

OVERVIEW

Based upon feedback and questions provided by the CAEP review team in its Formative Feedback Report (FFR), it was determined that additional information regarding Purdue University Northwest (PNW) may be helpful in understanding the Educator Preparation Program (EPP), its context, and the steps we have taken to provide evidence that demonstrates how our candidates meet requirements outlined in the CAEP standards of accreditation.

Becoming PNW

Prior to March 4, 2016, there were two regional campuses providing educational opportunities to students in Northwest Indiana-- Purdue Calumet (Hammond) and Purdue North Central (Westville). Each campus had over 70 years of growth and accomplishments subsequent to their inception as university extension operations following World War II. An announcement to unify these two institutions came on February 26, 2014 as a way for the institution to capture savings and opportunities by creating a higher quality regional campus. The unification was approved by Purdue University Board of Trustees on July 18, 2014. Administration and faculty members began the two year process of unification. Finally, on March 4, 2016 the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) recognized Purdue University Northwest as an institution. With the start of the next fiscal year, July 1, 2016, PNW began the final internal processes of unification with the selection of chancellor. With unification, the EPP undertook the yearlong process of curricular change, which involved housing all secondary programs within the content/disciplinary areas in which licensure is sought. A graphic of the unification process as well as accreditation processes has been provided (SSRA OE.1a- PNW Timeline).

CAEP policy indicates that reviews for unified/merged campuses occur following the timeline of the institution that was first recognized. In the case of PNW, this meant that an accreditation review would follow that of Purdue North Central (Westville) and occur during the fall 2019 semester. Since unification had just occurred, and with new leadership (i.e., a new Dean of the College of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (CHESS) and a new Director of the School of Education and Counseling) starting on July 1, 2017, the EPP sought deferral of the CAEP accreditation review for PNW (SSRA OE.1b- CAEP deferral request letter) on August 21, 2017. On November 9, 2017 we received a one-year deferral of the accreditation visit based upon a good cause extension (SSRA OE.1c- Purdue University Northwest_CAEP GCE Request Approval Letter; SSRA OE.1d- CAEP Response to Purdue University Northwest_CAEP GCE Request).

While the good cause extension request by the SoEC was being determined, we sought additional clarification from CAEP regarding the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Program Review with National Recognition process (SSRA OE.1e- CAEP SPA approval; SSRA OE.1f- accreditation email and Assistance with Program Review email). With receipt of the response, program areas began the SPA review submission process to align with the 3-year timeframe outlined in the CAEP Handbook. SPA reviews were submitted as follows: (SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet)

- September 2017
 - CEC SPA Undergraduate (initial review)

- March 2018
 - ACEI SPA: Hammond elementary education (initial review)
 - ACEI SPA: Westville elementary education (initial review)
 - NAEYC SPA (initial review)
- September 2018
 - CEC SPA Graduate Mild (initial)
 - CEC SPA Graduate Intense (initial)
 - NCTE SPA (initial review)
- February/March 2019
 - ACEI SPA (response to conditions)
 - NAEYC SPA (recognized with conditions)
 - CEC SPA Undergraduate (response to conditions)
 - CEC SPA Graduate Mild (recognized with conditions)
 - CEC SPA Graduate Intense (recognized with conditions)
- August/September 2019
 - ACEI SPA (recognized with conditions)
 - CEC SPA Undergraduate (nationally recognized)
 - Low enrolled programs submitted to state (initial review)
 - Transition to Teach submitted to state (initial review)
 - NAEYC SPA (response to conditions)
- February/March 2020
 - NAEYC (nationally recognized)
 - NCTE SPA (response to conditions)
- July 2020
 - Low enrolled programs state (continued state recognition)
 - Transition to Teach (continued state recognition “at risk” status)
- August 2020
 - NCTE SPA (nationally recognized)

While CAEP was having difficulties recognizing us as a new institution (e.g., separate submission of ACEI reports for elementary education programs on both campuses), so too was the state of Indiana. Data and information for the state was requested by campus (often the former institutional recognition-- PUC or PNC), and reports from the state followed a similar process (i.e., two reports for singular programs). Further, the state review process for low-enrolled programs, those occurring primarily in the secondary licensure areas at PNW, was supposed to have been fully integrated in the spring of 2019. There are several instances where this integration of data continues to be a barrier (e.g., Taskstream, Pearson edReports). Beginning in the spring of 2020 information from the state is now generated for PNW (SSRA OE.1g- IDOE PNW 1388 Report 2020). A visual timeline has been created that highlights the journey that PNW has taken in creating a unified curriculum and campus experience for candidates (SSRA OE.1a- PNW Timeline).

Evidence: SSRA OE.1a- PNW Timeline; SSRA OE.1b- CAEP deferral request letter; SSRA OE.1c- Purdue University Northwest_CAEP GCE Request Approval Letter; SSRA OE.1d- CAEP Response to Purdue University Northwest_CAEP GCE Request; SSRA OE.1e- CAEP SPA approval; SSRA OE.1f- accreditation email and Assistance with Program Review email; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA OE.1g- IDOE PNW 1388 Report 2020

Responding to Formative Feedback

Purdue University Northwest has organized this response to the formative feedback presented in the Formative Feedback Report (FFR) by standard or theme. The EPP response to areas for improvement and/or stipulations are at the beginning of each section. Responses to reviewers' requests for clarification of the SSR, for additional evidence and/or data are categorized by "tasks." Concerns were addressed through new data, and/or a more thorough explanation of existing data. When possible, evidence is grouped into a combined document by topic.

STANDARD ONE: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Standard One Area for Improvement

1. **Area for Improvement:** EPP stated that the lesson plan is a means to meet the expectation that candidates develop proficiencies associated with design and implementation of college and career readiness teaching using multiple measures and no evidence is provided about the validity and reliability of the lesson plan. (Component 1.4).

Rationale According to the CAEP Handbook (97) sufficient level requires multiple measures of data with analysis disaggregated by race and ethnicity as well as by program.

Evidence SSRA1.1a- Alignment Chart with EPP Programs and InTASC Standards; SSRA1.1b - Alignment Chart for Program Courses and InTASC Standards; SSRA 1.1c- SOEC Templates; SSRA 1.1d- Sample Course Outline; SSRA 1.1e- Sample Course Syllabus; SSRA 1.1f- Catalog of Assessments; SSRA 1.1g- PAKA Standard Alignment; SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook; SSRA 1.3.a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA 1.5a- SoEC ISTE Integration; SSRA 3.5b-STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.3h Niagara Data; SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle AY20-21; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups AY20-21.

EPP Clarification: The Educator Preparation Program at PNW has adopted a variety of tools to assess candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions, including proficiency in designing and implementing instruction for college and career readiness. Data is now disaggregated by program area for analysis, as well as in the aggregate as shown in sample assessment charts such as the presentation of edTPA data, STOT data and disposition data (e.g., SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 3.5b- STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.3h Niagara Data).

[Task 1] The EPP is committed to the InTASC Standards and has aligned the programs to both InTASC and SPA Standards (SSRA1.1.a- Alignment Chart with EPP Programs and InTASC

Standards) to ensure that candidates in all programs demonstrate an understanding of the InTASC standards and their relation to the professional standards. The EPP has also aligned program courses to the InTASC Standards (SSRA1.1b- Alignment Chart for Program Courses and InTASC Standards). This alignment shows a developmental progression, indicating when each standard is introduced (I), explored (E) and when proficiency is expected (P). The EPP has developed uniform templates to ensure that alignment with the InTASC and SPA standards exists in the programs and courses. (SSRA 1.1c- SOEC Templates). Using the master alignment chart, course outlines are prepared (SSRA1.1d- Sample Course Outline) to ensure that all standards are met and that alignment with both the InTASC and SPA standards is clear. To provide a consistent and coherent experience for candidates, faculty use the course outlines to develop course syllabi, incorporating the appropriate learning outcomes and standards. (SSRA1.1e- Sample Course Syllabus; SSRA1.1f- Catalog of Assessments).

