School of Education and Counseling
AY 2021-2022

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY
NORTHWEST.

Introduction

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

VISION:

PNW's Educator Preparation Program will transform education and empower educators to build a better future for all through the (a) construction of knowledge, (b) development of practice through continuous engagement, and (c) cultivation of relationships (Conceptual Framework of the Educational Leader).

MISSION:

The mission of PNW's Educator Preparation Program is to re-imagine and change education by creating opportunities for students, candidates, families, educators and our local communities.

SOEC'S CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Continuous Engagement

Construction of Knowledge

Relationships

Advocacy
inherent in being an educator
learning environments
mutually defined
shared responsibility
informed by coherent research and practice

Learning
developmental
socially constructed
meaningful   interactive
personal and social
dynamic process
contextual

Leading
learning foregrounded
Collaborative process
"All are leaders"
instructionally within community scholarly

Educational Leader

Health
self-care
mindfulness
emotionally
physically
mentally

Transformation
innovation
disruptive to status quo
informed by research
enduring sustainable
responsive to needs

Goals

The 2021-2022 academic year was a year of **CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**. While writing the CAEP Self Study, SoEC goals were created based on data review and in relation to the CAEP standards. The Revolutionizing the Educator Preparation Program at PNW (REP3) was created. Increase number of candidates successfully passing on first attempt of license exam (CAEP 1.3)

1. Provide training to clinical educators (training to reliability) (CAEP 2.1, 2.3)
2. Create and implement clinical placement tracking and monitoring system to ensure candidates have a diverse experience (CAEP 2.1, 2.3)
3. Develop and expand relationships with community partners (CAEP 3.1)
4. Increase diversity of candidates entering and completing EPP degree/license programs to align with the demographics of the region. (CAEP 3.1)
5. Create unique and diverse opportunities for candidates to engage in their profession (CAEP 3.1)
6. Create infrastructure within the EPP for ongoing study of the impact of candidates (CAEP 4.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
7. Establish and monitor progress toward meeting goals and establishing new ones for CAEP. (CAEP 5)

Goals focused on during 2021-2022 (REP3)

The SoEC Leadership selected the following goals to focus on during the academic year 2021-2022...

2. Provide training to clinical educators

3. Create and implement a clinical placement tracking and monitoring system to ensure candidates have diverse experiences.

7. Create infrastructure within the EPP for ongoing study of the impact of candidates

Training for Clinical Educators

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the Office of Partnerships and Outreach developed and implemented a variety of trainings for our clinical educators. Topics included...

- Difficult Conversations/Addressing Student Issues *(10/11/21)*
- General Supervisor Expectations/Relationship to PNW Faculty *(11/8/21)*
- Social-Emotional Learning and Social Hour/Semester Wrap-Up *(12/13/21)* (CAEP 2.1, 2.3)

Clinical Placement Tracking

During the Fall 2021 semester, an Access database was created to track candidates throughout their clinical placement experiences. Database fields include candidate name, PUID, field supervisor, field course, school district, school, grade level, school site type (urban, suburban, rural), cooperating teacher. This tool will assist in making sure that our candidates are obtaining a diverse clinical experience. This database is stored on the R drive and replaces TaskStream. (CAEP 2.1, 2.3)

Completer Impact on P-12 Learning

Committee members include Kelly Vaughan, Geoff Schultz, Nicole Baker, Amanda Passmore, Grace Pigozzi, and Dave Pratt.

Update: Based upon the *Next Steps for Investigating Program Impact* (NSIPI) study that was established during Fall 2021, e-mail requests for participation of completers were sent out (five (5) completers in each program area). When we did not hear back, we sent out additional requests. In total, twenty-five (25) requests were sent out and we heard back from two completers, including one who did not meet eligibility criteria. It was decided to move away from NSIPI and instead institute a Completer Advisory Committee.

Minutes CIC Meeting Tuesday, April 19th 12pm-12:30pm CLO 239 and via Zoom

In attendance: Kelly Vaughn, Amanda Passmore, Geoff Schultz, Sheila Stephenson, Dave Pratt, Grace Pigozzi, and Michelle Gilhooly

Via Zoom: Nicole Baker

NEXT STEPS:

Geoff, Dave, Nicole and Kelly to invite 5 students each to join the committee.

List of graduates will be shared next week. (Week of April 25th)

Expectation to reach out to potential committee members in the next two weeks before Graduation.

Pizza and Pedagogy Committee (PPC) Proposal

Purpose: We will convene a group of recent graduates to form an ongoing advising/ mentoring committee. We will ask members of the committee to participate in three meetings per year. During these meetings, committee members will:

· Provide recommendations to the SoEC about ways to support current students and recent graduates in meeting expectations in the classroom;

· Participate in at least one session with a faculty member designed to assess the impact of their teaching on their p-12 students; and

· Have the opportunity to receive ongoing mentoring/ professional development.

Participants: Participants will be selected by individual faculty members. We seek to have at least three elementary, three special education, and three secondary graduates on our committee. To be eligible, a committee member must:

· Be a recent graduate (no more than 3 years since graduation);

· Be actively employed as a full time teacher in the area of licensure; and

· Be willing to participate in three meetings per year.

Participants will receive PGP points, informal mentorship, and the ability to reflect upon their own teaching practices.

First Meeting:

We will convene our first meeting in the Spring of 2022. Kelly Vaughan will send a list of recent graduates (F2021 and S2022) already working in (or under contract to work) in classrooms to select faculty members. Kelly, Dave, Geoff, and LaVada (in consultation with other faculty members) will each invite five individuals to join the committee. Kelly will reach out to all interested students and through a doodle poll find a time/ place most convenient for our first Pizza and Pedagogy Committee Meeting, at which time we will celebrate graduation and invite participation for next year.

Office of Recruitment and Retention

Recruitment Goals:

- Reach out to rural communities
- Focus groups
  - Current and former PNW male candidates - Pam - beginning of December

Males of Color in Illinois

Lisa Lyons had the opportunity to interview two African American Men that currently work in Education

Daniel Jackson: 2ND Grade Teacher, Dixon Elementary, Chicago Public Schools (Traditional Undergraduate)

Brian Hayes: 6th – 8th Grade Teacher, Pershing Magnet School, Chicago Public Schools (Returned to college as a working adult and having a family)

What made you pursue a career in education?

I became a teacher because I wanted to transform the lives of young minds through teaching them about life styles and critical thinking. I've noticed not all students receive the support at home or from community and I wanted to ensure that all students receive the supports they need.

I pursued a career in education because I wanted to give back to my community, knew that I was very talented in communicating and teaching historical content, particularly from a Black perspective, and had become very disenchanted with Corporate America.

