

Annual Report

# School of Education and Counseling

AY 2018-2019

---



## Introduction

The School of Education and Counseling (SOEC) annual report will be completed by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) during the months of May-August with a final report deadline being the first week in September. The data will be reported to the SOEC faculty/staff at the biannual EPP Data Dialogue Days.

---

---

## Recruitment

- Summary based on accomplishments during AY18-19
- SoEC hosted East Chicago high schoolers who had expressed interest in becoming an educator. The students were given a tour of PNW, received lunch, heard from various departments such as TRIO, the library, and the honors college, proctored a course with Dr. Shultz or/and Mr. Polman, met SoEC's student ambassadors, received SoEC swag, spoke with current education students and met the Director, Dr. Anne Greogry, advisor Pam Ayala, and various other professors.
- Hosted AK Smith school at the Westville campus for a day in the life of a PNW student in the Early Childhood program. These high schoolers completed a campus tour, proctored 2 early childhood courses, had lunch, were given swag, and had a chance to mingle with current PNW students.
- Dr. Anne Gregory and Amanda Timm worked with PNW's marketing team to design ads that were posted on the south shore train line.
- Dr. Mary Jane Eisenhower with the help of Hadassah Moore hosted the 13th annual Early Childhood Conference at the Westville campus with keynote speaker Matt de la Pena.
- Pam and Amanda Timm worked with SoEC student ambassadors to create recruitment presentations for high school visits during the 19-20 year in addition to interviewing and selecting new student ambassadors.

## Interview

Eligible candidates are contacted for an interview. In this email, they are apprised of the format of the interview process and that they are to prepare the following items for the interview: resume and presentation with an outline This information is to be submitted the Monday prior to their interview.

Interview format will occur in three parts: writing sample, presentation and interview. At the end of each interview, the committee will score candidates using the "Professional Interview Scoring Rubric." For the writing sample candidates will have twenty minutes. Candidates will complete an informal writing task. They are presented with three prompts. They select one prompt and write their response. At the end of the interview, the committee will score the writing sample holistically, noting on the bottom of the interview scoring rubric if the writing reflects a serious concern. The candidates was ten minutes for the presentation porition. Candidates are asked to prepare a presentation describing their reasons for wanting to become an educator. They submit their presentation outline prior to their interview. Specifically, candidates are to respond to these questions: Why do you want to teach, what goals should a good educator attempt to accomplish with students, what are your areas of strength, what are your

---

areas of need, what are your future and professional goals. Finally, the interview section will be ten minutes following their presentation. The interview committee may ask a series of follow up questions to learn more about the candidate.

### Summary of EPP Interview Data

#### 2018-2019

In 2018-2019 the School of Education and Counseling implemented a new Interview process for all incoming students.

#### Summary of Students Participating

- 127 students were interviewed by a panel of three faculty members in 2018-2019
- A total of 125 were admitted to various programs, 82 provisionally (67%)

**Table 1.** Number of Applications, interviewees, and admission status

| Semester                | Fall 2018 | Spring 2019 | Total |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Applications            | 85        | 84          | 169   |
| Qualified for Interview | 64        | 78          | 142   |
| Interviewed             | 49        | 78          | 127   |
| Provisional Admit       | 27        | 55          | 82    |
| Full Admit              | 21        | 22          | 43    |

---

**Table 2.** Number of candidates interviewed for each program area

| <b>Semester</b>                  | <b>Fall 2018</b> | <b>Spring 2019</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Early Childhood Education        | 8                | 8                  | 16           |
| Elementary Education-<br>Reading | 20               | 25                 | 45           |
| Elementary Education- SPED       | 19               | 27                 | 46           |
| Secondary Education              | 2                | 18                 | 20           |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>49</b>        | <b>78</b>          | <b>127</b>   |

**Table 3.** EPP-wide Results for Overall Interview and by Component Area

| <b>Semester</b> | <b>Fall 2018</b> | <b>Spring 2019</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Average Score   | 30/36            | 29/36              |
| Writing         | 3.1              | 3.0                |
| Presentation    | 3.3              | 3.4                |
| Interview       | 3.5              | 3.4                |

---

## Summary of Feedback from Students and Faculty

### Interview Process: Spring 2019

#### Student Feedback (n=29)

| Prompt                      | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Prepared for what to expect | 9              | 20    | 0       | 0        | 0                 |
| Well-organized              | 16             | 13    | 0       | 0        | 0                 |
| Timing                      | 18             | 11    | 0       | 0        | 0                 |
| Clear Criteria              | 9              | 14    | 4       | 2        | 0                 |
| Valuable Process            | 16             | 9     | 4       | 0        | 0                 |

**Lowest Item:** The criteria for how I was going to be assessed was made clear 23/29 Agreement. 4 Neutral, 2 Disagreed.

**Highest rated Item:** The timing of each portion of the interview was appropriate (writing, presenting, interview)- 100% agreement (62% strongly agreed).

**Overall:** 25/29 (86%) agreed it was a valuable experience (compared to 77% in fall).

#### Open-Ended Questions

What aspect of this process do you believe was the most beneficial? (n=28)

1. Interview- 17

Sample: "The interview portion because I was able to ask question that I had concerns with the education program."

2. Presentation- 6

Sample: "I think the presentation was most valuable because I had to reflect on, collect and verbalize why I want to be a teacher."

3. Other - 5

Sample: "Assessing the strengths and weaknesses I'll have as a teacher in the classroom"

---

4. Writing- 0

What ideas do you have for improving the interview?

1. None (n=12). "I believe the interview went very smoothly and things were well organized. I would not change anything."

2. Clarification of process and criteria (n=6)

- More details on what is going to happen at the interview and how many people it will be in front of.
- To Inform the students that they need to bring a flash drive with their PowerPoint presentation on it to the interview.
- Give more instructions on how it will be graded
- Have more information available for what was being looked for in the interview.
- More in depth outline to prepare students
- Making the criteria for the presentation aspect more clear
- More in depth outline to prepare students

3. Other

- Draw questions from the resume and acknowledge the resume portion more.

# Selectivity Undergraduate

## Elementary Education

| Interview Semester | Admitted Semester | # Applied | # Admitted | Avg. GPA of Admitted | # Admitted w/CASA | # Admitted w/SAT | # Admitted w/ACT |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| FA18               | SP19              |           |            |                      |                   |                  |                  |
| SP19               | FA19              |           |            |                      |                   |                  |                  |

## Early Childhood

| Interview Semester | Admitted Semester | # Applied | # Admitted | Avg. GPA of Admitted | # Admitted w/CASA | # Admitted w/SAT | # Admitted w/ACT |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| FA18               | SP19              | 6         | 4          | 3.63                 |                   |                  |                  |
| SP19               | FA19              |           |            |                      |                   |                  |                  |

## Secondary Education

| Interview Semester | Admitted Semester | # Applied | # Admitted | Avg. GPA of Admitted | # Admitted w/CASA | # Admitted w/SAT | # Admitted w/ACT |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| FA18               | SP19              |           |            |                      |                   |                  |                  |
| SP19               | FA19              | 78        | 26         | 3.44                 |                   |                  |                  |

## Undergraduate Completers Traditional

|      | EC | Elem Read | Elem SpEd | English | Math | Bio | Physics | Chem | SS | Spanish | French |
|------|----|-----------|-----------|---------|------|-----|---------|------|----|---------|--------|
| F18  | 0  | 14        | 15        | 0       | 0    | 1   | 0       | 0    | 1  | 0       | 0      |
| Sp19 | 9  | 19        | 29        | 4       | 5    | 1   | 5       | 0    | 1  | 1       | 0      |

## Undergraduate Completers Alternative License

|      | English | Math | Bio | Physics | Chem | SS | Spanish | French |
|------|---------|------|-----|---------|------|----|---------|--------|
| F18  | 1       | 0    | 0   | 0       | 0    | 0  | 0       | 0      |
| Sp19 | 1       | 0    | 0   | 0       | 1    | 0  | 0       | 0      |

---

**Graduate Completers (Maya)**

|      | SpEd<br>Mild | SpEd<br>Intense | CMHC | School<br>Counseling | Human Services |
|------|--------------|-----------------|------|----------------------|----------------|
| F18  | 1            | ?               | 9    | 1                    | 0              |
| Sp19 | 6            | ?               | 2    | 10                   | 0              |



