

2023 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP ID:	11626	AACTE SID:	9145
Institution:	University of Saint Francis		
Unit:	Department of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information in the system is up-to-date and accurate.

1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

1.1.1 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head."

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should be authorized to receive time-sensitive CAEP-accreditation related communications.]

Agree Disagree

1.1.2 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator".

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator is primarily assigned the role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head and should be authorized by the EPP to receive CAEP-accreditation related communications.]

Agree Disagree

1.1.3 I confirm that the EPP has provided updated contact information for two distinct people for these roles.

[CAEP requires that EPPs provide information for at least two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personnel turnover.]

Agree Disagree

1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

1.2.1 *Basic Information* - I confirm that the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree

1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree

1.2.3 *Program Options* - I confirm that EPP's licensure area listings (including program title, licensure level, degree or certificate level, licensure(program) category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS under Program Options, for all licensure areas that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should either be marked as non-CAEP review or archived, as applicable, in AIMS).

Agree Disagree



Section 2. EPP's Program Graduates [Academic Year 2021-2022]

2.1 What is the total number of candidates who graduated from programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2021-2022?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

125

2.1.2 Number of graduates 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

0

Total number of program graduates 125

¹In Section 2 of the Annual Report, the EPP will provide the total number of graduates who finished the program and licensing requirements in the academic year specified.

² For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#)

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Please report on any substantive changes that have occurred at the EPP/Institution or Organization, as well as the EPP's current regional accreditation status.

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2021-2022 academic year?

3.1 Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach out agreements?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.4. What is the EPP's current regional accreditation status?

Accreditation Agency:

Higher Learning Commission

Status:

Continued with next affirmation being 2027-2028

Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per [CAEP's Accreditation Policy](#)?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

Please update the EPP's public facing website to include: 1) the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP (NCATE, or TEAC) reviewed programs, and 2) the EPP's data display of the CAEP Accountability Measures for Academic Year 2021-2022.

4.1. EPP's current CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.

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

4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2021-2022 Academic Year]

Provider shares a direct link to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures, as gathered during the 2021-2022 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2021-2022 Academic Year]

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer³ effectiveness. (R4.1)** Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth **AND** (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**
Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired** (in positions for which they have prepared.)

³For the CAEP Accountability Measures, the EPP will share information on the website pertaining to completer data per CAEP's definition of the term completer: "A candidate who successfully satisfied all program requirements of a preparation program at least six months previously and who is employed in a position for which they were prepared for state licensure."

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] <https://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation/>

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] [No Link Provided](#)

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. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

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.

Ultimately, the candidate must successfully pass the pedagogy PRAXIS exam to show proficiency within their area of study upon completion of their prospective education program for the state of Indiana to approve teacher licensure. Throughout a candidate's education program, the candidate has a university supervisor and cooperating teacher to assist with their pedagogical knowledge development, as well as course relevancy. The EPP has multiple frequent measures to ensure our candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession with regular checkpoints to measure progress. 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). Students apply their knowledge and skills to plan, instruct, and assess lessons through the completion of each LEM and POLAN. All of these checkpoints are monitored and assessed. Overall performance of effective pedagogical practices are tracked using the Candidate Progress Assessment (CPA). The CPA allows candidate and cooperating teacher to set goals for improvement after the cooperating teacher score a baseline CPA, and then compare final CPA to determine candidate growth and progression by the end of their field experience. The EPP will implement Taskstream to create required electronic portfolios, lesson plans, units, rubrics and webpages as a means to find efficient and effective tools that will display candidate growth. Pre and Post assessment requirements are found in the Learning Experience Map (LEM) and the Post Observation Lesson Analysis Narrative (POLAN). Along with those requirements, faculty has aligned courses to Indiana REPA standards, ETS for Educator Licensure, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP) to align with CAEP, EI. Ed. INTASC, and CEC standards. Each course is a progression of enhancing pedagogical knowledge which is documented utilizing the Taskstream tool.

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: 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 the IDOE website and the USF website for public viewing. The EPP developed and administered a Completer Survey, which is aligned to the INTASC standards. The survey is distributed to program completers in their first through third year of teaching. The INTASC standards are categorized into the following domains: Learner and Learning Environment, Planning, Instruction and Assessment, Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge, and Professionalism, which align with the IDOE Teacher Survey and EPP created Completer Survey. This ensures consistency in obtaining valid and reliable data. Annually, our graduates participate in the Survey of Graduating Students (SGS) with questions being aligned to INTASC standards to demonstrate content validity. Our 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. Generated ideas are discussed to determine gaps and training development opportunities to enhance the program. 2. Data from the Indiana Department of Education Principal and Teacher Surveys are analyzed and discussed 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 used to make programmatic changes where survey results call for attention. 4. Completers serve on the EPP's Teacher Education Advisory Council. Having the feedback annually allows us to aggregate data to provide an overall view of completer satisfaction and a regular assessment tool for us to implement any changes necessary for overall program improvement.