[Task 2] The EPP submitted reports for national recognition to the following Specialty Professional Associations: NAEYC, ACEI, CEC and NCTE. (SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet). The timeline and decisions for these reports are outlined on the first page of the EPP SPA Spreadsheet. In 2019, the EPP also submitted reports for state review of low-enrolled programs, and secondary initial licensure programs, including: Mathematics, Social Studies, Chemistry, Life Science, Physics, World Language – French and World Language - Spanish. Programs that achieved national recognition include: Early Childhood (NAEYC); Special Education (CEC) and Secondary English (NCTE). In July, 2020, the following low-enrolled programs were granted continued recognition by the state: Mathematics, Social Studies, Chemistry, Life Science, Physics, World Language – French and World Language - Spanish. The Elementary Education program was initially submitted to ACEI with no opportunity for resubmission. In response to the transition from ACEI to CAEP Elementary Education standards, the course syllabi for elementary education now include the CAEP Elementary Education Standards (SSRA1.1e- Sample Course Syllabus).

The EPP has adopted “Signature Assessments” which are used by *all* program areas and allow for EPP-wide analysis of candidate performance relative to CAEP Preparation Standards. The Signature Assessments include: Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), state licensure exams (CORE), Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT), Niagara University’s Disposition Instrument (Niagara), the EPP Candidate Interview and the NExT Exit Survey. These Signature Assessments are differentiated from the Program Area Key Assessments (PAKA). The Program Area Key Assessments are used within *specific* program areas to measure candidate performance relative to SPA standards and InTASC standards. The Program Area Key Assessments, as used in the SPA reports, are aligned with the InTASC and SPA standards (SSRA 1.1g- PAKA Standard Alignment).

[Task 3] The EPP and program areas within it examine candidate performance on the edTPA for evidence that they are able to use research and evidence to develop an understanding of teaching and how it can be used to guide their professional practice. Specific attention is given to candidate performance on edTPA rubrics 3, 10 and 15. These three rubrics require that candidates

use: their knowledge of students to justify their instructional plans (Task 1, Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning—CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, and 3.3); the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction (Task 2, Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness—CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, and 3.6); and the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction (Task 3, Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction—CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, and 3.6).

Following the pilot of the edTPA with each program area, the EPP established and re-established proficiency criteria for candidate performance on this capstone experience (SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary). Currently, candidates are considered to be meeting the EPP required level of performance on this assessment if they receive a composite score of 39. To achieve this threshold, candidates typically must receive a score of 3 on 9 of the 15 rubrics.

An examination of candidate performance on rubric 3, indicates that candidates are approaching a target performance level of 3. This level of performance indicates that candidates are able to make explicit connections between the learning tasks, students' prior academic learning, their assets, and research and/or theory in their justifications for use of instructional materials, as well as in their adaptations of the learning tasks and materials. Within individual program areas, this target has been met several times, although candidate performance has been inconsistent. Further, candidate performance on this rubric at the EPP level currently is a 2.84, indicating that candidates' performance is approaching target. Candidate performance continues to improve in this area. (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Summary).

Additionally, an examination of candidate performance on rubric 10, indicates that candidates have improved greatly over time, although, they have not yet attained the target performance level of 3. A level 3 performance on this rubric would indicate that candidates are able to analyze the instruction they provide for missed opportunities, identify changes that they would implement to improve student learning, provide explanation of these changes with evidence of student learning and principles from theory and/or research. Currently, none of the program areas have attained the target level performance. However, evidence illustrates that there has been a consistent level of improvement (i.e., increase in average scores on this rubric) across all program areas. At the EPP level, the last three iterations of the assessment illustrate a consistency in candidate performance ranging from 2.56-2.6 a dramatic improvement from the first use of this assessment, a 2.1 (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook).

Further, an examination of candidate performance on rubric 15, indicates that candidates' abilities to use assessment to inform instruction have increased overtime. Candidates in the elementary education and early childhood program areas consistently meet the target level of performance (i.e., a 3) on this rubric. Secondary and special education candidates are less consistent in performance on this rubric, although candidates in both program areas are approaching the target level. This is reflected in the EPP average performance score on this rubric of 2.73 which illustrates a tremendous amount of growth from the first assessment period when the average was a 2.05 (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook).

The EPP uses the data from the edTPA rubrics 3, 5 and 10 to demonstrate that candidates use research and evidence to guide their professional practice. The edTPA Assignment Guideline and

rubrics have been developed by SCALE as part of this proprietary assessment (i.e., edTPA Handbook). The rubrics specifically address candidate knowledge of students to justify instructional plans as well as candidates' analysis of students' knowledge and skills as part of the instructional planning and assessment processes.

[Task 4] With the EPP-wide Signature Assessments, all program areas share common tools to assess and analyze candidate performance relative to CAEP Preparation Standards (SSRA1.1f- Catalog of Assessments). For assessment of candidate performance as related to the respective SPA standards, programs have the prerogative to select assessments, Program Area Key Assessments - PAKAs, to demonstrate a standard has been met (SSRA1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA 1.1g- PAKA Standard Alignment). Some programs have similar assessments to provide evidence that candidates are prepared to become effective educators. For example, the Early Childhood program (NAEYC) and the Elementary Education program (ACEI/CAEP) each use a lesson plan collection to fulfill the requirement for SPA Report Assessment #2 (Program Area Content Knowledge Assessment) and Assessment #3 (Program Area Planning Assessment). Lesson plan assessments are not part of the EPP's Signature Assessments. Instead, these assessments are used by program/licensure areas as one part of their efforts to meet the respective, specific Specialized Professional Association requirements. The EPP tracks candidate performance on these assessments only so far as it fulfills the Program Area Key Assessment role (SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet) and ensures that it is used for analysis and interpretation of data for program/licensure area improvement during Program Data Dialogue Days (SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups).

[Task 5] The EPP established a Technology Taskforce, composed of faculty, PNW staff with expertise in instructional technology as well as clinical partners serving as district technology coordinators. After an audit of course syllabi and the program plans of study, the Task Force recommended that the ISTE Standards be integrated into the programs with consideration for developmental progression (SSRA 1.5a- SoEC ISTE Integration). This integration occurs throughout the programs: in pre-program course work, prior to formal admission to the program; during early courses prior to methods courses with significant clinical placements; in the methods courses; and during the professional year and capstone experience. Similar to the alignment of the InTASC standards, the alignment with the ISTE Standards reveals a developmental progression, indicating when each standard is introduced (I), explored (E) and when proficiency is expected (P). Although, all course syllabi reference technology and diversity integration as these are cross-cutting themes.

STANDARD TWO: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Standard Two Stipulations

1. **Stipulation:** The EPP stated that it provided professional development tailored for specific partner needs to support and retain high-quality clinical educators. No evidence of these professional development sessions were submitted.