## Dispositions

| <b>Pre-Admission Spring 2019</b>                              | <b>EC n=16</b> | <b>Elementary n=31</b> | <b>Secondary n=1</b> |
|---|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| A. Attendance   | 2.69           | 1.65                   | 4.00                 |
| B. Demonstrates punctuality                                   | 2.88           | 1.52                   | 2.00                 |
| C. Responds positively to feedback and constructive criticism | 2.88           | 1.52                   | 2.00                 |

| <b>Early Professional Dispositions</b>                        | <b>EC</b>       | <b>Elem</b>      | <b>English</b>  | <b>Math</b>     | <b>Science</b>  | <b>Social Studies</b> | <b>WL</b>       |
|---|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Criterion</b>  | <b>Sp19 n=4</b> | <b>Sp19 n=23</b> | <b>Sp19 n=3</b> | <b>Sp19 n=2</b> | <b>Sp19 n=1</b> | <b>Sp19 n=1</b>       | <b>Sp19 n=0</b> |
| A. Attendance   | 3.25            | 3.91             | 3.33            | 3.50            | 3.00            | 4.00                  | n/a             |
| B. Demonstrates punctuality                                   | 3.00            | 3.35             | 3.00            | 3.00            | 3.00            | 3.00                  | n/a             |
| C. Responds positively to feedback and constructive criticism | 3.25            | 3.83             | 3.67            | 3.00            | 4.00            | 4.00                  | n/a             |
| D. Meets deadlines and obligations                            | 3.25            | 3.78             | 3.67            | 4.00            | 4.00            | 4.00                  | n/a             |
| E. Preparation  | 3.25            | 3.89             | 3.67            | 4.00            | 4.00            | 4.00                  | n/a             |
| F. Ethical Practice   | 3.00            | 3.11             | 3.67            | 3.00            | 4.00            | 4.00                  | n/a             |
| G. Participates in professional development                   | 3.00            | n/a              | n/a             | n/a             | n/a             | n/a                   | n/a             |

| Mid Professional Dispositions                                 | EC        | Elementary EDCI 36204 |           | Elem EDCI 31600 | English EDCI 34X | Math EDCI 34X | Science EDCI 34X | Social Studies EDCI 34X | WL EDCI 34X |
|---|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|   | Sp19 n=17 | F18 n=33              | Sp19 n=48 | Sp19 n=31       | F18 n=14         | F18 n=3       | F18 n=2          | F18 n=3                 | F18 n=1     |
| A. Attendance   | 3.12      | 3.39                  | 3.94      | 3.77            | 3.11             | 3.67          | 4.00             | 3.00                    | 4.00        |
| B. Demonstrates punctuality                                   | 2.82      | 3.00                  | 2.94      | 3.06            | 2.93             | 3.00          | 3.00             | 3.00                    | 3.00        |
| C. Responds positively to feedback and constructive criticism | 3.35      | 3.26                  | 3.51      | 3.77            | 3.43             | 3.67          | 4.00             | 3.33                    | 4.00        |
| D. Meets deadlines and obligations                            | 3.41      | 3.79                  | 3.84      | 3.85            | 3.93             | 4.00          | 4.00             | 3.67                    | 4.00        |
| E. Preparation  | 3.71      | 3.70                  | 3.57      | 3.90            | 3.64             | 3.67          | 4.00             | 3.67                    | 3.00        |
| F. Ethical Practice   | 3.59      | 3.00                  | 3.39      | 3.68            | 2.86             | 3.33          | 4.00             | 3.00                    | 3.00        |
| G. Participate in professional development                    | 2.71      | 3.00                  | n/a       | 2.92            | n/a              | 3.00          | 3.50             | 3.00                    | 3.00        |
| H. Collaboration  | 3.65      | 3.00                  | n/a       | 3.40            | n/a              | 4.00          | 4.00             | 4.00                    | 3.00        |
| I. Learning environments                                      | 2.94      | 3.00                  | n/a       | 3.00            | n/a              | 4.00          | 4.00             | 3.67                    | 3.00        |
| J. Professional practice                                      | 3.47      | 4.00                  | n/a       | 3.50            | n/a              | 3.67          | 4.00             | 3.67                    | 3.00        |

| Late Professional Dispositions                                | EC           | Elem        |              | UG          | SpEd         | English    |             | Math        | Science    |             | Social Studies |             | WL          |
|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | Sp19<br>n=10 | F18<br>n=32 | Sp19<br>n=46 | F18<br>n=17 | Sp19<br>n=28 | F18<br>n=1 | Sp19<br>n=7 | Sp19<br>n=2 | F18<br>n=1 | Sp19<br>n=8 | F18<br>n=1     | Sp19<br>n=1 | Sp19<br>n=1 |
| A. Attendance   | 4.00         | 3.73        | 3.83         | 3.85        | 3.82         | 4.00       | 3.36        | 4.00        | 4.00       | 3.75        | 3.50           | 4.00        | 3.66        |
| B. Demonstrates punctuality                                   | 3.70         | 3.23        | 3.26         | 3.12        | 3.02         | 3.00       | 3.14        | 3.50        | 3.00       | 3.13        | 3.00           | 3.00        | 2.00        |
| C. Responds positively to feedback and constructive criticism | 3.95         | 3.70        | 3.71         | 3.66        | 3.64         | 4.00       | 3.29        | 3.50        | 4.00       | 3.00        | 4.00           | 4.00        | 2.10        |
| D. Meets deadlines and obligations                            | 3.90         | 3.64        | 3.52         | 3.54        | 3.63         | 4.00       | 3.29        | 3.50        | 4.00       | 3.13        | 4.00           | 4.00        | 2.60        |
| E. Preparation  | 3.80         | 3.47        | 3.59         | 3.56        | 3.64         | 4.00       | 3.29        | 3.75        | 4.00       | 3.38        | 4.00           | 4.00        | 2.30        |
| F. Ethical Practice   | 3.90         | 3.66        | 3.57         | 3.79        | 3.64         | 4.00       | 3.50        | 3.50        | 3.00       | 3.00        | 4.00           | 4.00        | 3.00        |
| G. Participate in professional development                    | 3.60         | 3.19        | 3.25         | 3.06        | 3.00         | 3.00       | 3.07        | 2.50        | 3.00       | 2.63        | 3.50           | 3.00        | 2.00        |
| H. Collaboration  | 3.95         | 3.73        | 3.53         | 3.78        | 3.64         | 4.00       | 3.43        | 3.00        | 3.00       | 3.00        | 4.00           | 4.00        | 2.80        |
| I. Learning environments                                      | 3.80         | 3.53        | 3.35         | 3.82        | 3.43         | 4.00       | 3.21        | 3.50        | 4.00       | 2.75        | 3.50           | 3.50        | 2.30        |
| J. Professional practice                                      | 3.80         | 3.59        | 3.55         | 3.59        | 3.61         | 4.00       | 3.43        | 3.50        | 4.00       | 3.00        | 3.50           | 4.00        | 2.30        |

| <b>EPP Professional Dispositions</b>                          | EPP Mean | EC   | Elem  | English | Math | Science | Social Studies | World Lang |
|---|----------|------|-------|---------|------|---------|----------------|------------|
| <b>Criterion</b>  | n=373    | n=31 | n=289 | n=25    | n=8  | n=12    | n=6            | n=2        |
| A. Attendance   | 3.63     | 3.46 | 3.54  | 3.45    | 3.79 | 3.69    | 3.63           | 3.83       |
| B. Demonstrates punctuality                                   | 2.94     | 3.17 | 2.94  | 3.02    | 2.88 | 3.03    | 3.00           | 2.50       |
| C. Responds positively to feedback and constructive criticism | 3.46     | 3.52 | 3.40  | 3.60    | 3.04 | 3.75    | 3.83           | 3.05       |
| D. Meets deadlines and obligations                            | 3.68     | 3.52 | 3.70  | 3.72    | 3.83 | 3.78    | 3.92           | 3.30       |
| E. Preparation  | 3.59     | 3.59 | 3.67  | 3.65    | 3.81 | 3.85    | 3.92           | 2.65       |
| F. Ethical Practice   | 3.43     | 3.50 | 3.48  | 3.51    | 3.28 | 3.50    | 3.75           | 3.00       |
| G. Participate in professional development                    | 2.95     | 3.10 | 3.07  | 3.04    | 2.75 | 3.04    | 3.17           | 2.50       |
| H. Collaboration  | 3.54     | 3.80 | 3.51  | 3.72    | 3.50 | 3.33    | 4.00           | 2.90       |
| I. Learning environments                                      | 3.41     | 3.37 | 3.36  | 3.61    | 3.75 | 3.58    | 3.56           | 2.65       |
| J. Professional practice                                      | 3.52     | 3.64 | 3.64  | 3.72    | 3.59 | 3.67    | 3.72           | 2.65       |

**Summary:** The Professional Disposition rubric was developed by the School of Education and Counseling faculty and implemented Fall 2018. This tool is used throughout the candidates' program experience and assessed during pre-admission and identified field experiences early methods (semester 4), methods (semester 6), and student teaching. A developmental approach is used to determine expected levels of performance. At the end of the 18-19 academic year, faculty and partners reviewed the rubric content language and made revisions. New content language was developed for Attendance, Punctuality, and Ethics. Ethical practice criteria was split into three (3) separate criterion. These revisions will be effective Fall 2019.

**EPP Areas of Strength:**

D. Meets deadlines and obligations 3.68

A. Attendance 3.63

E. Preparation 3.59

**EPP Areas of Weakness:**

B. Demonstrates punctuality 2.94

G. Participate in professional development 2.95

**Improvements:** New content language was developed for Attendance, Punctuality, and Ethics. Ethical practice criteria was split into three separate criteria for better evaluation. Each program revised which criterion will be assessed during early and mid points in their programs.

---

**EPP Assessment Review: Dispositions**

**Faculty Survey Report- Spring 2019**

**David Pratt, Ph.D.: dmpratt@pnw.edu**

A pilot of the new dispositions instrument took place in fall of 2018. A feedback survey was developed in Spring 2019 semester to determine the effectiveness of the disposition implementation among faculty. A total of seven (7) faculty completed the survey. Six Likert-scale prompts were developed with the following choices: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). This survey included one open ended question.

| <b>Prompt</b>   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Mode</b> | <b>Median</b> |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| The process for assessing dispositions was clearly described        | 2.9         | 2           | 3             |
| This course(s) selected were appropriate for assessing dispositions | 2.9         | 4           | 3             |
| The new disposition rubric was effective for measuring dispositions | 3.3         | 4           | 4             |
| I incorporated the dispositions as part of the course grade         | 2.3         | 3           | 2             |
| I was aware of who to send the dispositions to once completed       | 3.3         | 2           | 3             |
| I understand the next steps to take when dispositions are NOT met   | 2.7         | 2           | 2             |

**Summary of Results:**

Results from the close-ended survey questions indicated a variability in responses however the only item close to faculty agreeing with overall was that the new rubric was “effective for measuring dispositions” (mean 3.3; Mode 4; Median 4). The low areas consisted of “I incorporated the dispositions as a part of the course grade” (mean= 2.3) and “I understand the next steps to take when dispositions are NOT met in my course (mean=2.7). Most if not all faculty members disagreed with these statements. See Appendix A for each response.