Why is there a lack of men of color in the field of education?

There is a lack of men in education because many institutes and states lack scholarships, many districts are compensating teachers with low paying salary, there is a lack of male mentors to provide supports to other male educators, and many of the standardized licensor tests for teacher candidates could be a burden for the teacher candidate.

Historically, education has been viewed as a field created for women to work in. There's not enough financial benefit or incentive for Black men to pursue careers in education. Furthermore, unless Blacks are predominantly responsible for the hiring policies in public schools, particularly urban ones, whites will always dominate administratively and within the classrooms. In addition, Black men are viewed as being more threatening than Black women.

What can colleges and universities do to increase the enrollment of men of color in education program?

Many colleges would have to hire more representation men of color. Institutions would also have to provide financial support to ensure teacher candidates are not burdened by financial hardships, there should also be a higher compensation for male educators since this is the current need, and institutions would have to provide mentor academy to help teacher candidates learn the ropes of teaching.

Honestly, I don't think there is anything that institutions of higher education can do to increase the enrollment numbers for Black men in education unless there is substantial financial incentives for Black men to even consider it.

Anything else you would like to share?

Taught high school for a few years. I no longer teach high school. Black men were expected to be the disciplinarians because we were Black men. I got in this career to educate not to be a bodyguard.

Retention Goals:

- Group Advising Sessions
  - Lower level candidates (EDPS 28500/EDST 20000) - Takes place each semester
- GS191 (undecided/undeclared)
- Passport PNW

- 240 Tutoring: In addition to the information and resources for students found on the ETS site, candidates are able to use 240tutoring at a reduced rate using the code shared with them at the point of assessment registration. 240tutoring provides interactive study materials that align with the specific Praxis assessments required for licensure. Information for 240tutoring and Praxis vouchers are shared with candidates in the semester where the exam is recommended to be completed.

- Scholarships/Financial Assistance: SoEC hosted two scholarships/financial aid events during the fall 2021 semester. These events were not well attended by candidates. Advisors will try to reach out to candidates regarding financial aid opportunities during identified class times.

Office of Partnerships and Outreach

Goals:

- Tuesday check ins are taking place
- Supervisor Training topics are based on feedback from field supervisors/faculty
    - Difficult Conversations/Addressing Student Issues *(10/11/21)*
    - General Supervisor Expectations/Relationship to PNW Faculty *(11/8/21)*
    - Social-Emotional Learning and Social Hour/Semester Wrap-Up *(12/13/21)*
    - Personalized/Scheduled On-Boarding Trainings for New Supervisors *(1/22)*
    - General Expectations *(1/10/22)*
    - Faculty/Supervisor Relationship and Expectations *(2/9/22)*
    - OPO Open Office Hours (drop in with any questions) *(3/2/22)*
    - Meditation/Mindfulness *(4/13/22)*
- Tracking system: Access database was developed by graduate assistant, Ankit, replacing TaskStream.
- What to Know from the OPO is a weekly update on student teaching, field placements, supervision, licensing and testing, resources and is emailed out to clinical supervisors, faculty, and staff.

EPP Assessment Data Book

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) has six (6) overarching signature assessments that include…

1. Admission Process
2. Dispositions
3. Student Teaching Observation Tool (STOT)
4. edTPA
5. Program Exit Survey (NExT)
6. Impact on P-12 Learning

1. Admission Process

NOTE: Revised CAEP Standard 3 (2022) no longer requires evidence of a "group average performance on nationally normed assessments*."*

According to the State "…we will see fewer programs using basic skills assessments going forward. We were happy to see this change as it removes a potential barrier and expense for teacher candidates."

Praxis CASE Entrance Exam Cut Score

Action Items:

ELEMENTARY

- Pilot CASE/Praxis I during 2022-2023
- Review data end of Sp23
- Use baseline data to possibly revise interview process
- Review data to see how candidates perform on licensure exam

2. Dispositions

The **Niagara Disposition Assessment** tool was introduced during Fall 2019. This instrument was selected because of its proven validity and reliability. The EPP has determined that if candidates are rated on three or more dispositions as *Somewhat Disagree (2)* or one or more dispositions are evaluated as *Disagree (1)* the candidate will be referred to a Student Affairs hearing to develop a Dispositions Intervention Plan.

EPP disposition data was shared from Fall 2021. The top three areas of concern were **preparedness, punctuality,** and **responsibility**. How are expectations being managed? Candidates are at different levels, teachers expected base on previous experience. Faculty can set expectations for their own classes. Dispositions address Social Emotional Learning (SEL). **Teaching SEL skills to address dispositions**. **Establish minimal expectations of candidates**. Set up meetings to address field expectations through **OPO Orientation** including supervisors, candidates, faculty. **Faculty to send email to cooperating teachers with their expectations**. Create a **Brightspace page** for Field Experience.

[AY 21-22 Dispositional Data](#)

 ACTION:

Changes to Field Guide
- Index page
- One-page communication hand-out; assignments to cooperating teachers and schools
- Contract sign-off sheet
- Orientation by OPO (field supervisors and candidates)
- Brightspace page (e-learning/field experience information

3. Student Teaching Observation Tool (STOT)

The STOT is now being evaluated within Brightspace since TaskStream is no longer being used.

Major	Completion GPA	Praxis Pedagogy	Praxis HUMANITIES	Praxis STEM	Praxis SpED Mild	STOT	edTPA	Average edTPA Rubric Score	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
Early Childhood n=5	Range: 3.40-3.81	Range: 156-174	Range: 167-188	Range: 168-175		Range: 3.11-3.30	Range: 35-46	Range: 2.33-3.07															
AVERAGE	3.62	162	175	172		3.25	39	2.59	2.20	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.20	3.00	2.60	2.80	2.40	2.40	2.40	3.20	2.80	2.40	2.60
Pass Rate		4/5 80%	5/5 100%	5/5 100%																			
Elem/SpEd n=33	Range: 2.80-3.94					Range: 3.00-4.00	Range: 34-47	Range: 2.27-3.13															
AVERAGE	3.41	30/33 91%	24/33 73%	24/33 73%	27/33 82%	3.49	41	2.72	2.69	2.72	2.79	2.60	2.66	3.00	2.74	2.69	2.66	2.60	2.47	3.33	2.61	2.29	2.89
Elementary n=23	Range: 2.68-4.00					Range: 2.91-3.96	Range: 35-52	Range: 2.33-3.47															
AVERAGE	3.46	19/23 83%	18/23 78%	19/23 83%	n/a	3.59	43	2.89	2.91	2.83	2.91	2.67	2.83	2.95	2.91	2.87	3.00	2.57	2.87	3.48	2.65	2.70	3.23
Secondary		Pedagogy Exam	Content Exam																				
English n=4	Range: 3.17-3.99					Range 3.04-3.24	Range 42-51	Range 2.80-3.40															
AVERAGE	3.66	4/4 100%	4/4 100%			3.14	46	3.07	2.75	3.25	3.25	3.00	2.75	3.25	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.75	3.25	3.00
History n=4	Range: 3.31-3.86					Range 3.05-3.91	Range 35-47	Range 2.33-3.13															
AVERAGE	3.51	1/4 25%	3/4 75%			3.51	42	2.82	3.00	3.33	3.33	2.67	2.67	3.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	3.00	2.00	2.67	3.00
Math n=1	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Biology n=1	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