Rationale: No evidence of how the EPP determined clinical educators' needs in order to design professional development sessions was submitted. (Component 2.2)

Evidence: SSRA 2.1a- Connections with Volunteers; SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up; SSRA 2.2b- Beveridge CNA & SIP; SSRA 2.2c- Beveridge PD Communication; SSRA 2.2d- Beveridge PD Calendar; SSRA 2.2e- PD Example; SSRA 2.2f- Evaluation Data Explanation; SSRA 2.2g- University Supervisor Evaluation; SSRA 2.2h- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation; SSRA 2.2i- edTPA pilot LP Template; SSRA 2.2j- Revisions to MSTOT; SSRA 2.2k- FAQs IDOE PGPs; SSRA 2.2l- PGP Experience Documentation; SSRA 2.3a- OPO Handbook

EPP Clarification: [Task 8] Professional development provided by the EPP that is tailored for the needs of partners occurs in a number of ways. One example highlights the EPP's work with the Gary Community School Corporation (GCSC) (SSRA 2.1a- Connections with Volunteers). This collaboration began with an interaction to assist the district in meeting its hiring needs, grew to the placement of candidates in classrooms, and expanded to working with the leadership of the district to conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the development of a School Improvement Plan for an elementary school (Beveridge Elementary) (SSRA 2.2b- Beveridge CNA & SIP). Faculty members from the SoEC developed and offered professional development sessions at the school, connecting the faculty and the clinical educators around a common goal and shared professional learning (SSRA 2.2c- Beveridge PD Communication; SSRA 2.2d- Beveridge PD Calendar). An example of this professional development, a presentation about brain development and adverse childhood experiences (ACES), illustrates the content of the professional development sessions to meet the district-identified needs (SSRA 2.2e- PD Example). This type of engagement with a specific district and/or school exemplifies how the EPP works with partners to support and retain high-quality clinical education.

Another way that professional development opportunities are provided to support Clinical Educators are based upon changes made by the EPP in programming, assessment, and/or feedback from semester evaluations (SSRA 2.2f- Evaluation Data Explanation; SSRA 2.2g- University Supervisor Evaluation; SSRA 2.2h- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation). For example, at the EPP Fall Data Dialogue Day in October 2019, training was provided for university clinical educators related to Signature Assessments (i.e., Niagara Dispositions Assessment, edTPA, and STOT) based upon evaluations of and feedback from clinical educators. As a result of this training, the EPP identified the following outcomes: reduced number of indicators assessed on earlier administrations of the STOT (i.e., in early and mid-program field placements, as well as the timing of the administration of this tool); and integration of language from the edTPA within coursework and interactions with candidates, with a piloting of unified lesson plan template occurring (SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up).

[Task 5] Evidence is provided to show how the EPP revisits and implements feedback from data dialogue days (SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up). Included in red font are actions taken by the EPP to address the feedback from clinical educators during the meeting.

Additionally, examples of these actions are included (SSRA 2.2i- edTPA LP Template; SSRA 2.2j- Revisions to MSTOT).

[Task 7] The Office of Partnership and Outreach Handbook (OPO) describes how evaluation surveys are administered in the clinical environment (SSRA 2.3a- OPO Handbook). Candidates, Cooperating Teachers, and University Supervisors evaluate one another during the experience. Evaluations of Candidates, conducted by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, are used in conjunction with other field-based tools (e.g., Niagara Dispositions, STOT/MSTOT) to determine their preparedness for the profession. Evaluation of Cooperating Teachers are conducted by both Candidates and University Supervisors to determine their “fit” with the EPP (e.g., mentoring and support, collaboration in planning and delivery of lessons, communications, inclusivity, and positivity). The University Supervisors are evaluated by the Candidates and the Cooperating Teachers to determine their ability to serve as a liaison between the Candidate, the Cooperating Teacher and the University (e.g., mentoring and support, professional example, communication, and professionalism). In this way, each role in the field-based triad provides input and feedback to the others. Data tables, created to combine this data (i.e., the two evaluations), are reviewed by the OPO and then used to make data-informed decisions on continued roles as University Supervisors and/or Cooperating Teachers and/or professional development needed for the upcoming semester (SSRA 2.2f- Evaluation Data Explanation; SSRA 2.2g- University Supervisor Evaluation; SSRA 2.2h- Cooperating Teacher Evaluation).

[Task 10] As a means to recognize their service to the profession, the Cooperating Teachers who mentor and support Candidates from the EPP are provided with Professional Growth Plan (PGP) points (SSRA 2.2k- FAQs IDOE PGPs). PGPs and the earning of points towards the fulfillment of that plan is one method for renewing an educator license and therefore motivation to participate in working with candidates. Further, PGPs serve as a record of an educator’s professional growth/ development and demonstrate that educators are engaging in professional activities, remaining current on educational reforms and trends. The number of PGP points required for renewal varies depending on the type of license an educator holds:

- A 90 point PGP is required for
 - Renewal of a five- or ten-year educator license
 - Renewal of a two-year Initial Practitioner license for the third time
- A 40 point GP is required for converting a two year Initial Practitioner license to a five year Practitioner license

The Indiana Department of Education provides the guidance that one clock hour qualifies for one PGP point based upon the professional growth experience (e.g., curriculum development, college credit, educational publication and/or research, mentoring new teacher, serving as a cooperating teacher, etc.) (SSRA 2.2l- PGP Experience Documentation).

2. **Stipulation:** The EPP submitted a static screenshot of the Site Tracker of the EPP or STEPP to demonstrate its ability to ensure all students have experiences at various grade levels and in various subject areas in diverse settings. The EPP states that the Office of Partnership and

Outreach has specified diversity criteria for field placement sites that includes a 50% or higher diversity requirement however, no data on the diversity of partner sites was submitted.
(Component 2.3)

Rationale: While the screenshot from the STEPP did display the grade level and subject area for each placement, there was no diversity information readily available on each placement in this piece of evidence. No evidence supporting the EPP's requirement of 50% or more of diversity in the stated areas was submitted. No data to demonstrate the implementation of these requirements were submitted.

Evidence: SSRA2.3b- 2019-2020 School Site Data; SSRA 2.3d- EPP Placement Guide; SSRA 2.3e- Student Teaching Placement Process Flow Chart; SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook

EPP Clarification: Key features of the Site Tracker for the EPP (STEPP) are the demographic data for the schools and districts in which candidates are placed and the placement/field experience that the placement occurs within. Racial/ethnic identification, socioeconomic status (i.e., free/reduced lunch), special education needs, bilingual/ELL population, and school categorization (i.e., rural, urban, suburban) are gathered and/or updated when MOAs are signed/renewed (SSRA 2.3b- 2019-2020 School Site Data). Information about candidates' placements are updated each semester by the OPO to ensure that during their programs of study candidates have a variety of experiences, to include 50% or more of their placements occurring in diverse sites. Documentation in the STEPP is used to ensure that this occurs; however, its sheer size makes it difficult to share as a file. [Task 4] Therefore, this tool and its use will be demonstrated during the onsite visit.

[Task 11] The Office of Partnerships and Outreach (OPO) follows the EPP Field Placement Guide when making field placements across candidates' programs of study (SSRA 2.3d- EPP Placement Guide). To further illustrate the process for placing student teachers, a flowchart outlines the steps taken by the OPO to make placements, the topics/content of meetings occurring prior to placement, as well as the placement and selection process (SSRA 2.3e- Student Teaching Process Flow Chart).