Comments related to the Disposition Assessment Instrument or process:

- Guidelines and communication is lacking. We need more support if this is going to continue to be a best practice.
- The course was not appropriate (EDCI 36600) for measuring dispositions for several reasons. First, there was no field experience associated with the course. Second, it was only for early program candidates and most students were toward the end of the program.

Recommendations to the Disposition Assessment in the future include:

- More collective decision making and buy-in on the selection of field experiences early, mid and late that participate in the process.
- Share a policy statement about how and when to collect disposition data, who collects data
- Develop a policy for not meeting dispositions and clarify how that fits into course grade/success
- Include the policy for egregious dispositions process for ALL students

Appendix A: Raw results of responses to Likert-Scale items.

| Prompt   | SD | D | N | A | SA |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| The process for assessing dispositions was clearly described                   | 0  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0  |
| This course(s) selected were appropriate for assessing dispositions            | 1  | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0  |
| The new disposition rubric was effective for measuring dispositions            | 1  | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0  |
| I incorporated the dispositions as part of the course grade                    | 1  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0  |
| I was aware of who to send the dispositions to once completed                  | 0  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2  |
| I understand the next steps to take when dispositions are NOT met in my course | 0  | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0  |

---

## Field (Julie)

### Demographics

### Field Observations

Early

Mid

Late

Summary

# edTPA

Candidates in the Elementary, Elementary/Special Education, and Early Childhood programs were assessed on the Elementary Literacy edTPA. Secondary candidates were assessed in their content area.

| F18         | N = | GPA  | Total Test Score | Avg Rubric Score | Planning |      |      |      |      | Instruction |      |      |      |      | Assessment |      |      |      |      |
|-------------|-----|------|------------------|------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------------|------|------|------|------|
|             |     |      |                  |                  | 01       | 02   | 03   | 04   | 05   | 06          | 07   | 08   | 09   | 10   | 11         | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   |
| Elem        | 32  | 3.77 | 46               | 2.8              | 2.84     | 2.70 | 3.03 | 2.66 | 2.75 | 3.06        | 2.81 | 2.63 | 2.75 | 2.69 | 2.92       | 3.22 | 2.64 | 2.63 | 3.06 |
| Social Std  | 1   | 3.89 | 43               | 2.9              | 3.00     | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3.00       | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Science     | 1   | 3.11 | 39               | 2.6              | 2.00     | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00       | 3.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| English     | 1   | 4.00 | 46               | 3.1              | 4.00     | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00       | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| <b>Sp19</b> |     |      |                  |                  |          |      |      |      |      |             |      |      |      |      |            |      |      |      |      |
| Early Child | 10  | 3.22 | 45               | 3.00             | 3.00     | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.90 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.30 | 2.80 | 3.00       | 3.20 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 3.10 |
| Elem        | 43  | 3.55 | 44               | 2.90             | 3.00     | 2.90 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 3.10        | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 3.00       | 3.20 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 3.10 |
| English     | 6   | 3.42 | 45               | 2.96             | 2.80     | 2.80 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 3.20 | 3.20        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 3.20       | 3.60 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 3.00 |
| Math        | 7   | 3.40 | 37               | 2.45             | 2.71     | 2.14 | 2.57 | 2.29 | 1.86 | 3.00        | 2.33 | 2.33 | 2.17 | 2.17 | 2.29       | 3.14 | 2.00 | 2.57 | 2.43 |
| Science     | 1   | 2.94 | 43               | 2.90             | 3.00     | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00       | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Spanish     | 1   | 3.73 | 35               | 2.70             | 2.00     | 3.00 | 2.00 | n/a  | 2.00 | 3.00        | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 3.00       | 4.00 | 3.00 | n/a  | 3.00 |



---

## GPA

This data is based on the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) 1388 report. Data contains a combination of Traditional and Alternative candidates.

### Admission GPA

| Content Area                 | 2017-2018<br>Average GPA |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Early Childhood              | n=8<br>3.25              |
| Elementary/Reading           | n=42<br>3.27             |
| Elementary/Special Education | n=45<br>3.38             |
| Secondary English            | n=10<br>3.29             |
| Secondary Math               | n=4<br>3.52              |
| Secondary Science            | n=0                      |
| Secondary Social Studies     | n=2<br>3.79              |
| Secondary World Language     | n=0                      |
| Graduate Special Ed Mild     | n=8<br>3.34              |
| Graduate Special Ed Intense  | n=4<br>3.64              |

### Completer GPA Average

| Content Area                 | 2018-2019    |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Early Childhood              | n=10<br>3.60 |
| Elementary/Reading           | n=50<br>3.61 |
| Elementary/Special Education | n=39<br>3.37 |
| Secondary English            | n=13<br>3.37 |

|                             |             |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Secondary Math              | n=3<br>3.06 |
| Secondary Science           | n=1<br>3.18 |
| Secondary Social Studies    | n=2<br>3.24 |
| Secondary World Language    | n=5<br>3.35 |
| Graduate Special Ed Mild    | n=3<br>3.55 |
| Graduate Special Ed Intense | n=2<br>3.44 |

## CORE Pass Rates

| <b>EPP CORE</b> |           |             |             |                      |  |                |           |             |             |                      |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Year            | Pass Rate | Passed Test | Test Takers | Average Scaled Score |  | Year           | Pass Rate | Passed Test | Test Takers | Average Scaled Score |
| <b>Pedagogy</b> |           |             |             |                      |  | <b>Content</b> |           |             |             |                      |
| 2017-2018       | 95%       | 104         | 110         | 241                  |  | 2017-2018      | 87%       | 394         | 452         | 232                  |
| 2016-2017       | 94%       | 65          | 69          | 240                  |  | 2016-2017      | 93%       | 280         | 302         | 233                  |
| 2015-2016       | 98%       | 79          | 81          | 244                  |  | 2015-2016      | 94%       | 288         | 308         | 233                  |

## Program Level

| Year                            | Pass Rate | Passed Test | Test Takers | Average Scaled Score |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| <b>Early Childhood Pedagogy</b> |           |             |             |                      |
| 2017-2018                       | 90%       | 9           | 10          | 237                  |
| 2016-2017                       | 88%       | 7           | 8           | 236                  |
| 2015-2016                       | 86%       | 6           | 7           | 231                  |

| <b>Early Childhood Reading</b>        |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2017-2018                             | 100%             | 10                 | 10                 | 239                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 100%             | 8                  | 8                  | 236                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 86%              | 6                  | 7                  | 228                         |
| <b>Early Childhood Math</b>           |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                             | 100%             | 10                 | 10                 | 249                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 100%             | 8                  | 8                  | 243                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 100%             | 7                  | 7                  | 240                         |
|                                       |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| <b>Year</b>                           | <b>Pass Rate</b> | <b>Passed Test</b> | <b>Test Takers</b> | <b>Average Scaled Score</b> |
| 2017-2018                             | 100%             | 10                 | 10                 | 239                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 88%              | 7                  | 8                  | 233                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 100%             | 7                  | 7                  | 251                         |
| <b>Early Childhood Social Studies</b> |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                             | 89%              | 8                  | 9                  | 234                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 88%              | 7                  | 8                  | 236                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 71%              | 5                  | 7                  | 223                         |
| <b>Elementary Pedagogy</b>            |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                             | 95%              | 79                 | 84                 | 240                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 95%              | 51                 | 54                 | 241                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 98%              | 55                 | 56                 | 242                         |
| <b>Elementary Reading</b>             |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                             | 88%              | 77                 | 88                 | 231                         |
| 2016-2017                             | 93%              | 51                 | 55                 | 238                         |
| 2015-2016                             | 98%              | 57                 | 58                 | 237                         |
| <b>Elementary Math</b>                |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                             | 83%              | 73                 | 88                 | 230                         |

|  |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2016-2017                                  | 95%              | 54                 | 57                 | 234                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 91%              | 53                 | 58                 | 236                         |
| <b>Elementary Science</b>                  |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                                  | 94%              | 82                 | 87                 | 238                         |
| 2016-2017                                  | 96%              | 54                 | 56                 | 239                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 95%              | 55                 | 58                 | 239                         |
|  |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|  |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|  |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| <b>Year</b>                                | <b>Pass Rate</b> | <b>Passed Test</b> | <b>Test Takers</b> | <b>Average Scaled Score</b> |
| <b>Elementary Social Studies</b>           |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                                  | 82%              | 72                 | 88                 | 229                         |
| 2016-2017                                  | 88%              | 49                 | 56                 | 229                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 97%              | 56                 | 58                 | 235                         |
| <b>Special Education Mild Intervention</b> |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                                  | 92%              | 36                 | 39                 | 242                         |
| 2016-2017                                  | 100%             | 34                 | 34                 | 240                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 94%              | 29                 | 31                 | 238                         |
| <b>Secondary English</b>                   |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                                  | 50%              | 5                  | 10                 | 218                         |
| 2016-2017                                  | 100%             | 1                  | 1                  | 234                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 91%              | 10                 | 11                 | 233                         |
| <b>Secondary Math</b>                      |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018                                  | 50%              | 1                  | 2                  | 200                         |
| 2016-2017                                  | 50%              | 2                  | 4                  | 219                         |
| 2015-2016                                  | 100%             | 2                  | 2                  | 224                         |
| <b>Secondary Chemistry</b>                 |                  |                    |                    |                             |