PASSING SCORE   4.00 scale   STOT: 3.00   edTPA: 39 or
PLANNING   edTPA score of 35-38 w/a final
1 Content Understanding   STOT score of 3.00
2 Support varied student needs
3 Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning
4 Identifying and supporting language demands
5 Assessments to monitor and support student learning
INSTRUCTION
6 Learning environment
7 Engaging students in learning
8 Deepening student learning
9 Subject-specific pedagogy
10 Analyzing teaching effectiveness
ASSESSMENT
11 Analysis of student learning
12 Providing feedback to guide learning
13 Student use of feedback
14 Analyzing students' language use and content learning
15 Using assessment to inform instruction

4. 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. Graduate Special Education candidates were assessed on Special Education. edTPA scores can now be entered into Banner along with STOT scores. This will allow Institutional Research to run reports.

	Program Area	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Average Total Score
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	R15	
AY 19-20	ECH n=6	3.17	2.50	3.17	3.25	2.83	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.17	2.83	3.33	3.58	2.92	2.75	2.83	45
	ELED n=64	2.83	2.69	2.83	2.73	2.73	2.98	2.70	2.61	2.76	2.51	2.73	3.30	2.64	2.43	2.84	41
	Secondary n=17	2.94	2.47	2.94	2.71	2.59	2.94	2.65	2.47	2.47	2.35	2.65	2.94	2.53	2.47	2.47	40
	Special Ed n=16	2.88	3.00	2.63	3.13	2.94	3.13	3.00	2.94	3.06	2.69	2.44	2.94	2.63	3.20	2.44	43
	EPP n=103	2.96	2.67	2.89	2.96	2.77	3.01	2.84	2.76	2.87	2.60	2.79	3.19	2.68	2.71	2.65	42
AY 20-21	ECH n=7	2.71	2.71	2.93	2.57	2.71	3.07	2.86	2.64	2.79	2.64	2.57	2.86	1.86	2.57	3.00	41
	ELED n=50	2.80	2.89	3.02	2.76	2.80	3.00	2.80	2.82	2.71	2.52	2.66	3.23	2.58	2.58	2.78	42
	Secondary n=16	2.88	2.44	2.63	2.63	2.63	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.38	2.72	2.91	2.34	2.44	2.44	39
	Special Ed n=8	2.38	3.00	2.63	2.88	2.38	3.13	3.00	2.88	3.13	2.50	1.63	3.00	2.00	2.63	2.50	40
	EPP n=81	2.77	2.80	2.90	2.72	2.72	3.02	2.75	2.75	2.70	2.49	2.56	3.11	2.41	2.56	2.72	41
AY 21-22	ECH n=5	2.20	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.20	3.00	2.60	2.80	2.40	2.40	2.40	3.20	2.80	2.40	2.60	39
	ELED n=56	2.78	2.77	2.84	2.62	2.73	2.98	2.81	2.76	2.80	2.58	2.61	3.41	2.59	2.50	2.98	42
	Secondary n=6	2.67	2.67	3.00	2.33	2.00	3.17	2.67	3.00	3.00	2.83	2.67	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.83	41
	Special Ed n=14	2.57	3.00	2.71	2.71	2.71	3.00	3.00	2.92	2.69	2.38	2.00	2.93	2.43	2.71	2.43	40
	T2T n=3	2.67	3.33	3.00	2.67	1.67	3.00	2.67	2.33	2.33	2.33	3.33	3.67	2.67	2.50	2.33	40
	EPP n=84	2.58	2.83	2.87	2.59	2.26	3.03	2.75	2.76	2.64	2.50	2.60	3.31	2.50	2.56	2.63	40

1. Candidates who earn 39 or higher on the edTPA have met this requirement for graduation.

2. Candidates who score below 39 are contacted by the edTPA coordinator for a meeting to review materials, rubric progressions, and the Making Good Choices guide. In this meeting, the task(s) that need to be resubmitted are determined, and a timeline is established for resubmission.

3. Candidates who earn a 35-38 on the edTPA AND earn a 3.0 or higher on their final STOT do not have to resubmit edTPA. Since the State of Indiana does not require edTPA for licensure the university has identified a benchmark for students which aligns with requirements for nearby states.

Action Items:

T2T candidates had an average score of 1.67 for Planning Assessments to Monitor And Support Student Learning. This should be monitored.

5. Program Exit Survey (NExT)

Survey Administration: The NExT Exit Survey was sent to all candidates who completed an initial teacher licensure program during the fall 2021-spring 2022 academic year. The survey was sent to candidates toward the end of their final semester in their teacher licensure programs.

Response Rate: The 2021-22 Exit Survey response rate for the institution was 59% (52 out of 88). Rate is calculated by dividing the number of respondents who completed the survey through at least Section A by the population of student teachers who could have completed the survey.

Findings: The complete 2021-2022 NExT Program Exit Survey results can be found by clicking on the link below.

Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?

	2020-2021 n=76		2021-2022 n = 51	
	#	Percent	#	Percent
Definitely yes	7	9.21%	4	7.84%
Probably yes	17	22.37%	7	13.73%
Probably no	38	50%	20	39.22%
Definitely no	14	18.42%	20	39.22%

2021-2022 NExT Program Exit Results

6. Completer Impact on P-12 Learning

Pizza and Pedagogy Committee (PPC) Proposal

Purpose: We will convene a group of recent graduates to form an ongoing advising/ mentoring committee. We will ask members of the committee to participate in three meetings per year. During these meetings, committee members will:

- Provide recommendations to the SoEC about ways to support current students and recent graduates in meeting expectations in the classroom;
- Participate in at least one session with a faculty member designed to assess the impact of their teaching on their p-12 students; and
- Have the opportunity to receive ongoing mentoring/ professional development.