[Task 3] The School of Education and Counseling Education Candidate Handbook (SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook) has been provided. This Handbook is distributed to all *education pathway students* (i.e., new students entering Purdue University Northwest who have indicated education as a possible major) and shares information about the entirety of the educator preparation experience including requirements, technical and professional standards, degree maps, field experiences, student teaching, etc. It is also available online through the SoEC website.

Standard Two Areas for Improvement

1. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP did not provide multiple examples of completed Partnership Agreements (MOA) with partner districts. (Component 2.1)

Rationale: The EPP indicated the Partnership Agreements were designed based on a site's specific district needs; however, only the template of a universal MOA was submitted as evidence.

Evidence: SSRA 2.1b- MOA Process with a School Partner; SSRA 2.1c- MOA 20.21 Merrillville; SSRA 2.1d MOA 19.20 Gary; SSRA 2.1a- Connections with Volunteers; SSRA 2.1e- Contact Log: Clinical Experiences

EPP Clarification: Additional examples of MOAs with partner districts are provided (SSRA 2.1c- MOA 20.21 Merrillville; SSRA 2.1d- MOA 19.20 Gary). While all MOAs follow a similar format and include universal information somewhat uniformly, the MOA creation process is actually a unique process for each district and is dependent upon their needs and policies. Through meetings and conversations with school leadership and faculty members at PNW, the OPO drafts the MOA to include language that represents the needs/wants of both groups, timeframes for the agreement, requirements, etc. As an iterative process, the document evolves until both parties are satisfied with the document (SSRA 2.1b- MOA Process with a School Partner; SSRA 2.1e- Contact Log: Clinical Experiences).

[Task 9] Illustrative of the uniqueness of arrangements with partner districts is the EPPs engagement at Beveridge Elementary in the Gary Schools Corporation (SSRA 2.1a- Connections with Volunteers article). Over the course of two-years, the relationship between the EPP and this school evolved from having no/little interaction to piloting an innovation in the teaching experience. This evolution was only able to occur due to collaboration between the partner district and the EPP.

2. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP included minutes from two spring 2019 Advisory Board meetings and two fall 2019 EPP Forum meetings as evidence, but no previous minutes of these types of meetings were included. (Component 2.1)

Rationale: Three cycles of minutes from these meetings held each semester, along with analysis, reflection, and further action based on these minutes would be needed to demonstrate a shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

Evidence: SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings; SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums

EPP Clarification: Prior to 2019, opportunities for schools, districts, and community partners to engage with the EPP were limited to individual meetings typically convened to address a concern. This approach limited the ability of the EPP to engage the broader pool of individuals who were interested in improving education within Northwest Indiana. With the intent of sharing information about the EPP (e.g., candidate performance data, programming, research/study, etc.),

gaining community buy-in and assistance, establishing/re-establishing communication channels, and transparency, the first EPP Forum was held in June 2019. EPP Forums are meetings where ideas and views are exchanged, and where the EPP and members of the community are able to talk about issues related to the preparation of future educators. [Task 1] Provided are minutes from three EPP Forums and actions undertaken and/or proposed following these meetings (SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings; SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums)

- 3. Area for Improvement:** The EPP states that Data Dialogue Days, Program Advisory Board meetings, and EPP Forum meetings allow partners to review data and make decisions regarding assessment instruments and overall candidate performance; however, it is not clear from the meeting minutes what partners attended. (Component 2.3)

Rationale: Meeting minutes submitted list attendees by name, and EPP faculty and staff are sometimes identified in the minutes themselves, but the roles, titles, and partnership site information is not included in the list of meeting attendees. This information would be needed to establish these meetings as evidence of co-construction and a shared responsibility for the design and continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

Evidence: SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up; SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings; SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums; SSRA 2.3f- Glitter Agendas; SSRA 2.3a- OPO Handbook

EPP Clarification: Minutes are provided that include the names, roles, titles, and partnership sites for those who participated in Data Dialogue Days and EPP forums (SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up; SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings).

[Task 2] The Office of Partnerships and Outreach (OPO) “Glitter Meeting” agendas have been provided.

[Task 6] The Office of Partnerships and Outreach (OPO) Handbook has been provided (SSRA 2.3a- OPO Handbook). This document includes the policies and procedures used by the OPO to ensure that the EPP has effective partnerships that provide high-quality experiences for candidates.

STANDARD THREE: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Standard Three *Stipulations*

- 1. Stipulation:** The EPP did not provide 3 cycles of documentation of cohort average on CAEP criteria for GPA or performance on a national normed test of academic achievement. The EPP did not provide data, disaggregated by specialty licensure area, as well as aggregated.(Component 3.2)

Rationale: All data evidence disaggregated by specialty licensure area (as well as aggregated) and three cycles of analyzed data are required components.

Evidence: SSRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables; SSRA 3.2b- EPP Analysis Academic Achievement

EPP Clarification: Candidates meet or exceed performance of the EPP average on the CAEP criteria for academic achievement (SSRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables; SSRA 3.2b- EPP Analysis Academic Achievement).

One measure used by the EPP to ensure this is the grade point average (GPA) of candidates at point of admission (i.e., at the point o interview) and again at the end of their professional courses (i.e., the end of the semester immediately preceding student teaching/internship). In aggregate, the average GPA for candidates is a 3.16 at point of admission and a 3.43 at the end of their professional coursework (Tables 7 and 8 in SSRA: 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables). When examining performance at these points by program/licensure area, there is only one program/licensure area in which only candidates do not meet the criteria- Secondary Education-Life Sciences (GPA: 2.91). This is a low enrolled program area that did not have candidates entering student teaching in the spring 2020 semester. In general, candidates in low enrolled programs tend to have lower GPAs at point of entry. However, as is the case with the other program/licensure areas, the candidates all increase their GPAs by the time they are admitted to their student teaching/internship semester. While the EPP is not able to examine the growth of candidates from point of admission to point of student teaching with this dataset (i.e., the interview process was enacted after candidates entering student teaching/internship were already admitted), it does illustrate that candidates in all but one program/licensure areas meet the GPA requirements on the three cycles of data analyzed.

Prior to July 1, 2019, it was mandatory for candidates to meet requirements of minimum competency for admission into all EPPs in the state. A candidate could meet this requirement by scoring 220 or higher on each of the three subtests (Reading, Math, and Writing) for the Core Academic Skills Assessment (CASA); 24 or higher on the ACT; 1100 or higher on the SAT; or a 301 on the GRE. The EPP at PNW has continued to use requirements of minimum competencies for admission. Beginning in Fall 2020, requirements for the EPP were: 220 on subtests of CASA, 22 or higher on ACT, 1100 or higher on the SAT, or a 301 on the GRE. As is evident in Table 12 (SRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables) candidates exceed the minimum competency requirements for admission to the EPP. When analyzed individually, candidates across all program/licensure areas meet or exceed these requirements. If a prospective candidate does not meet the requirements at the point of interview, they are not admitted into the program. Instead, they are encouraged to pursue additional coursework in areas of low performance, attend test preparation sessions/workshops, and/or work with individual faculty members before attempting the assessments again.

The EPP uses performance on the CORE pedagogy and content assessments and the edTPA, both occurring at the end of their plans of study to further illustrate candidates' academic achievement. Data presented in Table 10: CORE Pass Rates (SRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables) indicate that over a three-year-period, 89% of candidates have met the requirements for the CORE Pedagogy exam and 81% of candidates have met the requirements for the CORE Content exam. On both assessments, the average score for candidates exceeds the 220 required by the state (i.e., average 239 pedagogy and average 230 content). An examination of the data for program/licensure areas shows that candidate performance on the CORE Pedagogy assessment for their program/licensure area is the strongest, with 83% of candidates in Early Childhood, 88% of candidates in Elementary Education, and 95% of candidates in Secondary Education meeting this requirement. Curricular changes have been proposed and/or enacted across programs within the EPP in an attempt to meet the demands of this assessment and continue to increase candidate performance.