|   |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2017-2018   | 100%             | 1                  | 1                  | 231                         |
| 2016-2017   | n/a              | n/a                | n/a                | n/a                         |
| 2015-2016   | 100%             | 1                  | 1                  | 231                         |
| <b>Secondary Social Studies Historical Perspectives</b> |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018   | 50%              | 1                  | 2                  | 216                         |
| 2016-2017   | 0%               | 0                  | 2                  | 198                         |
| 2015-2016   | 0%               | 0                  | 3                  | 195                         |
|   |                  |                    |                    |                             |
|   |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Pass Rate</b> | <b>Passed Test</b> | <b>Test Takers</b> | <b>Average Scaled Score</b> |
| <b>Secondary World Language</b>                         |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018   | 100%             | 5                  | 5                  | 242                         |
| 2016-2017   | n/a              | n/a                | 0                  | n/a                         |
| 2015-2016   | n/a              | n/a                | 0                  | n/a                         |
| <b>Secondary Pedagogy</b>                               |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018   | 100%             | 16                 | 16                 | 244                         |
| 2016-2017   | 100%             | 11                 | 11                 | 245                         |
| 2015-2016   | 100%             | 18                 | 18                 | 254                         |
| <b>Secondary Alternative Programs</b>                   |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018   |                  |                    | 8                  |                             |
| 2016-2017   |                  |                    | 2                  |                             |
| 2015-2016   |                  |                    | 6                  |                             |
| Combined<br>3 years                                     | 94%              | 15                 | 16                 |                             |
| <b>Secondary English Alternative</b>                    |                  |                    |                    |                             |
| 2017-2018   | 100%             | 3                  | 3                  | 241                         |
| 2016-2017   | 100%             | 1                  | 1                  | 233                         |



# Surveys/Feedback (Julie)

## Candidate Feedback

### Early Childhood

Exit Survey- SP 2019 (n=7)

| <b>INTASC Standards</b><br>To what extent did PNW's education program prepare you to:   | <b>Education Coursework</b> | <b>Field exp (ST)</b> | <b>Overall</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| understand the central concepts and tools of inquiry that enable you to create learning experiences that are meaningful for learners? (InTASC 1)                              | 3.6*                        | 3.9                   | 3.8            |
| understand how learners learn and develop so that you are able to create learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development? (InTASC 2) | 3.6                         | 4.0                   | 3.8            |
| understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning so that you are able to create and adapt learning opportunities to meet their needs? (InTASC 3)             | 4.0                         | 4.0                   | 4.0            |
| understand and use a variety of instructional strategies that encourage the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills? (InTASC 4)             | 3.7                         | 4.0                   | 3.9            |
| create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement, and self-motivation? (InTASC 5)   | 3.9                         | 4.0                   | 4.0            |
| use verbal, nonverbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom? (InTASC 6)                     | 3.4                         | 3.6                   | 3.5            |
| plan instruction based upon knowledge, subject matter, the community, and curriculum goals? (InTASC 7)  | 3.0                         | 3.9                   | 3.5            |
| use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner? (InTASC 8)                 | 3.6                         | 3.9                   | 3.8            |
| be a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of your choices and actions on others? (InTASC 9)  | 3.6                         | 3.7                   | 3.7            |
| foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and community agencies that support learners' learning and well-being? (InTASC 10)                                      | 3.6                         | 3.7                   | 3.7            |
| <b>Overall</b>  | <b>3.6</b>                  | <b>3.9</b>            | <b>3.8</b>     |

| <b>CAEP Standard</b><br>To what extent did PNW's education program prepare you to:            | <b>Education Coursework</b> | <b>Field exp (ST)</b> | <b>Overall</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Integrate technology effectively and appropriately into instruction (CAEP)                    | 3.1                         | 3.7                   | 3.4            |
| Help you develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to help all students learn (CAEP) | 3.3                         | 3.9                   | 3.6            |
| Enable you to use technology (CAEP)   | 3.6                         | 3.9                   | 3.8            |
| Allow you to demonstrate knowledge and skills gained in the university classroom (CAEP)       | 3.0                         | 3.3                   | 3.2            |
| Demonstrate a positive impact on student learning (CAEP)                                      | 3.7                         | 4.0                   | 3.9            |
| Include support from university faculty and school-based faculty (CAEP)                       | 4.0                         | 4.0                   | 4.0            |
| Include feedback from peers and faculty (CAEP)  | 3.7                         | 4.0                   | 3.9            |
| Work with highly effective school-based faculty (CAEP)  | 3.7                         | 3.9                   | 3.8            |
| Include opportunities to work with diverse students (CAEP)                                    | 3.6                         | 4.0                   | 3.8            |
| <b>Overall CAEP Standards</b>   | <b>3.5</b>                  | <b>3.9</b>            | <b>3.7</b>     |

*\*Based on 4 point scale of (1=Not at all, 2= Somewhat, 3= Mostly, 4=Well)*

## Cooperating Teacher Survey

## University Supervisor Survey

## Clinical Supervisor Feedback

## Partnership Feedback





---

## **Impact on P-12 Learning (Anne)**

**Spring 2019 EPP Case Study Pilot**

# Teacher Effectiveness

Source: IDOE 2019 Annual Report

| Percent of Teachers Achieving Effective or Highly Effective Rating 2017-2018   |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |              |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Institution  | Teachers with One (1) Year Experience |                  |                             | Teachers with Two (2) Years of Experience |                  |                             | Teachers with Three (3) Years of Experience |                  |                             | Grand Totals |
|  | Effective                             | Highly Effective | Total of Teachers Evaluated | Effective                                 | Highly Effective | Total of Teachers Evaluated | Effective                                   | Highly Effective | Total of Teachers Evaluated |              |
| <b>Purdue University Northwest</b>   | 97                                    | 21               | 126                         | 119                                       | 39               | 161                         | 96  | 60               | 161                         |              |
| Grand Total Rated Effective  |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             | 312          |
| Grand Total Rated Highly Effective   |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             | 120          |
| Grand Total Effective and Highly Effective   |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             | 432          |
| Grand Total Teachers Evaluated   |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             | 448          |
| Final Percent  |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             | <b>96%</b>   |
| <p><b>**Year" defined as September 1 - August 31.</b></p> <p>Visit <a href="http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations">http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations</a> for additional information.</p> |                                       |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |   |                  |                             |              |

# Satisfaction of Employers/Principals Survey

Source: IDOE 2019 Annual Report

| Principal Survey Results for Purdue University Northwest   |                   |              |           |                |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| Principals are responding to statements divided into three domains (knowledge, disposition, and performance) and reflect elements of both national professional standards (NCATE/CAEP) and the Model Core Teaching Standards, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). EPPs are expected to meet these standards in order to prepare educators for licensure (511 IAC 13-1-1). |                   |              |           |                |
| Knowledge Preparation of Teacher   |                   |              |           |                |
| For each of the following, please provide your assessment of how well the EPP prepared this teacher in the following categories. The range is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree     | Agree     | Strongly Agree |
|  | (1)               | (2)          | (3)       | (4)            |
| <b>The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to...</b>  |                   |              |           |                |
| 1. ...understand how students learn and develop at the grade level they are teaching.  | 0                 | 2            | 36        | 15             |
| 2. ...meet expectations of a beginning teacher for content preparation and knowledge.  | 0                 | 2            | 32        | 19             |
| 3. ...adhere to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession.   | 0                 | 0            | 23        | 29             |
| 4. ...adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession.   | 0                 | 0            | 27        | 26             |
| <b>Pedagogical Preparation of Teacher</b>  |                   |              |           |                |
| <b>The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to...</b>  |                   |              |           |                |
| 5. ...provide an appropriate and challenging learning experience.  | 0                 | 2            | 36        | 15             |
| 6. ...provide an inclusive learning environment.   | 0                 | 1            | 41        | 11             |
| 7. ...provide a rigorous learning environment.   | 0                 | 3            | 38        | 12             |
| 8. ...use a variety of assessment methods to guide, adjust, and improve instruction.   | 0                 | 2            | 39        | 11             |
| 9. ...develop content specific assessments to test for student understanding of the lesson objectives.   | 0                 | 3            | 40        | 10             |
| 10. ...differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs.   | 0                 | 3            | 41        | 9              |
| 11. ...work effectively with students with all exceptionalities.   | 0                 | 1            | 40        | 12             |
| 12. ...analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction.   | 0                 | 0            | 44        | 9              |
| 13. ...use effective strategies to manage the learning environment.  | 2                 | 2            | 39        | 10             |
| 14. ...integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning.   | 0                 | 0            | 36        | 17             |
| <b>Professional Disposition of Teacher</b>   |                   |              |           |                |
| <b>The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to...</b>  |                   |              |           |                |
| 15. ...openly accept suggestions/constructive feedback.  | 0                 | 0            | 21        | 32             |
| 16. ...exhibit ethical practice expected of educators.   | 0                 | 0            | 18        | 35             |
| 17. ...work effectively with other professionals.  | 0                 | 2            | 22        | 29             |
| 18. ...work effectively with parents/guardians.  | 1                 | 2            | 28        | 22             |
| 19. ...work effectively with school leaders.   | 0                 | 1            | 18        | 34             |
| 20. ...work effectively within the school culture.   | 0                 | 1            | 22        | 26             |
| <b>Overall Assessment</b>  |                   |              |           |                |
|  | Very Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
| 21. Overall, how satisfied are you with the training this teacher received from this EPP?  | 0                 | 2            | 29        | 21             |