Participants: Participants will be selected by individual faculty members. We seek to have at least three elementary, three special education, and three secondary graduates on our committee. To be eligible, a committee member must:

- Be a recent graduate (no more than 3 years since graduation);
- Be actively employed as a full time teacher in the area of licensure; and
- Be willing to participate in three meetings per year.

Participants will receive PGP points, informal mentorship, and the ability to reflect upon their own teaching practices.

First Meeting:

The first meeting took place on May 16, 2022. Kelly Vaughan sent a list of recent graduates (F2021 and S2022) already working in (or under contract to work) in classrooms to select faculty members. Kelly, Dave, Geoff, and LaVada (in consultation with other faculty members) will each invite five individuals to join the committee. Kelly will reach out to all interested students and through a doodle poll find a time/ place most convenient for our first Pizza and Pedagogy Committee Meeting, at which time we will celebrate graduation and invite participation for next year.

Field Data

Student Teaching Candidates

Program	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Graduate SpEd	6	13	14	3	9	5
Secondary (incl T2T) (19-20/20-21 only)	8	11	5	13	4	5
T2T	–	–	–	–	2	3
Elementary Dual	15	24	12	15	17	16
Elementary Reading	19	23	5	21	11	12
Early Childhood	1	5	0	7	0	5

Student Teaching Summary

	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Student Placement Sites	29	64	29	29	27	26
Districts	14	27	17	15	17	16
Student Teaching Candidates	43	76	36	59	43	46

Student Teaching Sites

County	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022

Lake	6	13	9	6	7	7
Porter	3	4	1	2	0	2
LaPorte	4	4	2	4	3	2
Starke	1	0	0	0	0	0
Newton	0	1	0	0	0	1
Jasper	0	0	0	1	1	1
IL						1
Other	0	5	5	2	6	1

Field Placements (not including ST)

Includes pre-admission field courses	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Field Experiences	15	13	9	11	21	5
Field Sites	14	25	25	21	52	72
Field Districts	8	10	11	12	21	27
Field Candidates	220	195	249	179	195	180

Field Placement Sites

County	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Lake	6	6	6	7	12	7
Porter	1	1	4	4	4	5
LaPorte	1	3	3	2	3	3

Starke	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newton	0	0	0	0	1	0
Jasper	0	0	1	0	0	0
IL					1	2
Other						1

Setting	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Urban	4	3	7	1	1	3	
Rural	2	0	3	5	1	5	
Suburban	10	11	15	19	22	13	

NOTE: Setting type is determined by State

Candidate Progression

CAEP standard 3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression. The provider creates and monitors **transition points** from admission through completion that indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical skills, critical dispositions, professional responsibilities, and the ability to integrate technology effectively in their practice. The provider identifies a transition point at any point in the program when a cohort grade point average of 3.0 is achieved and monitors this data. The provider ensures knowledge of and progression through transition points are transparent to candidates. The provider plans and documents the need for **candidate support**, as identified in disaggregated data by race and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission, so candidates meet milestones. The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of **candidate complaints**, including complaints made to CAEP, and documents the resolution.

Transition Points

Elementary Program

Undergraduate Elementary candidates' GPA will be monitored at three different transition points during their program

1. Point of Interview (Semester 3)
2. Prior to Admission to Professional Year (Semester 6)
3. During student teaching (Semester 8)

Secondary Program

For candidates in the undergraduate secondary programs, the transition points differ from the elementary program due to the fact that secondary candidates complete the majority of their content courses prior to being admitted into the program. Therefore, their GPA is monitored as follows…

1. Prior to being interviewed for admission to EPP
2. During semester seven (7) field experience
3. During student teaching

Further, secondary candidates are required to attempt the Praxis content area licensure exam prior to admission into the EPP.

Candidate Complaints

If a candidate expresses a complaint, the communication plan is as follows…

Candidate will speak to…

1. Professor
2. Program Coordinator
3. Director of School of Education and Counseling
4. Dean of College of Humanities, Education, Social Sciences

CAEP Accountability Measures

*Measure 1: Completer Impact and Effectiveness: Data on completer effectiveness and impact, which directly align with CAEP Component R4.1, may come from various sources, including those outlined below. The EPP should be sure to provide data related to BOTH completer effectiveness and impact. Data examples: contribute to P-12 student-learning growth (state-level data of student performance (e.g. student growth measures, value-added measures); performance portfolios, case study. Apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the P-12 classroom (**state-level data of teacher performance (e.g., teacher evaluations)**; focus groups/interviews (completers, P-12 students, observers); observations of completers; surveys.*

Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

Completer Impact

Update: Based upon the *Next Steps for Investigating Program Impact* (NSIPI) study that was established during Fall 2021, e-mail requests for participation of completers were sent out (five (5) completers in each program area). When we did not hear back, we sent out additional requests. In total, twenty-five (25) requests were sent out and we heard back from two completers, including one who did not meet eligibility criteria. It was decided to move away from NSIPI and instead institute a Completer Advisory Committee.

NEXT STEPS: Pizza and Pedagogy Committee (PPC) Proposal

Purpose: We will convene a group of recent graduates to form an ongoing advising/ mentoring committee. We will ask members of the committee to participate in three meetings per year. During these meetings, committee members will:

- Provide recommendations to the SoEC about ways to support current students and recent graduates in meeting expectations in the classroom;
- Participate in at least one session with a faculty member designed to assess the impact of their teaching on their p-12 students; and
- Have the opportunity to receive ongoing mentoring/ professional development.

Participants will be selected by individual faculty members. We seek to have at least three elementary, three special education, and three secondary graduates on our committee. To be eligible, a committee member must:

- Be a recent graduate (no more than 3 years since graduation);
- Be actively employed as a full time teacher in the area of licensure; and
- Be willing to participate in three meetings per year.

Participants will receive PGP points, informal mentorship, and the ability to reflect upon their own teaching practices.

First Meeting: First meeting convened on May 16, 2022.

Teacher Effectiveness (Std. 4.2)

This report is provided by the Indiana Department of Education as part of the 1388 Annual EPP Report.

Percent of Teachers Achieving Effective or Highly Effective Rating												
	Teachers with One (1) Year Experience			Teachers with Two (2) Years Experience			Teachers with Three (3) Years Experience					
PNW	Effective	Highly Effective	Total Teachers Evaluated	Effective	Highly Effective	Total Teachers Evaluated	Effective	Highly Effective	Total Teachers Evaluated	Grand Totals		
18-19	35	18	53	19	25	45	34	30	64	18-19	19-20	20-21
19-20	34	7	41	40	15	55	27	30	57			
20-21	32	10	44	25	28	55	35	34	70			
Total Effective										88	101	92
Total Highly Effective										73	52	72
Total Effective /Highly Effective										161	153	164
Total Evaluate										162	153	169
%										99%	100%	97%
**Year defined as September 1-August 31												
Visit http://www.doe.in.gov/evalations for additional information												

Source: IDOE 2022 Annual Report

Teacher Effectiveness: During the academic year 2020-2021 the final percentage of teachers rating highly effective/effective was 97% based on 167/169 teachers evaluated which was slightly below last year's 100% rating. Data based on the academic year 2021-2022 will be available from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) in September, 2023 and will be updated on this website at that time.