Finally, the EPP utilizes the edTPA, a subject-specific assessment of candidates' ability to demonstrate readiness for full-time classroom teaching, as a means for evaluating academic achievement and ability at the end of their plan of study. To meet EPP expectations, candidates must score a composite score of 39 or higher on the edTPA. In aggregate, over three cycles of data collection, as shown on Table 11 edTPA Data (SRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables), the average performance of candidates within the EPP exceeds program expectations. Examined at the program/licensure area-level, the impact of low enrollments within program/licensure area is clear. The three program areas whose average composite scores did not meet program expectations are all in secondary program areas (i.e., Spanish, Science, and Math), with a low enrollment of candidates. However, the remaining program/licensure areas perform well on this assessment, far surpassing EPP program requirements. Discussion about increasing the requirements has occurred and it has been decided to wait until the impact of secondary curricular changes are able to be examined.

Candidates' performance on measures at point of admission to the EPP, prior to entry to student teaching/internship, and within the final semester (i.e., student teaching/internship), all indicate that at the EPP-level they meet or exceed CAEP requirements for GPA, state/EPP requirements for minimum competency skills (i.e., Reading, Writing, and Math), licensure exams, and the edTPA. Low-enrolled programs appear to reflect the negative and positive impacts of candidate performance more strongly than those program/licensure areas with more robust enrollments. While it is tempting to overemphasize candidate performance in these program/licensure areas (e.g., Math, Social Studies), curricular changes have been enacted within the secondary licensure areas to begin to improve candidates' ability to meet EPP requirements.

[Tasks 6, 7, and 10] Information has been reviewed for accuracy and completeness regarding candidate ethnicity, gender, graduate point average, and assessment performances for the EPP (SSRA 3.2a- EPP Ethnicity, Gender, GPA, Assessment Performance Tables).

2. **Stipulation:** The EPP did not provide checkpoints for evaluating dispositions of its candidates throughout their programs of study in the 3.3 evidence. The EPP did not provide three cycles of data on monitoring attributes and dispositions beyond admission to the program. (Component 3.3)

Rationale: Checkpoints for evaluating disposition and three cycles of data on monitoring are required components of 3.3.

Evidence: SSRA 3.3a- Professional Dispositions Summary; SSRA 3.3b- Dispositions Niagara; SSRA 3.3c- Disposition Scorer Training Minutes; SSRA 3.3d- Disposition Reliability Validity; SSRA 3.3e- Professional Dispositions AY18.19; SSRA 3.3f- Dispositions AY18.19 EPP Program; SSRA 3.3g- Field Guide; SSRA 3.3h- Niagara Data; SSRA 3.3i- Admission Retention Process; SSRA 3.3j- Smoky Room Minutes SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook

EPP Clarification: The assessment of candidate dispositions has evolved over time (SSRA 3.3a- Professional Dispositions Summary). Initially, an EPP-created assessment was used. However, the EPP found it challenging to meet the “sufficient level” criteria outlined in the *CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessment* (SSRA 3.3c- Disposition Scorer Training Minutes; SSRA 3.3d- Disposition Reliability Validity). Further, while data was collected using the EPP-created assessment, difficulties occurred in interpreting that data for use in evaluation and improvement at the EPP- and program/licensure-levels. (SSRA 3.3e- Professional Dispositions AY18.19; SSRA 3.3f- Dispositions AY18.19 EPP Program).

Therefore, the Niagara Dispositions Assessment was selected for implementation in the fall 2019 (SSRA 3.3b- Dispositions Niagara). Candidates’ dispositions using the Niagara Dispositions Assessment (NDA) area assessed a minimum of four times throughout a candidate’s program using the courses identified by each program area (SSRA 3.3a- Professional Dispositions Summary). These courses are listed on the assessment tool (SSRA 3.3b- Dispositions Niagara) and the NDA is included as Appendix E within the Field Guides (SSRA 3.3g- Field Guide). The default score for candidate performance is a “3- No evidence to believe otherwise.” Candidates’ performance across the six criteria for each “Theme” (Theme I: Professional Commitment and Responsibility; Theme II: Professional Relationships; and Theme II: critical Thinking and Reflective Practice) are examined. If any candidate receives three or more indicators as being “2- Somewhat Disagree” or one or more indicators evaluated as a “1- Disagree,” the process to initiate a Dispositions Intervention Plan (DIP) is triggered. The DIP is created collaboratively between the candidate and the Field Placement Coordinator. The Office of Partnerships and Outreach monitors candidates’ completion of DIPs, recording completion on the STAR Report. If a DIP is not completed and/or if dispositional concerns persist, the candidate may be referred to the Student Affairs Committee and a Student Performance Review (SPR) completed.

Data for candidates not meeting program expectations (average “theme” scores of 3 or higher) and data for candidates who far exceed program expectations (average “theme” scores of 5) are compiled for review at the EPP- and program/licensure- levels (SSRA 3.3h- Niagara Data). Data is organized by the anticipated graduation semester to ensure that all dispositional concerns are

included in analysis (e.g., pre-admission, early, mid, and late). For example, data for candidates graduating in fall 2019 is considered to be “late” in the program for candidates, while data for candidates projected to graduate in spring 2023 occurs at the “pre-admission” point.

Data are presented for the AY 2019-2020 administration of the Niagara Dispositions Assessment (SSRA 3.3h- Niagara Data) as well as for the EPP-created disposition assessment (SSRA 3.3e- Professional Dispositions AY18.19; SSRA 3.3f- Dispositions AY18.19 EPP Program). Taken together, these represent the CAEP-required three cycles of data for the EPP. The Niagara Dispositions Assessment data will be analyzed as part of the fall 2020 EPP and Program Data Dialogue Days.

[Task 2] The EPP follows an admission/retention process that includes the use of data being collected and analyzed at various points (SSRA 3.3i- Admission Retention Process). A key feature of this process is the “Smoky Room,” an EPP-wide meeting launched in spring 2019. Smoky Rooms are meetings of faculty members convened each semester to share any concerns about candidates (SSRA 3.3j- Smoky Room Minutes). Information from these meetings are added to the STAR Report. This ensures that candidates with dispositional, ethical, grade or attendance issues are tracked and monitored. The STAR Report will be made available and its use will be demonstrated during the onsite visit.

The SoEC Student Handbook (SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook) is used to communicate to prospective and current candidates expectations (levels of both academic and non-academic performance) for admission and retention in the EPP. The degree maps included within this document (pp.11-13) provide visual representations of licensure area program progressions. Further, technical standards (pp. 14-15) are included to highlight the communication/interpersonal skills, affective skills, cognitive capabilities, and physical capabilities deemed essential by the EPP. Information regarding professional dispositions, the Niagara Disposition Assessment, and the Student Performance Review (SPR) process are also provided. Further, candidates receive field guides for each of their field placements where candidate expectations are articulated and shared (SSRA 3.3g- Field Guide).

3. **Stipulation:** The EPP did not provide three cycles of data on the proficiency level achievement on the Student Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) and impact on P-12 student learning and development in Standard 3 evidence. (Component 3.5)

Rationale: Impact on P-12 student learning is a required component for 3.5.