# Satisfaction of Completers

Source: IDOE 2019 Annual Report

| Teacher Survey Results for Purdue University Northwest   |                     |          |       |                |
|--|---------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| The range is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).   | Number of Responses |          |       |                |
| Teachers responded to each of the following:   | Strongly Disagree   | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|  | (1)                 | (2)      | (3)   | (4)            |
| <b>Knowledge Preparation</b>   |                     |          |       |                |
| <i>My educator preparation program prepared me for:</i>  |                     |          |       |                |
| 1. understanding how learners/students develop and grow.   | 3                   | 1        | 23    | 39             |
| 2. meeting the content preparation and knowledge level expected of a beginning teacher.                              | 4                   | 1        | 24    | 37             |
| 3. adhering to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession.  | 2                   | 0        | 21    | 43             |
| 4. adhering to the legal requirements of the teaching profession.  | 2                   | 1        | 24    | 39             |
| 5. recognizing the importance of continued professional development.   | 2                   | 2        | 23    | 39             |
| <b>Pedagogical Preparation</b>   |                     |          |       |                |
| <i>My educator preparation program prepared me for:</i>  |                     |          |       |                |
| 6. providing appropriate and challenging learning experiences.   | 3                   | 3        | 25    | 35             |
| 7. providing an inclusive learning environment.  | 2                   | 1        | 22    | 41             |
| 8. providing a rigorous learning environment.  | 3                   | 2        | 25    | 36             |
| 9. working collaboratively with school leaders and/or colleagues to promote safe and positive learning environments. | 2                   | 1        | 20    | 43             |
| 10. differentiating instruction to meet all students' learning needs.  | 2                   | 2        | 24    | 38             |
| 11. working effectively with students with all exceptionalities.   | 2                   | 3        | 24    | 37             |
| 12. developing quality assessments to test for student understanding of lessons.                                     | 2                   | 3        | 29    | 32             |
| 13. analyzing student assessment data to improve classroom instruction.  | 2                   | 6        | 27    | 31             |
| 14. using appropriate strategies to effectively manage learning environments.  | 3                   | 4        | 27    | 32             |
| 15. integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning.                                      | 2                   | 5        | 24    | 35             |
| <b>Professional Disposition Preparation</b>  |                     |          |       |                |
| <i>My educator preparation program prepared me to recognize the importance of:</i>                                   |                     |          |       |                |
| 16. openly accepting suggestions/constructive feedback.  | 2                   | 0        | 19    | 45             |
| 17. exhibiting ethical practice.   | 2                   | 0        | 19    | 45             |
| 18. working effectively with other professionals.  | 2                   | 0        | 18    | 46             |
| 19. working effectively with parents/guardians.  | 2                   | 6        | 24    | 34             |
| 20. working effectively with school leaders.   | 2                   | 2        | 19    | 43             |
| 21. working effectively within the school culture.   | 2                   | 2        | 20    | 42             |
| <b>Overall Assessment</b>  |                     |          |       |                |
| 22. Indicate your overall assessment of how well you were prepared to teach by your educator preparation program.    | Poor                | Fair     | Good  | Excellent      |
|  | 0                   | 5        | 20    | 41             |

## Attrition-Retention-Completion

Source: IDOE 2019 Annual Report

| <b>Attrition-Retention-Completion Rates<br/>By Academic Year<br/>2018-2019</b> | <b>State<br/>Average</b> | <b>Purdue University<br/>Northwest<br/>(Hammond)</b> | <b>Purdue University<br/>Northwest<br/>(Westville)</b> |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Total Number of Education Candidates**   | 9981                     | 169  | 183  |
| Total Number of Completion/Graduation  | 3128                     | 67   | 61   |
| Percentage Completion/Graduation   | 31.3                     | 39.6   | 33.3   |
| Total Number Retained in Education   | 6255                     | 101  | 114  |
| Percentage Retained in Education   | 62.7                     | 59.9   | 62.3   |
| Total Number Program Attrition   | 220                      | 0  | 4  |
| Percentage Program Attrition   | 2.2                      | 0.0  | 2.2  |
| Total Number Institutional Attrition   | 360                      | 1  | 4  |
| Percentage Institutional Attrition   | 3.6                      | 0.5  | 2.2  |

---

## **Ability Completers to be Hired (Anne)**

### **Summary**

---

# Data Dialogue Days

## FALL 2018

### Early Childhood Program *October 4, 2018*

- edTPA Data Discussion
  - Cut score was briefly discussed. Currently=37; Spring 2019=39; Fall 2019=41. It will remain at 41 per Anne. *(Since this meeting EPP decided to keep the score at 39 for Fall 2019 and implement edTPA language/training throughout the program).*
  - As data was reviewed, Anne shared that Standards 1-5 comprise of planning skills; 6-10 teaching skills; 11-15 assessment skills. Collectively, the committee agreed that Assessment standards 11-15 are the area in need of improvement.
    - **ACTION:** Need to provide more opportunities for students to receive instruction relative to Standards 11-15 can be addressed by the following:
      - Remove field experience from EDCI 27500 in Spring 2019. This course will be taught by Dave Pratt.
        - Mary Jane will submit curriculum document through Faculty Senate
      - EDCI 371/372 will add the following assignment with additional standards-aligned content: Students will use the edTPA rubric to create a lesson aligned to a specific standard which contains a formal assessment. The students will create a second lesson addressing the same standard and teach this lesson two weeks (approximately) later than the first. Students will collect data and assess the growth and achievement of students in order to use the data to inform future lessons.
      - EDCI 373/374 will add the same assignment to be done with grade appropriate standards, data collection and analysis.
      - These are fall courses, so changes will be created at the ECEd meeting and implemented in Fall of 2019.
- Exit Survey Data Discussion
  - Exit survey data was reviewed. There was a very small sampling of data. We look forward to collecting another batch of data in order to identify trends and areas of need.



- **ACTION:** Examine the language surrounding the question about students being employed. They cannot work during student teaching—how is this question phrased? We will discuss this in the near future after we see the question.

Elementary October 4, 2018

## Secondary October 10, 2018

**CAEP Standard 1:** Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**Agenda Item #1:** Data Dialogue Day

**Evidence Reviewed:** Content CORE Assessment Data: English, Social Studies, Math, Science, and Foreign Language.

**Conclusions based on data:**

| Content Area               | PNW Pass Rate | State Pass Rate |
|----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| English                    | 67%           | 77%             |
| SS: Economics              | 0%            | 72%             |
| SS: Government             | 67%           | 92%             |
| SS: Historical Perspective | 60%           | 60%             |
| SS: Sociology              | 50%           | 50%             |
| SS: Psychology             | 100%          | 57%             |
| Math                       | 40%           | 60%             |
| Science                    | 0%            | 63%             |
| Foreign Language: Spanish  | 75%           | 85%             |

**Decisions, Proposals, and Notes:** Content CORE Data shared. History data for Historical Perspective showed that candidates pass rate mirrored the State average. Members of the Social Studies content area were pleased with the results.

**Follow-Up:** November, 2018 meeting intense conversation regarding data and plans to address areas of weakness.

**Additional Concerns** were shared by all content area members present regarding pass rate percentage as compared to State pass rate averages. Content areas agree to evaluate content CORE assessment data

---

and conduct a course alignment analysis to address areas of weakness identified through content assessment data.

**Follow up:** January, 2019 meeting Secondary Program Chair will follow up during regular meeting to find out courses and or program changes that have been identified to address areas of weakness.

**Agenda Item #2:** State SPA Assessment #5

**Evidence Reviewed:** Artifact requirements for State program review

**Conclusions based on data:** Each content area will be responsible for the 5th assessment.

**Decisions, Proposals, and Notes:** The following 5th assessment (key content artifact) will be provided by the following content areas: English/Social Studies: Social Justice EDPS 37000); Science Safety Lesson currently in courses offered; Math: take-home tests and graded homework assignments; FLL: Oral presentation with accompanying rubric SPAN 451

**Follow-up:** Assessment Coordinator will need to collect data from the artifacts identified.

Special Ed (UG/Grad) October 15, 2018

Counseling October 25, 2018

## **PROGRAM ADVISORY COUNCIL (PAC) MEETINGS**

### **Early Childhood Program Advisory Committee (EPAC) *December 4, 2018***

#### Updates from SOEC

- Imagine PNW
- Quality Assurance Committee's purpose
- EC Data Dialogue Day report findings

#### Partnership Needs

- External demand for BS Early ed?
  - Local schools need quality people
  - When the state funds public preschools, where will the good, licensed teachers come from?
  - Overall teacher shortage (schools home-growing, teacher's aides)
  - Mary Jane Eisenhower: Take our program out to external sites and schools