Faculty noted that this was during COVID and perhaps the less than 100% effectiveness rating was due to the pandemic. Perhaps candidates took time off or candidates were not pursuing teaching jobs. Perhaps some of our candidates left Indiana to pursue teaching positions in neighboring states such as Michigan or Ohio.

Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement: Data may come from various sources including: employer satisfaction surveys, employer satisfaction case studies, employer focus groups or interviews with detailed methodology, involvement of internal and external stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes such as (MOUs/partnerships, advisory board feedback/input, co-construction or assessment/surveys, documentation of meetings and decisions)

Measure 2.Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholders Involvement (CAEP Std. 4.3)

Principal Survey Results for Purdue University Northwest 2022															
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).	**Means**			Disagree Strongly (1)			Disagree (2)			Agree (3)			Strongly Agree (4)		
The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to…	'20	'21	'22 n=45	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
1. ...understand how students learn and develop at the grade level they are	3.32	3.37	3.33	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=2 5%	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=23 52%	n=19 50%	n=30 67%	n=18 41%	n=17 45%	n=15 33%

The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to...	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
teaching.															
2. ...meet expectations of a beginning teacher for content preparation and knowledge.	3.36	3.42	3.36	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=23 52%	n=20 53%	n=29 64%	n=19 43%	n=17 45%	n=16 36%
3. ...adhere to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession.	3.50	3.62	3.50	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=17 39%	n=14 37%	n=22 50%	n=25 57%	n=23 61%	n=22 50%
4. ...adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession.	3.41	3.61	3.44	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=21 48%	n=15 39%	n=23 51%	n=21 48%	n=23 61%	n=21 47%

Pedagogical Preparation of Teacher															
The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to...	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
5. ...provide an appropriate and challenging learning experience.	3.39	3.37	3.22	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=24 55%	n=21 55%	n=33 73%	n=19 43%	n=16 42%	n=11 24%
6. ...provide an inclusive learning environment.	3.34	3.50	3.31	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=26 59%	n=19 50%	n=31 69%	n=17 39%	n=19 50%	n=14 31%
7. ...provide a rigorous learning environment.	3.34	3.39	3.20	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=26 59%	n=20 53%	n=34 76%	n=17 39%	n=17 45%	n=10 22%
8. ...use a variety of assessment methods to guide, adjust, and improve instruction.	3.36	3.32	3.32	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=23 52%	n=23 61%	n=35 78%	n=19 43%	n=14 37%	n=10 22%
9. ...develop content specific assessments to test for student understanding of the lesson objectives.	3.27	3.37	3.19	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=2 5%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=25 57%	n=22 58%	n=35 81%	n=16 36%	n=15 39%	n=8 19%
10. ..differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs.	3.36	3.39	3.13	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=1 2%	n=23 52%	n=21 55%	n=37 82%	n=19 43%	n=16 42%	n=7 16%
11. ..work effectively with students with all exceptionalities.	3.41	3.43	3.24	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n-1 2%	n=19 43%	n=21 55%	n=32 71%	n=22 50%	n=16 42%	n=12 27%
12. ..analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction.	3.27	3.35	3.18	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=27 61%	n=21 55%	n=35 78%	n=15 34%	n=15 39%	n=9 20%
13. ..use effective strategies to manage the learning environment.	3.27	3.32	3.18	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=3 7%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=23 52%	n=23 61%	n=35 78%	n=17 39%	n=14 37%	n=9 20%

	Means			Very Dissatisfied			Dissatisfied			Satisfied			Very Satisfied		
14. ..integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning.	3.36	3.49	3.34	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=25 57%	n=19 50%	n=29 66%	n=18 41%	n=18 47%	n=15 34%

Professional Disposition of Teacher

The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to…	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
15. …openly accept suggestions/constructive feedback.	3.45	3.58	3.56	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%		n=16 36%	n=16 42%		n=25 57%	n=22 58%	
16. …exhibit ethical practice expected of educators.	3.43	3.62	3.51	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=19 43%	n=14 37%	n=20 45%	n=23 52%	n=23 61%	n=24 55%
17. …work effectively with other professionals.	3.41	3.61	3.52	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=20 45%	n=15 39%	n=21 48%	n=22 50%	n=23 61%	n=23 52%
18. …work effectively with parents/guardians.	3.34	3.49	3.47	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=2 5%	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=19 43%	n=15 39%	n=24 53%	n=21 48%	n=20 53%	n=21 47%
19. …work effectively with school leaders.	3.45	3.61	3.53	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=18 41%	n=13 34%	n=21 47%	n=24 55%	n=24 63%	n=24 53%
20. …work effectively within the school culture.	3.34	3.61	3.53	n=2 5%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=21 48%	n=14 37%	n=19 42%	n=20 45%	n=22 58%	n=25 56%

Overall Assessment	**Means**			Very Dissatisfied			Dissatisfied			Satisfied			Very Satisfied		
	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
21. Overall, how satisfied are you with the training this teacher received from this EPP?	3.34	3.53	3.38	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=1 3%	n=0 0%	n=24 55%	n=16 42%	n=28 62%	n=18 41%	n=21 55%	n=17 38%

Source: IDOE 2022 Annual Report

Principal comments…

- General classroom expectations for a first year teacher…what to expect when I get my first classroom…Basic understanding of technology, gradebook, etc.
- Outstanding program
- None…is a young teacher that is growing with our assistance. Through continued growth she will be an outstanding teacher.

- This teacher would have liked to receive more instruction on properly differentiating students and ways to integrate more standard-based activities/hooks to get the students' attention and keep it throughout a lesson.
- Various strategies for disruptive behaviors.
- I would say that society utilizes social media quite a bit and it would be nice if education programs helped all students to minimize their social media footprint. We have had a few instances with newer teachers where they have inappropriate things posted in a public fashion that their students should not see.
- More classroom management and adolescents development (understanding how the brain works at various ages).
- Whole Child Education (MTSS) centered around behavior education.
- Social Emotional Learning of Students

Analysis: The 2022 Indiana Department of Education Principal Survey results for Purdue University Northwest, indicate that 98% of principals surveyed were very satisfied/satisfied in the preparation of our completers in the areas of knowledge, pedagogy, and professional dispositions. Principals indicated a 100% very satisfied/satisfied overall preparation rating of our completers.