Evidence: SSRA 3.1a- REW; SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills of Teaching Observation of Tool InTASC; SSRA 3.5b- STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5c- Analysis of the STOT Performance Data; SSRA 3.5d- edTPA Proficiency; SSRA 3.5e- Statement of Acknowledgement; SSRA 3.5f- Confidentiality Agreement; SSRA 3.5g- edTPA Permission Form; SSRA 2.2a-EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up; SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook; SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet

EPP Clarification: The use of the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) was adopted and implemented during the fall 2018 semester. Three cycles of data for the EPP are provided, indicating average levels of performance on each of the standards at the EPP level and program levels (SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills of Teaching Observation of Tool InTASC; SSRA 3.5c- Analysis of the STOT). However, not all licensure programs within the EPP have candidates participating in their student teaching experience each semester which limits the number of data cycles available for review. Further, the number of candidates in these programs tends to be small making it difficult for generalizations about the program/licensure area's ability to prepare candidates to meet the ten (10) InTASC Standards. However, the EPP continues to collect, monitor and analyze data from this tool. Comparisons in performance across the program area (in the case of secondary licensure, T2T, graduate special education program areas) and/or semesters are made to inform program actions (in the case of Early Childhood Education in which student teaching only occurs during the spring semester). For this level of analysis, data are disaggregated and candidate proficiencies are examined to determine recommendations and next steps to be taken by program/licensure areas (SSRA 3.5b- STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5c- Analysis of the STOT Performance Data).

As a means to assess candidates' impact on P-12 learning, the EPP piloted the use of the edTPA during the spring of 2018 with candidates in the elementary education and early childhood education programs. The edTPA was subsequently piloted with other program areas and adopted as an EPP Signature Assessment (i.e., use with all program areas) in the spring 2019. Once the pilot semesters of the edTPA concluded, the EPP established and re-established proficiency criteria for candidate performance on this capstone experience (SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary). Five cycles of data for the EPP are provided which indicate levels of candidate performance on each of the edTPA Rubrics at the EPP level and program levels (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook). Similar to the STOT, not all licensure programs within the EPP have candidates participating in the student teaching experience each semester, limiting the number of data cycles available for review. Further, the number of candidates in these programs tends to be small making it difficult for generalizations about the program/licensure area's ability to prepare candidates who positively impact student learning since the sample size is small. However, the data are analyzed and comparisons in performance across the program area (in the case of secondary licensure/T2T, graduate special education program areas) and/or semesters are made to inform program actions (in the case of Early Childhood Education in which student teaching only occurs during the spring semester). For this level of analysis, data are disaggregated and candidate proficiencies are examined to determine recommendations and next steps to be taken by program/licensure areas (SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 3.5d- edTPA Proficiency).

[Task 4] Three cycles of data for the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool have been (SSRA 3.5b- STOT InTASC Proficiency) as well as three cycles of data for the edTPA (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook) have been provided.

[Task 8] The School of Education and Counseling Education Candidate Handbook (SSRA 2.3c- SoEC Student Handbook) is distributed to all *education pathway students* (i.e., new students entering Purdue University Northwest (PNW) who have indicated education as a possible major) and shares information about the entirety of the educator preparation experience (i.e., requirements, technical and professional standards, degree maps, field experiences, student teaching, etc.) Following an overview of this Handbook at an academic advising meeting, prospective candidates are required to read, sign, and return the “Statement of Acknowledgement” (page 48) indicating that they understand the technical standards and policies (SSRA 3.5e- Statement of Acknowledgement). Candidates’ completion of the Statement of Acknowledgement is documented as part of the STAR Report.

Additionally, for each course that includes a field component, candidates are required to complete a “Confidentiality Agreement” for retention in the SoEC (SSRA 3.5f- Confidentiality Agreement). In this agreement, candidates are reminded of the importance of restricting access to student information and the rights of individuals to have information about them be private. Finally, as part of the capstone experience candidates complete the edTPA and are required to collect and return to the SoEC releases for student participation (SSRA 3.5g- edTPA Permission Form). Each of these documents (i.e., the Statement of Acknowledgement; Confidentiality Agreement for Field Experiences; and the edTPA Permission Forms) becomes part of the STAR Report, a tracking and monitoring system of both academic and non-academic factors for every candidate as they progress through the program. Through the collection of this information for each candidate, the EPP is able to recommend candidates for licensure or certification and has documented that he/she understands the expectations of the profession including an understanding and commitment to codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and laws and policies. The sheer size of the STAR Report makes it difficult to share as a file. Therefore, this tool and its use will be demonstrated during the onsite visit. Additionally, as part of the onsite visit, candidates will be available to interview [Task 5].

[Task 9] Data for candidate performance on the edTPA is included in the edTPA Averages Workbook (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook), the edTPA Summary (SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary) and the edTPA Proficiency documents (SSRA 3.5d- edTPA Proficiency).

[Task 1] The *Revolutionizing Educational Workforce: PNW’s EPP Plan for Recruitment and Retention (REW)*, has been adjusted to include the shortage areas of Special Education and English Language Learners (ELL) (SSRA 3.1a- REW). Analysis for the preparation of Special Educators was not initially included in the shortage area of employment since it forms one of the largest program/licensure areas within the EPP preparing candidates at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Analysis for the preparation of candidates to address the ELL need was originally not included in the REW due to the limited capacity of the EPP to provide a full, licensure program in this area. It is important to note, however, that the EPP is one of few programs within the state with a required ELL course required of its elementary and early childhood education candidates. Further, curricular changes underway in the undergraduate level

elementary and early childhood programs will make special education licensure available to all candidates in these programs.

[Task 3] Three cycles of the data used to monitor candidate's advancement points which includes their understandings of college- and career-ready standards (SPA Assessments 2 and 3); content knowledge (SPA Assessments 1 and 2); pedagogical content knowledge (SPA Assessment 1 and 5); pedagogical skills (SPA Assessments 4 and 5), and the integration of technology (SPA Assessments 3, 4, and 5) is provided in (SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet).

STANDARD FOUR: Program Impact

Standard Four Stipulations

1. **Stipulation:** The EPP provides no data for at least one measure of impact on student learning nor was a CAEP-approved phase-in plan provided. (Component 4.1)

Rationale: The data used in the case study to address Component 4.1 (state level assessments) were only reported at the school level. No related data were provided specific to teachers who completed their teacher training at the EPP (SSR 52: The Application of Educator's Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Impact Student Learning).

Evidence: SSRA 4.1a- PNW Phase-In Plan; SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study; SSRA 4.1d- NSIPI Collection Instruments

EPP Clarification: Following CAEP's Accreditation Policy 1.02 and in conjunction with the Phase-In Schedule for Initial Level Programs found in Appendix B, the EPP did not presume that Phase-In Plans were allowable for a Fall 2020 visit. Therefore, *The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study* (SSRA 4.1c) was provided in the Self Study Report (submitted in March, 2020) as a means for demonstrating program impact. The May 22, 2020 CAEP Weekly Newsletter included an announcement of changes to the requirements for component 4.1, allowing for Phase-In Plans to continue for this component. Consequently, the PNW Phase-In Plan is included here and illustrates the steps the EPP has undertaken and will continue to undertake to demonstrate its impact (SSRA 4.1a-PNW Phase-In Plan).

[Tasks 1 & 2] Included in the Phase-In Plan is an alignment of the Case Study Measures with CAEP Standard 4 Components.