- 
- Continued High Quality professional development for current teachers and current licensure
  - Less one-shot Professional Development and more continued/series PD
  - Stackable credentials
  - Early Childhood Special Education?
    - Spectrum of services
    - State pushing for less self-contained classrooms
    - Some kids come in with no identification
    - Challenge of meeting-wide variety of needs
    - Preschool is more intensive (trying to catch them and train early)
  - MJ Eisenhower has more requests for family educator candidates
    - Built into Head Start
    - Social workers
    - Build them into schools? - K. Mackey
    - Pediatrician intervention?
    - Value of reading to children
    - Increased conversation (parents/children)
  - MJ Eisenhower - Need for Master's Level training?
    - Poor incentives/pay grades
    - Look at Master's candidate more favorably
  - What are you seeing in our graduates? What would you like to see?
    - Level of resilience more clearly communicated
    - E. Provenzano well-prepared in field experience/how it builds upon itself
    - E. Provenzano well-prepared in reading & math/integrating disciplines
    - Erin not as prepared in how to instruct writing (beginning, middle, end sentences)
    - Teach candidates to remember growth, not just standardization
    - Large spectrum of learning
    - Less kids exposed to reading (less books more tech)
    - D. Pratt – Problems in new teachers?
    - Work ethic
    - Immune systems / taking care of yourself
    - All things “atmosphere” rather than content/instruction
  - How can we recruit the best and brightest into our program?
    - Theatre (selfless, rambunctious)
    - Career Center Program – vocational practicums and eligible for CEA upon completion
    - Brickly kids in Hobart
    - Cohort idea – in preschools but can't afford BS
-

- 
- Indiana TEACH scholarships – education while teaching
    - Early Ed degree P3 is limiting, but not determining
    - Educate administrators on importance of P3 focus
    - P3 educators need to feel support from administration
    - Educators need to advocate for their profession (more creative approaches)
    - “If we aren’t having the conversation, no one else is” – K. Mackey
    - K6 flexibility is appealing
    - Focus on your specialization rather than limitation
    - “Sell yourself”

## Secondary Advisory December 6, 2018

Present: Ronda Waters, Catherine Murphy, Chrissy Chidichimo, David Tokarz, Kelly Vaughan, Sean Egan, Hall Pinnick, Sheila Stephenson, Staci Trekles, Monica Gajdos

### Old Business

· Challenges facing schools and classrooms:

○ What are the present realities facing public schools today?

- Parent support/involvement, which translates to student motivation and performance; many parents are not taking an active role in ensuring students are doing homework, accessing available resources for their child’s benefit
- Changes in policies, technology, scores on tests versus creating an innovating learning environment
- Attracting high-quality candidates for open positions; teacher shortages particularly in math and science

○ In what ways are these realities influenced by technology?

- Sweeping changes under new administrations can bring large amounts of new technology, which requires additional policies and training
- Teachers can be overwhelmed with the changes that technology integration brings, and administrators often feel pressure for “change” as well as pressure for increased scores, which do not often coincide initially

- 
- Access to technology such as wi-fi is still an issue in some communities, but many communities are able to supplement and offer open libraries after school, wi-fi buses, or reduced rates negotiated with Comcast

o In what ways are these realities influenced by diversity?

- Foster families, English language learners, and inconsistent home lives means inconsistent access to resources, inconsistent skills coming in, requiring schools to offer more resources for families in multiple languages
- Cultural disconnect with regard to parental involvement
- It would be helpful to reach students in early childhood to help them take more responsibility for their learning and advocating for themselves; a better partnership between teachers and counselors, and more holistic training for counselors would also be helpful in this
- Emotional-social training needs to be part of the preservice teacher's curriculum (currently elementary teachers receive this at PNW)
- Can the university offer QPR training and drug awareness training to candidates within the context of the program, but not open up a new course?
- Another idea is to invite parents to workshops on things like QPR, socio-emotional awareness, etc.

o List 5 things education preparation programs are doing well to prepare candidates

- Trained well in diversity and multicultural education
- Exposure to a wide array of school settings, though even more time in the field for candidates may be helpful; giving students more specific directed "projects" for their field experiences that may be differentiated for each student
- Prepared well with technology, competent with Google apps, Microsoft Office, etc. - better communication between university and school administrators about candidates in the field may be needed, though
- Prepared well in their content areas, though classroom management skills may need to be strengthened; also, students may need more practice in analysis of data on a wider scale to inform teaching decisions
- Case studies / videos provided from new teachers who have entered the classroom may be useful in supplementing instruction in handling unexpected circumstances, starting off the school year, and so forth

---

o List 5 things that education preparation programs can do to prepare teacher candidates for the diversity and technology in today's classroom

- More time in the classroom
- More time across different classes analyzing data
- More training in health and wellness for candidates prior to entering the classroom (possibly added into the EDCI 37000 course)

### **New Business:**

· Quality assurance

o Sheila Stephenson, assessment coordinator, provided insight into the accreditation data and processes (CAEP) that the university is currently working on

o Quality Assurance committee has been formed that works from the CAEP standards related to continuous improvement

o The QA cycle must ensure that data and feedback given translates into action in the programs; therefore the feedback from the advisory board provided twice a year (fall and spring) will give us information with which to act in improving courses and programs

o Report on Pearson CORE completion scores will be available in August for 2017-18, so that further analysis can be done

o Program changes have been made since feedback received in May

· PEL (Purdue Educational Leaders) Fellowship program at PNW

o Instituted in spring 2019 for teacher candidates at all levels to be able to spend additional time in the schools on Mondays and Fridays as substitute teachers; will be open to students at the junior or senior level

o Partner schools are still being selected, please contact LaVada if you are interested in participating

o Most education courses with a field component will institute them on Wednesdays all day, with course lecture components held on TR

· Why Teach: A Secondary Teacher Initiative

---

o “Why Teach” program – secondary program initiative intended to recruit high school students and provide mentorship in their pathway to become a teacher; pilot school is East Chicago, provides them with training on campus, college student ambassadors, and scholarship opportunities

· Secondary Program changes implemented as a result of the last advisory board meeting:

o EDCI 32300 Educational Technology for Teachers and Learning will be required for all secondary majors

o EDPS 28500 Diversity and Education will be required for all secondary majors

o EDPS 37000 Teaching Students with Diverse Learning Needs will update curriculum to include all levels of diversity beyond disability

o Increased candidate field experience in the programs by an additional 90 hours (full day field experience rather than 3 hours)

### **Counseling and Development December 5, 2018**

Attendance: Andrew Raeleteju, Jessica Schultz, Maria Alvarado, Maya Blackwell, Mary Didelot, Lisa Hollingsworth, Rhonda LaMarr, Sylver Smith, Christine Rosenbaum, Tom Grzesik, Peggy Payonk, and Amanda Timm

Welcome

Tour of new Community Counseling Center facility and update of number of clients in the community being served

- a. We’ve seen over 1400 clients in the Community Counseling Center

Preparing for CACREP re-accreditation and changes in courses and assessment to address latest CACREP standards

- a. CACREP accreditation expires in 2020
- b. We’ve revamped syllabi, student assessment, and program evaluations to meet the new standards

Disseminate and review Annual Report: discussion and feedback

- 
- a. Things to note from the report:
    - i. PNW Assembly for Counseling and Drug Education Established
    - ii. Student numbers have increased
    - iii. Current student to faculty ration is 27.5:1; CACREP requires 10:1

Hiring two new faculty: one in Clinical Mental Health Counseling and one in School Counseling; hoping to have the new faculty start in the fall

- a. Feedback/brainstorm ideas on how to grow our School Counseling program
  - i. (Please see information provided under #8)

Dr. Didelot will be holding a Supervisor Training session early in Spring Semester and will offer free CEU's and PGP's

- a. Feedback/brainstorm ideas on what would be most helpful for site supervisors
  - i. 3 credit hours for students and site supervisors
  - ii. Suggested different topics on supervision (i.e. method, type, Q&A session)
  - iii. Suggested to make the training also NAADAC approved

Will be holding our Ethics Poster Presentation next semester and providing a pre-program that will offer free CEU's and PGP's

Any other feedback for improving our programs?

- a. Provide more electives: pharmacology, human sexuality, concurring disorders, health psychology
- b. Shorten program to less than 2 years
- c. Weekend concentration classes
- d. Have classes be 8 weeks long; split classes into two sections. I.E. College and Career Readiness 1 &2



- 
- e. Addictions class held more often than just the summer
  - f. Less theory, more experience in class
  - g. Students and site supervisors create a collaborative presentation and present it to class
  - h. Have students go into the field and talk to various counseling centers, business, schools, etc. about the program
  - i. Provide better information on crisis response
    - i. Integrate crisis response at every level and into each class curriculum
  - j. Explain in a class or during an event how mental health counselors can work better with school counselors
    - i. Also strengthen mental health in schools
  - k. Hold a possible family and couples class (for school counseling students who must work with a couple or parents)

What may we do for you?

- a. We love being able to help you and are always happy to answer questions that you all have and come across!

## **SPRING 2019**

### **Early Childhood Program *February 8, 2019***

#### Interview/Admission Process Discussion

- Overview of the interview process. In general, the feedback was positive
- Areas of concern: resumes, lateness, length of time for each section of the interview, repetition of interview and presentation questions
- Mary Jane asked when EC candidates interview. Answer: the third or fourth semester. They cannot continue taking education courses beyond this point without being admitted
- Mary Jane suggested a program for those who are direct admit—high flyer day

- 
- ACTION: Add more details to the letter that is sent to candidates who will be interviewing; for example; use the Career Center for your resume assistance.
  - Dave will create online training for interviewers to increase inter-rater reliability this spring, to explain where interviews fall in the program.

### Recruitment/Selectivity

- We need to increase numbers for EC (Anne).
- Mary Jane suggested that we get students talking about the program.
- Brainstorming occurred about outreach.
- Anne said that there are funds available to support marketing. Transition to teaching is a strong possibility.
- Mary Jane mentioned students who are in behavioral sciences as possible T to T candidates. PNW needs courses for licensure completion and TSAP.