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 University of Saint Francis Division of Education's Quality Assurance System (QAS) is a framework of meaningful measures used to produce valid and reliable data, monitor and support candidate and completer progression, and support continuous, sustained and evidence-based improvement. The QAS has been developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. It is overseen by the Division Director and Accreditation Coordinator. The EPP maintains fidelity to the established system to collect and analyze data, determine actions, collaborate with stakeholders, and ensuring validity and reliability of program key assessments. The EPP's Quality Assurance System is cyclical in nature to ensure ongoing and continuous improvement and is guided by data from the EPP's Candidate Progress Assessment Process (CFAP), EPP Progression Points, and internal and external reporting timeframes. The EPP established validity for all field assessments using the Lawshe Method. All the EPP created field assessments were revised by the faculty and a few university supervisors during the 2018-2019 academic year. The revised field assessments were presented to the EPP's advisory council which engaged in the content

validity study of each assessment. A reliability training module was developed for faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Rater training occurs when a new assessment is introduced and includes a review of the assessment instrument and scoring guidelines. Most new assessment rater training occurs in-person or via virtual meetings. Raters are provided with an explanation of the assessments, their use in the program, and performance expectations according to progress in the program. Further, as previously mentioned, the EPP uses three measures that are implemented by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) under the House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1388 and 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 the IDOE website and the USF website for public view. In addition, the EPP uses state and federal annual reporting measures (Title II and HEA 1388) to inform practices and planning.

Section 6. EPP's Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-level) Transition Plans

Please share any continuous improvement initiatives at the EPP, AND (if applicable) provide CAEP with an update on the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans.

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 two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

In response to stakeholder feedback and identified need, the EPP implemented a new course (EDUC 209- Foundations in Learning Modalities) in Spring 2022. The course focuses on Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and effective online pedagogical practices. The course requires candidates to utilize Learning Management Systems (LMS) in order to effectively transition to the P-12 classroom after program completion. After course implementation, content and results were shared with the Teacher Education Advisor Council (TEAC). TEAC agreed with the effectiveness of the change to programming. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) renewed approval for the undergraduate Elementary Program and Master of Arts in Teaching and Transition to Teaching programs in Secondary Education. Due to the teacher shortage and candidate interest, the EPP decided to add an intense intervention licensure pathway for undergraduate candidates. Stakeholders indicated the need to add intense intervention criteria to the Learning Delivery Checklist assessment (LDC) to evaluate teacher competencies in intense intervention. The EPP is collaborating with stakeholders to develop intense intervention criteria. Based on comments during the validity study, university supervisors expressed the need to better understand UDL. The EPP developed a UDL refresher training module.

6.1.2 Optional Comments

A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of progress on phase-in/transition plans if applicable (This is optional and for the EPP's records as it prepares for the next CAEP review).

-  **R3.2_EDUC_209_Syllabus.docx**
-  **R5.2.2_USF_Elementary_State_Review.pdf**
-  **R5.2.3_State_Review_USF_Secondary_MAT_and_T2T.pdf**
-  **R5.2.1_Lesson_Delivery_Checklist.docx**
-  **R3.1_Early_Start_T2T_Intense.docx**
-  **R5.2.2_USF_Field_Experience_Website_with_UDL_Training.docx**

Section 8: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

8.1 . [OPTIONAL] Just as CAEP asks EPPs to reflect on their work towards continuous improvement, CAEP endeavors to improve its own practices. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information to identify areas of priority in assisting EPPs.

8.1 Questions: Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?

No, completing SSR 6/29/2023

8.2 Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2023 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages are up to date and accurate at the time of submission..*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Kelly Rothgeb

Position: Accreditation Coordinator

Phone: 260-399-7700 x8415

E-mail: korthgeb@sf.edu

Secondary Contact Person for Annual Report Feedback*(Notification of Annual Report Feedback will be sent to the report preparer and the secondary contact person listed to ensure receipt of feedback in the event of EPP turnover.)*

Name: Mary Riepenhoff

Position: Director of Division of Education

Phone: 260-399-7700 x8409

E-mail: mriepenhoff@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.

See [CAEP Accreditation Policy](#)

Acknowledge