After a review of the case study, the EPP's Completer Impact Committee (CIC), a subset of the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), recognized limitations of the case study (i.e., scope, generalizability) and the inadequacy of the EPP to implement a full-scale study using this methodology (e.g., time, cost, and bias). This was reinforced by feedback provided in the Formative Feedback Report. Therefore, the CIC proposed the *Next Steps for Investigating*

Program Impact (NSIPI) study (SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study). As outlined in the NSIPI study and the PNW Phase-In Plan, this study began in April 2020 when 20% of completers who graduated between August 2017-May 2020, and who were employed licensed educators were identified using a stratified random methodology. During the fall 2020 semester, multiple measures (SSRA 4.1d- NSIPI Collection Instruments) will be collected of participant completers' impact in classrooms following the NSIPI Study.

2. **Stipulation:** The EPP provided no data speaking to teacher effectiveness that is specific to program completers. (Component 4.2)

Rationale: Both Federal (SSR 53) and State (SSR 54) Accountability Ratings were provided at the school-level. Data presented in the Statewide Average of Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness (SSR 55) provided state-level totals. Very little data spoke specifically to the performance of the EPP's completers. Federal Accountability Ratings (SSR 53) and State Accountability Ratings (SSR 54) were not disaggregated by licensure area.

Evidence: SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.1d- NSIPI Collection Instruments; SSRA 4.2a- EPP Comparative and Performance Data-Effectiveness Ratings; SSRA 4.2b- Statewide Average of Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness

EPP Clarification: As stated previously, a stratified random sampling methodology is used as part of the NSIPI study (SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study). This methodology, in conjunction with new collection instruments (SSRA 4.1.d- NSIPI Collection Instruments), will allow the EPP to collect and analyze teacher effectiveness data in the aggregate for EPP improvement and also to disaggregate the data by licensure area for program improvement. Additionally, this information along with the suggestions/recommendations made can be further validated in comparison with data provided by the state on teacher effectiveness (SSRA 4.2a- EPP Comparative and Performance Data- Effectiveness Ratings; SSRA 4.2b- Statewide Average of Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness).

3. **Stipulation:** Employer survey data were not disaggregated by licensure area. (Component 4.3)

Rationale: Employer survey data (SSR 17: EPP Comparative and Performance Data—Principal Survey for PNW Completers) were not disaggregated by licensure area.

Evidence: SSRA 4.2c- IDOE Data Explanation

EPP Clarification: Measures of employer (principal) satisfaction on completers provided by the state are not disaggregated by licensure area, as explained by the Indiana Department of Education (SSRA 4.2c- IDOE Data Explanation).

4. **Stipulation:** Completer survey data were not disaggregated by licensure area. (Component 4.4)

Rationale: Teacher survey data (SSR 18: EPP Comparative and Performance Data—Teacher Survey for PNW Completers) were not disaggregated by licensure area.

Evidence: SSRA 4.2c- IDOE Data Explanation

EPP Clarification: Surveys of teachers provided by the state are not disaggregated by licensure area, as explained by the Indiana Department of Education (SSRA 4.2c-IDOE Data Explanation).

Standard Four *Areas for Improvement*

1. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP provided limited data on the representativeness of the sample of in-service program completers with respect to the teaching observation and/or student survey data and limited data were provided on the validity and reliability of the PPAT and STOT. (Component 4.2)

Rationale: The sample size of completers who completed the STOT and whose students completed the PPAT was very small (6) and may not represent all teachers in the EPP's initial licensure programs (SSR 52: The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions to Impact Student Learning). The STOT and PPAT are intended for pre-service (not in-service) teachers (SSR 52: The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions to Impact Student Learning).

Evidence: SSRA 4.1a- PNW Phase-In Plan; SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study

EPP Clarification: As outlined in the PNW Phase-In Plan (SSRA 4.1a) and the *Next Steps for Investigating Program Impact* (SSRA 4.1b NSIPI Study) study, in the future a sampling 20% of completers by program or licensure area will occur. This will enable the EPP to analyze the effectiveness of completers at the EPP level in a way that is more generalizable than what occurred in the Case Study (SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study). Additionally, it provides the EPP with the ability to disaggregate the data (i.e., data is presented by licensure area) and allows licensure programs to determine the effectiveness of their programs, identify potential areas for improvement, and enact plans of action.

2. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP did not provide response rates for employers. (Component 4.3).

Rationale: The response rates for the principal survey (SSR 17: EPP Comparative and Performance Data—Principal Survey for PNW Completers) were not reported.

Evidence: SSRA 4.2c-IDOE Data Explanation

EPP Clarification: The state does not have the resources to calculate response (SSRA 4.2c-IDOE Data Explanation).

3. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP did not provide response rates for completer surveys. (Component 4.4).

Rationale: The response rates for the teacher survey (SSR 18: EPP Comparative and Performance Data—Teacher Survey for PNW Completers) were not reported.

Evidence: SSRA 4.2c-IDOE Data Explanation

EPP Clarification: The state does not have the resources to calculate response rates (SSRA 4.2c-IDOE Data Explanation).

[Task 1] The year-long residency experience for student teachers was piloted in the spring 2020. A group of 16 candidates completed the first semester. During this semester, they completed coursework on campus on either Monday or Friday, with some additional courses being offered in the evenings. Further, they were in their field placements three consecutive days each week (i.e., candidates were in the field Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday) all semester long. In the fall, these candidates will return to the same schools and classrooms they were placed in during the spring semester to work with their cooperating teacher. This will be expanded for further review during the onsite visit.

STANDARD FIVE: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

Standard Five *Areas for Improvement*

1. **Area for Improvement:** The EPP provided no evidence of validity and reliability for the lesson plan assessment (Component 5.2).

Rationale: The EPP indicated the use of an EPP-created lesson plan. Was a means to meet the expectation that candidates develop proficiencies associated with the design and implementation of college and career ready teaching using multiple measures however, no evidence is provided about the validity and reliability of the lesson plan.

Evidence: SSRA 1.1g- PAKA Standard Alignment; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups; SSRA 5.2a- Interview Protocol Analysis; SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up

EPP Clarification: Lesson plan assessments are not part of the EPP's Signature Assessments. Instead, these assessments are used by program/licensure areas as part of their efforts to meet

their specific Specialized Professional Association requirements. The EPP tracks candidate performance on these assessments only as far as it fulfills the Program Area Key Assessment role (SSRA 1.1g- PAKA Standard Alignment; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet) and ensures that it is used for analysis and interpretation of data for program/licensure area improvement during Program Data Dialogue Days (SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups).

[Task 2] The process for establishing validity and reliability for the interview protocol is described in the Interview Protocol Analysis (SSRA 5.2a).

Training for the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) was initially conducted as in-person training (SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up). Following this training, participants requested that virtual formats (i.e., online webinars and presentations) be pursued to make it more accessible for all clinical educators. Building upon the initial training and being responsive to this request, the Office of Partnerships and Outreach created a STOT training module. This module is accessible through the SoEC Accreditation Documents found on myPNW. This module will be presented/demonstrated during the onsite visit.

2. Area for Improvement: The EPP presented the SoEC Annual Report however, the report was incomplete (Component 5.5).

Rationale: Data from the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) were not presented and some components of the report were incomplete (e.g., field placement data, cooperating teacher and university supervisor survey, clinical supervisor feedback, partnership feedback).