### Content Knowledge (CAEP 1 & NAEYC #2)

- In regards to Content Knowledge we do not need to take action at this time. Monitor these going forward

### Planning (CAEP 1 & NAEYC #3)

- Results do not warrant any changes at this time.
- What is being taught in regards to assessment is producing growth. 1B also showed growth—learner differentiation. Monitor these going forward.

Secondary February 20, 2019

### **Special Education March 12, 2019**

**Graduate:** Reviewed Fall 17, Sp18 data for the Fall 2018 CEC Initial SPA report for both the Mild and Intense programs and submitted their report on September 10, 2018. Feedback report was received January 30, 2019 and both graduate programs were Nationally Recognized with Conditions through February 1, 2021. Rubrics will need to be revised based on CEC feedback and implemented during the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. A response to condition report will be submitted March 15, 2020.

**Undergraduate:** Reviewed F17, Sp18, F18 data for the Spring 2019 CEC SPA Response to Condition Report and submitted their report on March 12, 2019. The undergraduate special education program was Nationally Recognized with no conditions on August 1, 2019. Assessment data will continue to be monitored.

---

## **EPP May 8, 2019**

**IDOE Basic Skills:** Effective July 1, 2019, basic skills is longer an educator preparation program (EPP) admission requirement per IDOE Senate Enrolled Act (SEA) 438. SOEC will no longer require passing CASA scores; however, SOEC will require an admission requirement based on passing SAT 1030/ACT 20 scores and will be part of a one-year pilot program (AY 19-20). Admission data will be reviewed at the end of Spring 2020. New passing SAT/ACT scores were determined based on a three (3) year average of incoming freshman. Passing Praxis II scores will be required for Fall 2021 graduates.

**Student Teaching Passing Scores:** Spring 2019 completers will be required to pass Student Teaching Observation Tool (STOT) with a score of 69; Professional Disposition score of 30; and edTPA score of 39.

**Student Progress Reviews** aka Smoky Room will be a way to monitor candidate progress throughout the program. During today's meeting candidates' professional dispositions were reviewed by all EPP faculty. Beginning Fall 2019 faculty will review GPA, course performance, and disposition data on students being considered for Spring 2020 program admission in addition to already admitted candidates in semester 4, 5, 6, and 7.

## **Early Childhood Program Advisory Committee (EPAC) May 7, 2019**

**Learn.Lead.Inspire** - Values of the educator preparation programs at PNW where candidates are prepared to assume complex educational roles inside and outside of traditional educational environments. The PNW educator preparation program mission:

*To re-imagine and change education by creating opportunities for students, candidates, families, educators and our local communities.*

Welcome/Introduction

One Word Exercise

Overview of BS Early Childhood Education

Data Sharing

Discussion:

- How can we best help candidates present themselves as specialists?
- Are there any issues with being hired with this license?
  - o Erin-no we have higher standards and emphasis on play
  - o Terry-it's a benefit

- 
- Erin-explain why K-3 is beneficial and the need for it
    - The program does a good job teaching candidates how to articulate and sell yourself and your skill set
    - Own what you believe

## **Elementary April 26, 2019**

### **Secondary Advisory April 24, 2019**

In attendance: Tareg Mansour, Rhonda Waters, Christine Chidichimo , Monica Gajdos, Hal Pinnick, Catherine Murphy, Sean Egan, Saul Lerner, Colette Morrow, LaVada Taylor, Sheila Stephenson, Kelly Vaughn, Anne Gregory, Staci Trekles, and Amanda Timm

#### 1. EdPTA-Anne Gregory

- EdTPA is a teacher performance scale
- Creates validity and reliability measures
- Test whether a novice performer if they're ready for being in a classroom
- Plan lessons, implement the lesson, and record the teaching of the lesson
- Each task has 5 rubrics
- Piloted in April 2018 in elementary education
- Piloted in Fall 2018 in Secondary education
- Spring 2019 now has everyone using it
- Must have a composite score of 39.
- Secondary did well in Fall 2018 for the pilot program
- Issues with secondary math and science
- Believe that this cohort was part of old secondary program

- 
- SoEC is holding workshops and seminars to go over the tasks
    - o Asking candidates to shoot for a score of 3
  - Look at average scores by rubric
    - o If it's a score of 2.5 or lower, investigate on how to better support candidates
  - 30 other states are also using EdTPA as part of the licensure process
    - o Makes our candidates more marketable
  - EdTPA is also used to improve our program
    - o A test for the SoEC on what we're asking them to do. Are they able to? Are we teaching them well?
  - Anne-surprised that the planning is a low score
  - Rhonda-not surprised. Candidates teach how they learned to teach. And can't always implement and adapt to other methods
  - SoEC tries to work around ISTEP/ILEARN and other tests and is aware of that for candidates so that it does not impact scores
  - There have been changes in the classes within the SoEC to adapt:
    - o EDPS 370-Teaching candidates how to teach an idea in multiple ways
    - o EDCI 355-showing candidates "here's what planning looks like daily and long term"
  - How are we helping hard sciences become better at explaining/writing their own feedback?
  - We need to help candidates understand how to teach to diverse learners
  - LaVada-how do we help candidates deconstruct the notion that they should teach how they were taught; there is more than one way to teach
  - SoEC is becoming more intentional about placements/teachers/districts
  - Kelly-as part of one of her classes, she's having candidates pick impact students who need extra support and create a separate lesson plan to help them in addition to the lesson plan to the class as a whole
-

- 
- Candidates must also learn to adapt a lesson plan to different classes. I.e. what worked for first period may not work for second period
  - Anne-stressing to candidates that it's not about a perfect lesson but looking at who your learners are and making a lesson work for them
    - o Candidates have not learned resiliency yet
  - LaVada-candidates need to develop their tool kit
  - Christine-while a student at PNW, an impactful part of her time was her experience in O21.
  - Catherine- provide secondary students a chance to co-teach a class (i.e. math)
    - o Either observe or work as an SI
  - Sean-teaching to adults is a very different concept than teaching to secondary students
  - SI students
    - o Do a reflection, deconstruct what they saw, discuss and reflect with other SI students
    - o Possible 1 credit course
    - o Allow for a mentor in their core program area courses
    - o Mentor allows for candidates to present possible lesson plans, help on material, ideas on how to present a concept
    - o Examples courses: CHM 111 or SCI 112
  - Kelly: for her elementary education candidates, they have to stay after school and help a student
    - o Could we create something similar for high school students:
  - Other programs are already in place we could help with:
    - o Open hours at the library for students to receive help
    - o At Merrillville, math/science/English clinics in the morning
-

---

o Class for tutoring athletes that are failing

- Saul-as part of SRA response, History dept. is looking at how can we offer help and support to the community

o Proposed summer reading courses (in math, science, and reading)

o Help accelerate local students

o Other Chicago area schools have a program in place

- Collette-will look for a grant for this summer school/reading project

Old Business:

- This is our accreditation year and a lot of work is going into that

- History-in the process of identifying capstone courses

- Science-still determining total credit limit for science

- Math-working with Sheila to provide plan of study to map courses

o Will need to select assessments

§ Similar to SPA

o Due Spetember 15th-need to look at standard alignment and plan of study

- English

o Kelly and Collette are working with the standards to make sure they align to CORE

- Struggle in getting artifacts from English faculty
- Send an email to faculty explaining the necessity and importance of artifacts and that it's not an attack on them

o Struggle in figuring out how to include all of the classes and competency standards

- How to include other elective classes and not just the core 4 classes
- May have to have capstone at the end
- Develop rubrics for the classes

- 
- Look at feedback report for what should be included in the rubrics

- Math, Foreign Language, and English programs of study are going up for review

- Candidates will front load content and then enter program

o EDCI 355 in fall

o 340x in spring

o Student teaching in the fall

o Pre-methods courses before admittance into the program

o While in 355, students will sit for CORE content and CORE pedagogy before student teaching

o Will still have field experience in EDCI 285 before reaching 355

o One of the reasons this change was suggested is that it's hard to learn how to teach content if you haven't had all the content area

o Arranged that we're not intentionally pushing students an extra semester

§ Most are doable in 8 semesters

o CORE-highly conceptual based and must understand content

§ Little pedagogy

o If students do graduate in December we're helping them

- Full time subbing (learn classroom management)
- SoEC is developing a relationship with Gary schools and getting candidates positions there

What can PNW do to help local schools?

- Develop a course/class/program for classroom management for secondary students

o Primary focus is for elementary education students and it's a very different experience

- Help candidates learn how to understand and interpret data



---

o Looking at ISTEP scores, how does data apply to me, my classroom, lessons, standards, and how to make changes

- We have taken your feedback and made changes in our classroom

o EDPS 370-now talk about restorative justice

o Brought in a speaker about self-harm

o We do appreciate your feedback!