*CAEP Measure 3: Candidate competency at completion. Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: Progression level threshold/criteria for success at completion; EPP-created measures; proprietary measures (e.g., **edTPA rubrics**, PPAT rubrics, Praxis Content Exams); **state required licensure measures**; student-teaching evaluation instruments; **dispositions**/non-academic factor instruments) (Initial and advanced)*

Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Program Completion:

Multiple points of data regarding candidate competency upon completion is used to determine the EPP's efficacy in this area. A large portion of this data is captured in our annual Title II report below. The Title II single assessment pass rates on all certification exam results for convenience and maximum transparency. Sample sizes with fewer than 10 examinees are not reported based on privacy reasons.

Title II Pass Rates

Data is based on the total number of completers from all program areas.

Traditional

Academic Year	PNW Number taking test	PNW Number passing	PNW Pass Rate	State Pass Rate
2021-2022	66	50	76%	87%
2020-2021	72	51	71%	81%
2019-2020	94	68	72%	86%
2018-2019	94	71	76%	90%

Alternative

Academic Year	Number taking test	Number passing	Pass Rate	State Pass Rate
2021-2022	15	14	93%	92%
2020-2021	6*	n/a	n/a	

2019-2020	9*	n/a	n/a	
2018-2019	4*	n/a	n/a	

*below 10 does not get reported.

Title II Single Assessment Pass Rate

Traditional Programs

Licensure Exam	PNW Pass Rate			PNW Scaled Score			State Pass Rate	State Scaled Score
	19-20	20-21	21-22	19-20	20-21	21-22	21-22	21-22
Early Childhood is not reported since the n=7 which is below 10. *Below 10 does not get reported.								
005 Elem Pedagogy	89% 64/72	82% 40/49	88% 22/25	239	233	235		
5622 Principles Learning Teaching K-6 (score:160)	n/a	n/a	100% 25/25	n/a	n/a	173		
006 Secondary Pedagogy	100% 12/12	100% 15/15	n=3	251	249	n/a		
5624 Principles Learning Teaching 7-12 (score:157)	n/a	n/a	6*	n/a	n/a	n/a		
060 Eled Reading	84% 64/76	84% 41/49	71% 15/21	230	230	222		
061 Eled Math	88% 64/73	83% 40/48	76% 13/17	238	237	230		
062 Eled Science	92% 69/75	85% 40/47	83% 15/18	236	233	226		
063 Eled SS	86% 64/74	78% 35/45	78% 14/18	230	227	225		

5007 Reading/SS (score: 160)	n/a	n/a	82% 27/33	n/a	n/a	167		
5008 Math/Science (score: 158)	n/a	n/a	77% 23/30	n/a	n/a	164		
021 ELA	n/a 5*	n/a 5*	n/a 2*	n/a	n/a			
5038 ELA	n/a	n/a	2*	n/a	n/a	n/a		
035 Mathematics	n/a 1*	n/a 3*	n/a 0	n/a	n/a			
5165 Mathematics	n/a	n/a	1*	n/a	n/a	n/a		
045 Life Science	n/a 0*	n/a 1*	n/a 1*	n/a	n/a			
051 SS HP	n/a 3*	n/a 5*	n/a 1*	n/a	n/a			
025 Exceptional Needs Mild	82% 31/38	95% 21/22	85% 11/13	237	237	237		
5543 SE CK Mild to Mod (score: 155)	n/a	n/a	94% 15/16	n/a	n/a	168		

ACTION: Continue to monitor candidates' attempts based on new Praxis licensure exam

Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared:

Program Area	Completers	Eligible for License	Completers	Eligible for License	Completers	Eligible for License
	19-20		20-21		21-22	

EPP Wide	n=108	n=81 75%	n=85	n=57 67%	n=88	n=63 72%
Early Childhood	n=7	n=3 43%	n=7	n=3 43%	n=4	n=2 50%
Elementary	n=34	n=29 85%	n=25	n=15 60%	n=25	n=13 52%
Elementary/Mild	n=42	n=32 76%	n=27	n=22 81%	n=31	n=27 87%
English	n=6	n=5 83%	n=6	n=4 67%	n=4	n=4 100%
Mathematics	n=2	n=0 0%	n=3	n=2 67%	n=1	n=1 100%
Science	n=3	n=2 67%	n=1	n=1 100%	n=1	n=1 100%
Social Studies	n=3	100%	n=6	n=5 83%	n=4	n=1 25%
World Language	n=0	n/a	n=0	n/a	n=0	n/a
Special Education Mild (graduate)	n=7	n=3 43%	n=8	n=3 38%	n=11	n=8 73%
Special Education Intense (graduate)	n=3	100%	n=2	n=2 100%	n=3	n=2 67%
T2T					n=4	n=4 100%

During the 2021-2022 academic year, there were a total of eighty-eight (88) completers. Across all programs, there were a total of 63 candidates who received their teaching license; this is a 5% increase over last academic year. Out of the eighty-eight (88) completers, six (6) have emergency permits (Elementary/SpEd=2; Elementary=2; SS=2); these candidates were not included in the eligible for license count since emergency permits are not valid teaching licenses. Three (3) candidates, all Elementary, have valid substitute permits; these candidates were also not included in the eligible for license count.

2022 1388 Annual EPP Report

IC 20-28-3-1 and IC 20-28-11.5-9 require the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to collect and report information from Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) annually. This information must be reported using a matrix which is to be posted to the IDOE website. While this matrix is not intended to rank or "grade" programs, it provides an opportunity for the public to interpret or compare program quality based on a variety of data points. Please note that data points are based upon the September 1, 2020-August 31, 2021 Title II timeframe.

Attrition-Retention-Completion

Attrition-Retention-Completion Rates by Academic Year	State Average 2020-2021	PNW 2020-2021	2019-2020 PNW
Total Number of Education Candidates**	11,914	290	300
Total Number Completion/Graduation	3,462	85	108
Percentage Completion/Graduation	29%	29%	36%
Total Number Retained in Education	7,726	188	175
Percentage Candidates Retained in Education	67%	65%	58%
Total Number Program Attrition	199	3	1
Percentage Program Attrition	1.7%	1%	1%
Total Number Institutional Attrition	570	14	16
Percentage Institutional Attrition	5%	5%	5%
Percentage Total	100%	100%	100%

EPP Candidate Selection

Data is required for the Indiana Department of Education 1388 report. Data includes both admitted candidates and program completers in any program leading to initial instructional licensure (traditional undergraduate, Transition to Teach, etc.)

