default Rate

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

2

Link: <https://accreditation.sf.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/HEA-Final-EPP-Report-2019-USF.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: 2019 HEA 1388 Report

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

3

Link: <https://accreditation.sf.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2019-Title-II-Traditional-Program-Report.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: 2019 Title II Report

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"/>

4

Link: <https://accreditation.sf.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/Class-of-2018-USF-Career-Outcomes-by-Program.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: USF Career Outcomes Report 2018-2019

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=152336&s=all&id=152336&id=152336>

Description of data accessible via link: USF Student Loan Default Rate

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?

Data and trends for Employer satisfaction remain high. Over the past 2 years, a survey conducted by the Indiana Department of Education shows that 99-100% of employers agree or strongly that the teachers who graduated from the EPP's programs have knowledge preparation. 83-100% of employers agree or strongly agree that the teachers who graduated from the EPP's programs are pedagogically prepared. 99-100% of employers agree or strongly agree that the teachers who graduated from the EPP have professional dispositions.

Data from the P-12 impact survey continue to show that the EPP's graduates have a positive impact on P-12 learning. Over the past 2 years, a survey conducted by the Indiana Department of Education where teachers' effectiveness ratings are submitted to the state, show that all of the EPP's graduates are rated Effective or Highly Effective on their annual evaluation.

Graduates continue to share that they did not feel as prepared as they would like in the areas of classroom management and technology. When the EPP discussed this with the Teacher Education Advisory Council, the overwhelming remarks were that this is a typical feeling among new teachers and that as they become more practiced in their full time positions, they grow in their abilities and skills related to classroom management and technology use.

The EPPs' teacher candidates are successful in finding jobs. Our data from the university in 2017 and 2018 shows that all candidates eligible to graduate did graduate. At the time of the survey, 75% of the graduates reported that they were employed in a position for which they were prepared.

The University of Saint Francis has been continually reviewing survey results and data trends from the HEA1388 reports provided

by the State of Indiana as well as Pearson pedagogy and CORE content data provided by Pearson which is reviewed and analyzed on an ongoing basis. Benchmarks and data is reviewed by the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC), comprised of local K-12 partners and, former and current teacher candidates, on an annual basis. Continual monitoring by the licensing advisor and faculty provides the department of education data to adjust curriculum and instruction throughout the year. This data is shared on our public website and visible to all potential candidates and partners. Transparency with enrollment trends and data outcomes with internal and external stakeholders is heavily encouraged and in the forefront of our departmental agenda.

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.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Provider does not ensure candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession.

The EPP has multiple and frequent measures to ensure candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession. The candidates' ability to review their progress and monitor their acquisition of knowledge and skills in becoming an effective teacher are completed through the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). The ability of the candidates to view and reflect on their performance during the CFAP at multiple points of their preparation demonstrates that evidence is used to develop an understanding of the teaching profession.

Monitoring and measuring progress on the use of evidence and research to develop an understanding of the teaching profession is done repeatedly throughout the candidates' preparation in applying their knowledge and skills to plan, instruct, and assess lessons through the completion of each LEM and POLAN, and by faculty and adjunct adherence to the course maps. Effective practices result in effective performance. Candidate performance of the strategies and practices used to deliver lessons is tracked and monitored through the EPP's LMS system on the LEM and POLAN. Candidates' overall performance in which effective pedagogy, content knowledge, and knowledge of the learners and their environment is frequently tracked using the Candidate Progress Assessment (CPA). The EPP is in the process of creating growth charts to show candidate progress on their LEM, POLAN, and CPA throughout their preparation, from their very first evaluation to their final evaluation. The EPP continues to find efficient and effective tools that will display candidate growth in a simple and straightforward format.

Teacher candidates are required to assess learners' growth and achievement after each formal lesson is delivered at multiple times during their preparation. The candidate selects researched-based instructional strategies best suited to the classroom demographics, group setting, content standards, prior knowledge, and desired learner outcome. The candidates administer pre-assessments and post-assessments to their learners for each formal lesson. An analysis of the pre and post assessment data is presented in graphic and narrative format; displaying the candidates' ability to analyze and reflect on the learners' performance and their instruction for that specific lesson. These requirements are found in the Learning Experience Map (LEM) and the Post Observation Lesson Analysis Narrative (POLAN).

