2021 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	⦿	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	○
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	○

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

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[1]

46

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]

3

Total number of program completers   49

---

[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 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

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

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:	Completer 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		☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

2

Link:	https://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation/
Description of data accessible via link:	Completer data on current job position

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://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation/
Description of data accessible via link:	Student loan 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?

Data for Measure 1: Impact of P-12 learning and development is not available due to the ILEARN State Assessments and NWEA Assessments being cancelled due to COVID-19. Data for Measures 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness, 3: Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones, 4: Satisfaction of Completers, and 5: Graduation rates is currently not available due to the HEA1388 data for reporting year 19-20 is not provided to EPPs by the Indiana Department of Education until after September 1, 2021. Data for these measures is expected to become available to the public by November 1, 2021. The EPP plans to use the IDOE Teacher Effectiveness Survey data for Measure 2, the IDOE Principal Survey data for Measure 3, and the IDOE Teacher Survey data for Measure 4, and Attrition/Enrollment/Completer data from the HEA 1388 Report for Measure 5. The Title II Report for additional data for Measure 6 will not become available until Fall 2021 as well. This information is listed on the USF Accreditation website under the corresponding Measure at https://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation/.
The EPPs' teacher candidates are successful in finding jobs. Our data from the Division of Education in 2019-2020 shows that 57% of candidates that graduated licensed in their program area. Historically, the licensing percentages have been higher but due to COVID-19 issues with testing availability, our completers are still in the process of taking licensure exams. Our data from the Division of Education in 2019-2020 shows that 92% of candidates are employed in their area of licensure.
The EPP will provide further analysis on measures data once the data is available and posted to the public.

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. Candidate performance of the strategies and practices used to deliver lessons is tracked and monitored. 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). In field experiences which use the CPA, the candidates and cooperating teachers score a baseline CPA, set goals for improvement, and compare final CPA scores to determine candidate growth at the end of the field experience. The EPP will use a new LMS which will allow the candidate to view and reflect upon their progression. The benchmarking system for all EPP field related assessments is progressive in nature, that is, first field experience to final field experience should exhibit candidate growth in their understanding of the teaching profession. The benchmark scores inform the EPP and candidates that the candidates met benchmark from first to final field experience or an intervention to improve the candidates' performance is enacted. The EPP will implement Taskstream as a means to find efficient and effective tools that will display candidate growth. 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). 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 El. 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 demonstrates, 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: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness, Satisfaction of Employers-Principal Survey, and Satisfaction of Completers-Teacher Survey. 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 two surveys administered by IDOE to employers: Teacher Effectiveness Survey and the Principal Survey provide the EPP sufficient information on completer success. The EPP will administer the Teacher Questionnaire for USF Education Programs 1st-3rd year. This questionnaire is 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 IDOE Teacher Survey. Annually, the university engages its graduates in an additional survey, Survey of Graduating Students (SGS). Data from the SGS is aggregated to provide an overall view of completer satisfaction. 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 IDOE Teacher Survey. 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.

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: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness, Satisfaction of Employers-Principal Survey, and Satisfaction of Completers-Teacher Survey. 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 two surveys administered by IDOE to employers: Teacher Effectiveness Survey and the Principal Survey provide the EPP sufficient information on completer success. Additionally, the EPP uses state and federal annual reporting measures (Title II and HEA 1388) to inform practices and planning. Furthermore, 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 stakeholder feedback. In response to reliability, the EPP created the USF Division of Education Field Experience Site. This website provides cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates with information, directions, and documents to accurately assess candidate performance in the field. The EPP is in the process of creating training videos to assist CT and US in reliable use of the field assessments during the CFAP process. The EPP adopted Taskstream as 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 assisted the EPP in establishing content validity 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'

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 1/2 of the candidate's preparation program was significantly altered due to full online learning at the EPP and the closure of P-12 schools. However, our partners and faculty engaged in problem-solving to create a supportive environment for the teacher candidates during their spring semester. One of the COVID-keepers is the creation of a new class which will be implemented Spring 2022. The course: EDUC 209-Foundations of Learning Modalities will provide direct instruction on effective online learning. 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 and the advice and input of the TEAC are memorialized in minutes. Each action the EPP implements 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 elevated level of reflection and input from stakeholders, CAEP, and faculty expertise, the EPP selected the following tasks toward continuous improvement: 1. The EPP created the USF Division of Education Field Experience Site. This website provides cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates with information, directions, and documents to accurately assess candidate performance in the field. The EPP is in the process of creating training videos to assist CT and US in reliable use of the field assessments during the CFAP process. 2. 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. 3. With the explosive growth in the alternative licensure program, the EPP adopted policies to ensure efficient and proficient candidate progression through their program. For example, the Professional Learning Assessment (PLA) was revised and is completed as an electronic submission for distant candidates. 4. As a response to our CAEP 2017 review, the EPP

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

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
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.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
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
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Kelly Rothgeb
Position:	Accreditation Coordinator
Phone:	260-399-7700 x8415
E-mail:	krothgeb@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 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 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 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**