- How can we help address the issues of teachers leaving after 1-3 years

o Bring in more guest speakers to our class

- Talk about the reality of being a teacher
- Not so scare candidates but to educate them and make them better prepared

- Highlight the importance of finding a teacher mentor

o Have before student teaching

o Use PNW SoEC alumni as mentors for students

o Have a phone call mentor

§ Check in x times a month

o Also have a content area mentor

- Create/update a student organization for secondary majors

o Staci-rebooting the student club

§ Importance of developing a professional network

o Importance of honor societies

Sheila-Quality Assurance Update

- Fall 2018, new interview process for students entering the program

- 
- o Three parts: writing sample, interview, and presentation
  - 127 interviewed
  - o 26 were secondary
  - 4 point rubric-1 being the highest and 4 being the lowest
  - Students could be admitted, provisionally admitted or denied
  - First chance that many students have had to 'interview' and many were very nervous
  - Overall was a good process and students
  - Sean-Hold mock interviews with area principals for students? Good practice!
  - Professional Disposition update
  - o Candidates are reviewed 4 times prior to graduation
    - Scores are expected to go up each time
  - o If a c scores less than a 2 for any section, an improvement plan is implemented for the candidates

Other Items:

- Provide training for student teachers from ISTA on boundaries/appropriate relationships in the classroom
- o i.e. no social media contact
- o find a balance/boundaries between being a good teacher and their friend
- o do's and don'ts of being a teacher
- o Club that is being updated is a part of the ISTA

What can we do better?

- Earlier notification of meetings
- What are we doing to address lower numbers/teacher shortage

- 
- No Spanish teachers at PNW

o Issues:

- Cost of college
- IN Education system
- How do we open doors to education for the working class

- Rename/repackage the Transition to Teach program into a master's program

Take away:

- Work on grant for summer reading program
- Developing a mentor program
- Develop a classroom management course/seminar

Thank you for your time and input into our program!

## **EPP Advisory Meeting June 6, 2019**

Partners in attendance: Barbara Eason-Watkins (Michigan City); Terry Kolopanis (Lake Station)

### **Interview Process**

PNW EPP has introduced a new interview process for admission of new candidates into the program.

Gregory explained the process and posed the following questions...

- Does it make sense?
- What would make it better?
- Another point for the interviews?

Eason-Watkins:

- The university owns a level of responsibility for candidate's knowledge and content
- University clinical experiences take place earlier
- Opposed to screening candidates earlier
- Field experiences much earlier
- Not so much a formal interview but more observations from faculty
- What the candidates do; what they can contribute

Kolopanis:

- 
- Agreed to earlier field experiences
  - Principal consistency and being part of assessment
  - Whole experience

### **Residential Experiences**

Gregory explained the plan for full-year residential experiences and working toward the increase amount of classroom time within the field.

- Kolopanis agreed with earlier exposure within the field
- Instruction with children and observe when candidates are with children

### **What about during standardized testing?** (Gregory)

Kolopanis: Yes, the candidates need to see the process and protocol

Eason-Watkins:

- Summer experience – tutoring
- U of M advisory board Mary Grove (Polytechnic)
- Interdisciplinary team – recruit
- CPS – “Dean’s Group”, e.g., reading methods courses
- Funding for 5 universities to bolster content knowledge

### **How to provide opportunities to recruit candidates outside of education?**

- Create introductory courses that are GenEd approved

Gregory:

- Ratchet up the quality of candidates to meet needs of both school districts
- Required course in ELL

Eason-Watkins:

- Need culturally responsive pedagogy
- Start teacher cadet program
  - Pipeline to Westville/Hammond

Kolopanis: Use to have cadet teaching opportunities

Gregory:

- Dual license/SpEd at Westville
- Passport to PNW through Concurrent Enrollment Program (CEP)
  - Clear degree pathways

Eason-Watkins:

- Instructional assistant turnover
- Teacher Ed program at Ivy Tech
- Grow your own: *paras – instructional assistants – teachers*

- 
- Kolopanis – training paras
  - Not undecided education
  - Next level jobs – Chancellor?
  - Funding
  - Communication with kids; e.g., Valparaiso nursing – healthcare fields
  - Nobody is interacting with kids
    - Example: Elementary teacher wants to go to SpEd
      - § How to move this
      - § PD – add SpEd course at the PD schools
        - 25 interested in SpEd teachers

## **Dispositions**

Eason-Watkins:

- Clinical students – come in and tell a teacher
- Clarify role of candidates
- Challenged with constructive criticism
- Faculty to spend enough time to observe candidates to gauge their capacity and readiness to be a teacher

Kolopanis:

- Agreed with constructive criticism
- Not being aware of confidentiality

Eason-Watkins:

- Invite district HR person to talk about DO and DO NOT
  - E.g., Wendell McCullom – MCAS

Gregory:

- Confidentiality, Social Media, Disclosure

Eason-Watkins:

Curriculum – invite school personnel in to ? alignment/scoped sequence

Kolopanis enjoyed working with Dave Pratt on curriculum

Eason-Watkins:

- Geminus model
- Office space @ MCAS – Niermann?
- Edgewood – Fathers involved

## **One thing new teachers...**

Eason-Watkins:

- Middle school/secondary teachers

- 
- Understand how to relate – not being

Kolopanis:

- More consistency in the buildings and more frequency in being there
- Small groups – standing back?
- Being engaged

## **Counseling and Development April 16, 2019**

Attendance-Mary Didelot, Lisa Hollingsworth (Chair), Amanda Timm, Maya Blackwell, Lindsey Farmer, Maggie Musillami, and Andrew Raeleteju

1. Welcome!
2. Much appreciation to all members for being on our Advisory Board
  - Thank you for being a part of our advisory board. Your participation and input is really welcome and appreciated.
3. Disseminate and review 2018 Annual Report: discussion and feedback
  - See substantive changes
    - Crisis Intervention and Emergency Management is now a required course for SC rather than an elective.
    - As per the advice from the last advisory board, more courses will include material on trauma and crisis as related to those courses
4. Two new tenure-track faculty members beginning in August, 2019: Dr. Injung Lee in School Counseling and Dr. Vincent Marasco in Clinical Mental Health. One of the suggestions provided by the Advisory Board last semester was to provide a course in human sexuality. Dr. Marasco is very interested in teaching this course, as this is one of his areas of specialty.
5. Dr. Didelot and Jil Hus held three Supervisor Training sessions this spring for free CEU's and PGP's. They were very well attended by site supervisors and were a great learning opportunity for our students.
  - Mary and Jil held professional development trainings on supervision
  - In 2012, CACREP told us we needed more contact with supervisors
  - Mary will continue additional training into the fall and spring
  - Internship and practicum students were included in the training
  - The board was asked to please provide ideas as to additional training topics
6. Our Purdue Northwest Assembly for Counseling and Drug Education is offering a panel presentation on adolescent addiction on April 24<sup>th</sup>. It will be followed by the Ethics in Action

---

Poster Session provided by our students in our ethics courses. Attendees who go to both can earn free CEU's and PGP's.

- Registration is open for the event.
- This year's theme is "Adolescents Dealing with Drugs, Addiction and Mental Illness"

7. Our question for you: The field of counseling changes constantly in the schools and in the mental health field. What are some things that you did not get in your training program that would assist you with these areas of change?

- Topic areas:
  - Leadership and how to be in a leadership role
  - ASCA in-service
  - How to advocate for yourself
  - Risk assessment
    - § Correct/more universal language for risk assessment
      - Maggie will provide information to Lisa from a conference she attended
  - Differences in assessing adolescents and children
    - § Who has more risk and how to determine this
  - More training on how to document ethical decisions that must be made
  - Mental status exam-differential and use with differential diagnosis
  - Disorders and evaluating disorders
    - § Would like to have 2 classes of psychopathology rather than 1 (Psychopathology 1 and Psychopathology 2)
  - Differential diagnosis elective
  - Understanding data
    - § especially for school counseling
  - Substance abuse for school counseling
    - § awareness of new drug names
    - § important for both students and families and their impact on families
  - Business of counseling
    - § coding, Medicare/Medicaid, insurance, reimbursement, referrals, case management, resources, how to refer out, levels of different types of care
    - § make the resource list a project in internship
  - Possible homework idea- SOAP note with requirement to highlight the different subjective and objective terms

---

8. The question was posed: What may we do for you?



---

## Program Review Updates

### Fall 2018

#### NCTE (Secondary English)

- Nationally Recognized with Conditions
- Spring 2019 - revise rubrics/assessments
- Fall 2019 implement revised assessments
- Spring 2020 resubmit March 15, 2020

#### CEC Special Education Graduate

- Both Mild and Intense programs were nationally recognized with conditions
- Spring/Summer 2019: revise rubrics
- Spring 2020: Resubmit March 15, 2020

### Spring 2019

#### ACEI (Elementary)

- Resubmitted March 15, 2019
- **Met 2007 ACEI standards with conditions.** Review of reports using ACEI standards have been discontinued. Evidence of the program's efforts to address conditions may be provided in the CAEP self-study report.

#### CEC Undergraduate (Special Education)

- Resubmitted March 15, 2019
- **Nationally Recognized:** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years (2025-2027). The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years (2022-2024) in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit.

---

## Summer 2019

CACREP submitted self-study in June, 2019. An on-site visit will take place sometime in February/March 2020.

## Initiatives

### Undergraduate

- Applied for Head Start grant; not awarded
- Beveridge Partnership
- PEL Fellow
- Study Abroad: Italy
- New tenure-track faculty were hired for AY19-20...**Jennifer Call-Jones**, assistant professor of special education (early childhood/early intervention), School of Education and Counseling. Dr. Call earned her Ph.D. the University of Utah. **Patrick Keegan**, assistant professor of education with expertise in social studies and multicultural education, School of Education and Counseling. Dr. Keegan earned his Ph.D. from Columbia University.

### Graduate

Two new tenure-track faculty were hired to begin AY 2019-2020. **Vincent Marasco**, assistant professor of counselor education, School of Education and Counseling, Dr. Marasco earned his Ph.D. from Idaho State University.

**Injung Lee**, assistant professor of education with a primary focus in school counseling, School of Education and Counseling. Dr. Lee earned her Ph.D. from the University of Iowa.