Additionally, the EPP is collecting course level information from its faculty and adjuncts to assess the use of research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession. The faculty has undertaken a full alignment and mapping of its courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP) and cross-walked these standards to CAEP EI. Ed. INTASC, and CEC standards. Each course has a defined body of research which is presented to the candidates to inform the knowledge and skills candidates are expected to master in each course.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4 Program Impact

The provider does not demonstrate, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective

The EPP uses three measures that are implemented by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) under the House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1388 and are therefore deemed to provide to the EPP valid and reliable data on the following: P-12 Student Learning (4.1), Teacher Observation Evaluations (4.2), Employer Satisfaction with Preparation (4.3), and Completer Satisfaction with Preparation (4.4). These measures are administered annually by the IDOE and results are sent to each EPP and posted on IDOE website and the USF website for public review. The three measures are the IDOE Principal Survey, IDOE Teacher Survey, and IDOE Teacher Effectiveness Ratings. We have received three years of Teacher Survey data so more data is needed. The EPP had hoped the IDOE annual surveys could replace the EPP's Surveys of Employer Satisfaction and Alumni Surveys but the IDOE Principals' Surveys of Teacher Effectiveness are only measured at two and three years out. No first year teacher data is available from this survey. The EPP administers an EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey every 3 years to principals who evaluate EPP's completers. The data from the EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey is aggregated to provide the EPP an overall view of employer satisfaction. Since the EPP's CAEP accreditation in 2017, the EPP has not solicited information from this survey. At the next administration, to ensure content validity, all questions on the revised survey will be aligned to INTASC standards and categorized into the following domains: Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism, which will align to the aforementioned IDOE surveys.

The EPP also administers the Teacher Questionnaire: USF Completors to its completors. The data from the SGS is aggregated to provide an overall view of completer satisfaction. At the next administration, to ensure content validity, all questions on the

revised survey will be aligned to INTASC standards and categorized into the following domains: Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism which align to the aforementioned IDOE surveys.

Stakeholders are engaged in this process in the following means:

1. Director of Field Experiences met with principals who receive the EPP's candidates for field experiences and employ the EPP's completers to collect anecdotal data on completer and candidate preparation. Ideas from these meetings are discussed with full faculty to determine topics and training gaps for course development and enhancement.
2. Data from the Indiana Department of Education Principal and Teacher surveys are analyzed and shared with the faculty at the EPP Program Improvement Day (PID) and the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) each year.
3. The IDOE surveys provide information that is first shared with all EPP faculty and stakeholders at the annual PID and TEAC meetings, and is used to make changes to the program if the 'n' of each criterion that is rated less than 'satisfied or highly satisfied' is significant enough to warrant the program change.
4. Completers serve on the EPP's Teacher Education Advisory Council

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP assurance system does not rely on measures that are valid and reliable.

As part of the strategic plan required by the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, during the 2019-2020 academic year, the EPP focused its efforts on the following 3 initiatives:

1. Alignment of graduate courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate

Field Assessment Process (CFAP). The faculty mapped the graduate courses to the standards, wrote learning objectives for the courses based on the standards, and assigned the national standards (CAEP EL ED, INTASC, and CEC) to the Indiana REPA standards for each course.

2. Identify all assessment data to complete CEC SPAs so that data sets can be created to write the SPA reports.
3. Set signature assignments for the graduate courses so that data can be collected to measure candidate performance in the online setting. Graduate students are required to complete signature assignments based on their licensure status: advanced or initial.
4. Establish validity of all EPP CFAP assessments using stakeholders (TEAC).

Future plans for the suite of EPP field assessments include:

1. Develop video training of how to use EPP's instruments (CFAP)-the training of use is currently done via paper copies for each CT and US.

2. Create training videos to assist CT and US in assessing candidate performance as measured by the CFAP process.

4. The EPP continues its struggle in selecting an effective LMS that will collect and report data by outcome from the CFAP assessments. Stakeholders (P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers) are integral to the work described above. P-12 Partners will assist the EPP in establishing validity and reliability with its assessments. Faculty is intimately involved in course alignment, learning objectives for each course; and communicating directions and expectations for field work and use of assessment tools; and applying the EPP assessments to course expectations. Candidates use the EPP assessments to evaluate themselves in the field and participated in creating two surveys used to evaluate support of the CT and US during field experiences. During the revision of the LEM and POLAN, senior level candidates provided input on the length and clarity of criteria. All changes to the EPP's assessments are annually vetted with the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) at its annual meeting and US meetings with the Director of Field Experiences. The efforts described for this AFI complement existing initiatives by bringing into full focus the strategic plan of the EPP. The EPP believes that mapping the standards for each course, cross-walking the Indiana standards to CAEP Elem Ed., INTASC and CEC standards, writing learning objectives reflective of the course standards, and revising field assessments will assist the EPP in determining its strengths and weaknesses in preparing teacher candidates and the EPP instruments that measure their preparation. In additional efforts toward validity of its assessments, the EPP cross-walked the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives and blueprints with the standards mapped in each course taken by teacher candidates. This crosswalk allowed the EPP to determine overlaps and gaps in content knowledge and skills as defined by the Indiana CORE Assessments' objectives. When gaps were identified, the EPP faculty added standards to courses to ensure candidates were receiving sufficient knowledge and practice of the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives.