	2021-2022	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019
Minimum GPA Entry Traditional	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Minimum GPA Entry Alternative	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Average GPA Admitted Candidates Traditional		3.20	3.29	3.21
Average GPA Admitted Candidates Alternative		3.27	3.47	3.36

Completer Average GPA

Data is based on the Indiana Department of Education 1388 report and Includes program completers in any program leading to initial instructional licensure (traditional undergraduate, Transition to Teaching, etc.)

Content Area	2021-2022	2020-2021	2019-2020	2018-2019
Early Childhood	n=4 3.63	n=7 3.67	n=7 3.41	n=10 3.23
Elementary/Reading	n=27 3.39	n=25 3.06	n=34 3.49	n=34 3.57
Elementary/Special Education	n=30 3.49	n=27 3.61	n=40 3.45	n=42 3.51
Secondary English	n=5 3.53	n=6 3.20	n=6 3.44	n=7 3.46
Secondary Math	n=1 n/a	n=3 3.33	n=2 3.39	n=7 3.40
Secondary Science	n=1 n/a	n=1 n/a	n=3 3.25	n=3 3.35

Secondary Social Studies	n=3 3.53	n=6 3.34	n=4 3.42	n=2 3.84
Secondary World Language	n=0	n=0	n=0	n=0
Graduate Special Ed Mild	n=11 3.69	n=8 3.66	n=7 3.42	n=3 3.74
Graduate Special Ed Intense	n=3 3.85	n=2 3.77	n=3 3.92	n=1 n/a

Teacher Survey Results

Teacher feedback form results for those receiving initial license within the previous three (3) years.

Teacher Survey Results for Purdue University Northwest 2022														
The range is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Teachers responded to each of the following…														
Knowledge Preparation														
	Means			Strongly Disagree(1)			Disagree (2)			Agree (3)			Strongly Agree (4)		
My educator preparation program prepared me for:	'20 n=56	'21 n=66	'22 n=33	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22	'20	'21	'22
1. ...understanding how learners/students develop and grow.	3.57	3.53	3.45	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 3%	n=21 38%	n=28 42%	n=16 48%	n=346 0%	n=37 56%	n=16 48%
2. ...meeting the content preparation and knowledge level expected of a beginning teacher.	3.43	3.29	3.33	n=1 2%	n=2 3%	n=1 3%	n=2 4%	n=6 9%	n=0 0%	n=25 44%	n=29 44%	n=19 58%	n=28 50%	n=29 44%	n=13 39%
3. ...adhering to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession.	3.66	3.58	3.45	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=16 29%	n=25 38%	n=18 55%	n=39 69%	n=40 61%	n=15 45%
4. ...adhering to the legal requirements of the teaching profession.	3.61	3.50	3.48	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=19 34%	n=28 42%	n=17 52%	n=36 64%	n=3654 %	n=16 48%
5…recognizing the importance of	3.59	3.44	3.39	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=3 5%	n=2 6%	n=20 36%	n=28 42%	n=16 48%	n=35 62%	n=34 51%	n=15 45%

continued professional development.															
Pedagogical Preparation															
6…providing appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	3.55	3.30	3.45	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=4 6%	n=0 0%	n=23 41%	n=35 53%	n=185 5%	n=32 57%	n=26 39%	n=15 45%
7…providing an inclusive learning environment.	3.70	3.52	3.48	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=17 30%	n=29 44%	n=17 52%	n=39 70%	n=36 54%	n=16 48%
8…providing a rigorous learning environment.	3.57	3.38	3.39	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=3 5%	n=0 0%	n=24 43%	n=32 48%	n=20 61%	n=32 57%	n=30 45%	n=13 39%
9…working collaboratively with school leaders and/or colleagues to promote safe and positive learning environments.	3.63	3.30	3.45	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=4 6%	n=1 3%	n=21 37%	n=35 53%	n=16 48%	n=35 63%	n=26 39%	n=16 48%
10…differentiating instruction to meet all students' learning needs.	3.61	3.36	3.48	n=0 0%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=2 4%	n=4 6%	n=1 3%	n=18 32%	n=28 42%	n=15 45%	n=36 64%	n=32 48%	n=17 52%
11…working effectively with students with all exceptionalities.	3.59	3.39	3.33	n=0 0%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=2 4%	n=1 2%	n=2 6%	n=19 34%	n=32 48%	n=18 55%	n=35 62%	n=31 47%	n=13 39%
12…developing quality assessments to test for student understanding of lessons.	3.45	3.27	3.42	n=0 0%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=4 7%	n=5 8%	n=1 3%	n=23 41%	N-32 48%	n=17 52%	n=29 52%	n=27 41%	n=15 45%
13…analyzing student assessment data to improve classroom instruction.	3.45	3.27	3.42	n=0 0%	n=3 5%	n=0 0%	n=3 5%	n=4 6%	n=0 0%	n=25 45%	n=31 47%	n=19 58%	n=28 50%	n=28 42%	n=14 42%
14…using appropriate strategies to effectively manage learning environments.	3.50	3.26	3.33	n=0 0%	n=2 3%	n=1 3%	n=4 7%	n=5 8%	n=1 3%	n=20 36%	n=33 50%	n=17 52%	n=32 57%	n=26 39%	n=14 42%
15…integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning.	3.45	3.32	3.42	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=3 5%	n=4 6%	n=0 0%	n=25 45%	n=34 52%	n=19 58%	n=28 50%	n=27 41%	n=14 42%
Professional Disposition Preparation															
My educator preparation program prepared me to recognize the importance of:															
16…openly accepting suggestions/constructive feedback.	3.66	3.52	3.52	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=16 29%	n=29 43%	n=16 48%	n=39 69%	n=36 55%	n=17 52%