Evidence: SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report; SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills Teaching Observation Tool InTASC Standards; SSRA 3.5b STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5c- Analysis of Skills of Teaching Observation Tool

EPP Clarification: The first SoEC Annual Report was attempted during AY18-19. Unfortunately, data collection and analyses were not aligned in such a way that the report could be completed. Adjustments to the collection and analysis of data, the actions taken as a result of the analyses were undertaken by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). As a result, a completed version of the SoEC Annual Report for AY19-20 is provided (SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report). Further, analysis of the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) are provided (SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills Teaching Observation Tool InTASC Standards; SSRA 3.5b- STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5c- Analysis of Skills of Teaching Observation Tool).

3. Area for Improvement: The EPP presented data for principals and completers however, there was limited analysis and interpretation of these data (Component 5.3).

Rationale: Although the EPP presented data there was missing analysis and interpretation for some of the data (e.g., principal and completer survey). Through meeting minutes there are

several examples of ongoing continuous improvement, however, the EPP provided limited data to indicate the trends and patterns.

Evidence: SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study; SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report

EPP Clarification: Analysis of the state provided data (i.e., principal and completer surveys) occurred as part of the Case Study (SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study) and within the SoEC Annual Report (SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report).

4. Area for Improvement: The EPP presented limited data reports presented that support the assessment of the CAEP eight goals nor it clear that they are shared widely (Component 5.4).

Rationale: Although the EPP has a structured QAS (i.e., REP3, master calendar, DDD and data collection points, meeting minutes) there were limited data reports presented that support the assessment of the goals. In addition, there is limited evidence that the EPP that the annual and impact measures and their trends are shared widely (i.e., posted on EPP website).

Evidence: SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report; SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings; SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums; SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Follow Up; SSRA 5.5d- Presentation EPP Forum; SSRA 5.3a- EPP Master Calendar AY19.20; SSRA 2.1e- Contact Log: Clinical Partners

EPP Clarification: [Task 4] Annually the EPP compiles data and reports its findings in the CAEP Annual Report. Reporting on the eight (8) CAEP measures also occurs in two additional ways: as part of the SoEC Annual Report (SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report) and the SoEC website

(<https://www.pnw.edu/education-counseling/school-of-education-and-counseling/about-us/epp-data-dashboard/>).

[Task 3] The SoEC Annual Report (SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report) is shared with SoEC faculty and staff at the fall EPP Data Dialogue Days and with external stakeholders during the fall EPP Forum (SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings). During these meetings, input and recommendations from stakeholders is gathered and integrated into the EPP's actions (SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums; SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Follow Up). All PNW faculty and staff members are invited and encouraged to attend and participate in the biannual EPP Data Dialogue Days (fall and spring semester). An example of the data shared and the actions undertaken by the EPP following it is provided (SSRA 2.2a- EPP DDD Feedback Follow Up).

Similarly, educators from the six counties served by PNW are invited to take part in biannual EPP Forums (fall, spring/summer). Data is presented and input gathered during these meetings and

recommendations for actions to be pursued by the EPP occur (SSRA 2.1f- Partnership Meetings; SSRA 2.1g- Actions Following EPP Forums; SSRA 5.5d- Presentation EPP Forum)

Dates for these meetings are established at the beginning of the academic year and communicated through the EPP's master calendar that is shared (SSRA 5.3a- EPP Master Calendar AY19.20).

The EPP engagement (meetings, phone calls, emails, etc.) with stakeholders is also tracked using the Contact Log; Clinical Partners (SSRA 2.1e).

5. Area for Improvement: No evidence was provided that the EPP disaggregates data by race and ethnicity (Component 5.1)

Rationale: Although the EPP indicated that the QAS supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions that were no disaggregated data related to race and ethnicity. Although the EPP indicated that the system support disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions.

Evidence: SSRA 5.5a- CAEP Leadership Team Retreat Agenda; SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups; SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.1c- The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study; SSRA 4.1d- NSIPI Collection Instruments; SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook; SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills Teaching Observation Tool InTASC Standards; SSRA 3.5b-STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5d- edTPA Proficiency; SSRA 3.3h- Niagara Dispositions Data; SSRA 3.3f- Dispositions AY18.19 EPP Program Report; SSRA 3.3e- Professional Dispositions AY18.19; SSRA 4.2c- IDOE Data Explanation; SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report; SSRA 1.1f- Catalog of Assessments

EPP Clarification: Following the CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018, data are disaggregated by licensure area (SSRA 1.2b- edTPA Averages Workbook; SSRA 1.2a- edTPA Summary; SSRA 1.3a- EPP SPA Spreadsheet; SSRA 3.5a- Candidate Skills Teaching Observation Tool InTASC Standards; SSRA 3.5b-STOT InTASC Proficiency; SSRA 3.5d- edTPA Proficiency; SSRA 3.3h- Niagara Dispositions Data; SSRA 3.3f- Dispositions AY18.19 EPP Program Report; SSRA 3.3e- Professional Dispositions AY18.19). Data provided by the state are not disaggregated by licensure area (SSRA 4.2c- IDOE Data Explanation). While the EPP agrees that careful disaggregation of data (i.e., by race/ethnicity, sex, etc.) can increase clarity about specific questions or issues regarding sub-populations of candidates, disaggregation of data in this way at this time for the EPP would hinder interpretations of data since sample sizes would be small across all program areas limiting the generalizability and reliability of the data.

[Task 1] On October 26-27, 2018 a retreat of the CAEP Team Leads was held (SSRA 5.5a- CAEP Leadership Team Retreat Agenda). The purpose of this retreat was to establish and define the PNW EPP Quality Assurance System. Participants included faculty and staff members who had been tasked with leading efforts to meet the different CAEP Standards. The Continuous

Improvement Cycle, which guides data collection and analysis at the EPP- and Program levels and defines the roles and responsibilities of each group, was an outcome (SSRA 5.5b- Continuous Improvement Cycle; SSRA 5.5c- Continuous Improvement Groups). The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and CAEP Team Leads are synonymous labels for the group of individuals responsible for implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the efforts of the Quality Assurance System. The QAC determined data for analysis during the EPP- and Program level- Data Dialogue Days (DDD). Data for analysis during the DDDs were determined by the timeline as to when the most complete reporting of data could be provided. For example, the state-provided data is made available in August each year and is therefore interpreted, analyzed, and acted upon during the fall EPP DDD.

During the writing of the Self-Study Report, it was determined by members of the Completer Impact Committee (CIC, CAEP 4 working committee) that *The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study* (SSRA 4.1c) had several limitations. As a result, they proposed the *Next Steps for Investigating Program Impact* (NSIPI) study (SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.d- NSIPI Collection Instruments). The CIC is led by a member of the QAC and includes faculty members who serve two-year terms to investigate the impact of program completers on P-12 students. Annually, the CIC summarizes its findings for inclusion in the SoEC Annual Report (SSRA 5.0a- SoEC Annual Report).

While the EPP differentiates between EPP Signature and Program Area Key Assessments (PAKA), the role each play in informing program and licensure-areas in advancing and implementing improvements, the two types of assessment are not distinguishable for candidates (SSRA 1.1f- Catalog of Assessments).

The QAS will be presented and demonstrated during the onsite visit.

As has been previously stated, it was determined that *The Application of Educators' Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Case Study* (SSRA 4.1c) had several limitations. As a result, the proposed the *Next Steps for Investigating Program Impact* (NSIPI) study (SSRA 4.1b- NSIPI Study; SSRA 4.d- NSIPI Collection Instruments) in which data collection will begin in October 2020.