5. The CFAP process continues to warrant reconstruction so that the EPP can draw efficient data from the assessment tools. The EPP has tested different methods to offer Candidates, University Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers an efficient and concise process for assessing and submitting field work progress. The EPP tries to balance the candidates' cost of a tracking system like Taskstream vs. the usefulness of the university's LMS. We have spent many hours investigating the right tool by visiting other EPPs, soliciting information from small EPPs like us, and contacting sales representatives of data systems. The EPP has settled on using Taskstream during the 2020-2021 school year.

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?

At the time of this writing, any reviewer would know that the world as we know it has changed dramatically due to the pandemic. Although the EPP can cite its program changes aligned to quality assurance, it is important to note that 1/3 of the candidate's program is significantly altered due to full online learning at the EPP and the closure of P-12 schools. Annually, the EPP engages in its Program Improvement Day (PID). During this full-day meeting in the fall, the EPP analyzes all data points of the most recent three years to determine needs and changes to its programs. Data points include: enrollment and retention, program GPA, state licensure tests, EPP assessments, survey results provided by the Indiana Department of Education on completer satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and P-12 impact. Other data sets include: candidate survey of their university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and the cooperating teacher's survey of the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). Additionally, the EPP seeks advice and direction from its candidates, completers, and P-12 partners during its Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) which meets two times during the academic year. The majority of candidate and completer input is sought and recorded as anecdotal notes and discussions, while the advice and input of the TEAC are memorialized in minutes. Each action the EPP puts into action has been vetted by either the faculty, faculty and candidates, faculty and CAEP, or faculty and P-12 partners. Timelines are established for the work and duties assigned to appropriate stakeholders. Due to the high level of reflection and input from stakeholders, CAEP, and faculty expertise, the EPP selected the following tasks toward continuous improvement:

1. The Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP) continues to warrant reconstruction so that the EPP can draw efficient data from the assessment tools. The EPP has tested different methods to offer Candidates, University Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers an efficient and concise process for assessing and submitting field work progress. The EPP tries to balance the candidates' cost of a tracking system like Taskstream vs. the usefulness of the university's LMS. We have spent many hours investigating the right tool by visiting other EPPs, soliciting information from small EPPs like us, and contacting sales representatives of data systems. The EPP has settled on using Taskstream during the 2020-2021 school year.
2. The EPP identified the need to establish full alignment of its graduate courses to the state standards and licensure exams, therefore it engaged in full alignment and mapping of its graduate courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). The faculty mapped the courses to the standards, wrote learning objectives for the courses based on the standards, and assigned the national standards (CAEP EL ED, INTASC, and CEC) to the Indiana REPA standards for each course. The EPP believes that mapping the standards for each course cross-walking the Indiana standards to CAEP Elem Ed., INTASC and CEC standards, writing learning objectives reflective of the course standards, and revising field assessments will assist the EPP in determining its strengths and weaknesses in preparing teacher candidates. During the mapping process, the EPP created a course template that displays learning objectives aligned to state and national standards, its central topics (essential questions), research and evidence strategies within the course content, and cross-cutting themes of technology and diversity. This process is now complete for the undergraduate courses and graduate courses.
3. All EPP assessments were revised with the support of university supervisors and Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) members. The TEAC participated in assisting the EPP to establish validity of its assessments. Currently, the analysis of the TEAC's rating of validity is being conducted.
4. As a response to our CAEP 2017 review, the EPP wanted to gather more information from its completers, therefore survey of completers was created and aligned to InTASC standards, it will be administered in the spring 2020.
5. As more and more teacher candidates in the EPP's graduate program are teaching on emergency/temporary permits, the EPP

determined it needed a standard rubric for scoring graduate teacher candidates' portfolio of learning was created. Two rubrics (Secondary Education and Special Education) were created and are implemented during the 2019-2020 academic year.

6. Because the reading courses in the undergraduate program are heavily consumed with reading diagnostics and strategies, little time is left for a full exploration into children's literature. Through collaboration with the English department at the university, a course in children's literature will be added to the students major.

T

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic 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 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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Mary Riepenhoff
Position: Chair of Education Department
Phone: 260-399-7700 x8409
E-mail: mriefpenhoff@sf.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