	Means			Poor			Fair			Good			Excellent		
17…exhibiting ethical practice.	3.63	3.59	3.52	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=18 32%	n=24 36%	n=16 48%	n=37 66%	n=41 62%	n=17 52%
18…working effectively with other professionals.	3.66	3.55	3.61	n=1 2%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=0 0%	n=16 29%	n=25 37%	n=13 39%	n=39 69%	n=39 59%	n=20 61%
19…working effectively with parents/guardians.	3.41	3.26	3.33	n=1 2%	n=2 3%	n=1 3%	n=3 5%	n=8 12%	n=1 3%	n=24 43%	n=30 45%	n=17 52%	n=28 50%	n=26 39%	n=14 42%
20…working effectively with school leaders.	3.55	3.45	3.45	n=1 2%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=1 2%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=20 36%	n=29 44%	n=18 55%	n=34 60%	n=33 50%	n=15 45%
21…working effectively within the school culture.	3.57	3.42	3.52	n=1 2%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=2 4%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=17 30%	n=31 47%	n=16 48%	n=36 64%	n=31 47%	n=17 52%
OVERALL ASSESSMENT	**Means**			**Poor**			**Fair**			**Good**			**Excellent**		
22…Indicate your overall assessment of how well you were prepared to teach by your educator preparation program.	3.57	2.86	3.27	n=0 0%	n=2 3%	n=0 0%	n=2 4%	n=8 12%	n=2 6%	n=20 36%	n=29 44%	n=20 61%	n=34 60%	n=27 41%	n=11 33%

Overall Comments:

I feel that Purdue Northwest did well to try and prepare me for teaching and to be flexible (obviously there are things that you can't be prepared for and learn on the job but most of what they could prepare me for I felt like they did). After talking to some of my peers I feel that Purdue Northwest better prepared me for teaching than other college/educator preparation programs could.

My program prepared me through professional development opportunities as well as real world hands on experiences.

Our education program at PNW kept changing during the last 2 years of my college experience. Various classes were no longer offered last minute last minute changes to our degree requirements were common and no information from the administration was ever shared to us students regarding these changes.

I felt well prepared going into my teaching career. Student teaching was by far the most valuable experience I had.

I feel like my behavioral management class didn't fully prepare me for how to handle different situations with difficult students.

I am so thankful to have received my education from Purdue Northwest. I received a top-notch education at a fraction of the price of other universities. I feel like they really prepared me to the best of their ability. Of course there were things I was not expecting as a first-year teacher. However, as with all new jobs/careers there is a learning curve. I also feel as if all educators should continue to grow and learn each year that they teach. As educators we should constantly be evolving.

Purdue University Northwest was a good college to go to for education. It prepared me for the school district I work in now.

My mentor did a good job at preparing me for a counseling position. She also was available to to me whenever I needed her.

Analysis: The 2022 Indiana Department of Education Teacher Survey results for Purdue University Northwest, indicate that 94% of teachers surveyed (n=31/33) were very satisfied/satisfied in their preparation of knowledge. Ninety-seven percent (97%) (n=32/33) were very satisfied/satisfied in the areas of pedagogy and professional dispositions. Teachers indicated a 100% very satisfied/satisfied overall preparation rating of our completers. Faculty noted that this percentage of preparation is higher than those who completed the NExT program exit survey. This could mean that teachers feel more prepared once they are in their own classroom vs. being a student teacher.

Minutes

Data Dialogue Days

FALL 2021

Present: Anne Gregory, Hadassah Moore, Katie Bowers, Rachel Meyers, Patrick Keegan, Kelly Vaughn, Amanda Passmore, Lisa Lyons, Michelle Gilhooly, Sheila Stephenson. Via Zoom: Geoff Schultz, Deb Pratt, Dave Pratt, Pam Ayala, Danielle Starks, and Peter Turbek.

NExT Survey Results AY20-21 based on a 85% response rate.

Section A: Your Program (Program Structure/Quality: Scores were 2.80-3.62. Content advising: secondary programs receive advising from content areas not SoEC. We need to do a better job of building relationships with students (advisors, Brightspace page, class presentations, group advising). Upcoming social events include: Back to School/Give Thanks. Student groups/clubs: Patrick will be recruiting for the Indiana State Teachers Association Aspiring Educators with their first meeting Oct 18, 2021 .

Section B: Preparation for Teaching

Diverse Learners: Scores were 1.59-1.93 fall below the 3.00 proficient level. What makes up diverse learners? Focus group to ask this question.

Professionalism: More interaction with collaborating teachers. OPO is working on creating partnerships with schools.

Section C: Student Teaching

University or College Supervisor: Scores were 3.36-3.60. Define actively teaching?

ACTION:

- **Set up meeting for secondary advisors - Pam**
- **Pull comments - Sheila**
- **Focus Group to ask what makes up diverse learners - Kelly (part of CIC)**
- **Program areas to look at how diverse learners/differentiation is being covered in methods course, field experience, lesson plan template and syllabus**
- **OPO creating partnerships with schools**

Secondary October 14th

Information Sharing

- Program Review/SPA Timeline
  - Submit by September 15, 2023
  - Two submissions of data F22 and Sp23
  - One year to revise rubrics, standards
  - Meetings with content area will be scheduled
- New Standards
  - NCTM (Math 2020) - SPA review
  - NSTA (Science 2020) - State program review

Secondary November 9th

Data presentation—Sheila Stephenson

- *Quantitative Data*
- Looking at possible correlation between GPA, License Exams, STOT, edTPA
- S. Stephenson reports highest edTPA 1st attempt scores she's seen in a while
- K. Vaughan notes change in content exam. Even still, candidates not passing content exams (all pass pedagogy)
- S. Stephenson clarifies this data updated as 8/31/21

- C. Morrow – what happens to candidates who don't pass all licensure exams? They are graduated without begin license eligible?
- S. Stephenson notes they can continue retaking the test
- K. Vaughan notes some become long-term subs, not fully licensed
- L. Taylor wonders about creating policy around not allowing graduation/passing Student Teaching unless content exams are passed? That way, we do not have them leave our program without being able to fully use their degree.
- S. Stephenson suggests to wait and see data from Praxis exams (vs using CORE data to form policy)
- L. Taylor suggests we know candidates' identity in data so we can best intervene. S. Stephenson will share
- P. Ayala notes the difference in standardization between Praxis & edTPA. Will need to provide more support if we create policy about required licensure passing before graduation
- L. Taylor suggests taking content exams closer to content courses (stricter plans of study followed). Agrees we should provide more support while they are still PNW students. Also, anonymity in this data is not to our benefit
- P. Ayala discusses candidates with transfer credits—how do we make sure they are ready for content exams?
- K. Vaughan asks for clarification when content exams are taken
- P. Ayala – voucher codes sent during 355/370. Encourage them to seek content/dept support sooner. Can we share resources for low Praxis scores similar to low GPA interventions?
- C. Morrow wants to know how we distinguish which specific content material they need extra support in? Encourages depts. to be more conscious of the need/support
- P. Ayala clarifies candidates receive detailed score reports to help guide supports, S. Stephenson also receives this data. Can we review those content areas to make sure depts. are offering courses that best align?
- K. Vaughan requests final grading policies are clearly communicated
- *Qualitative Data*
- P. Ayala shares specific courses for secondary education candidates. Working more closely with content advisors. Would like to do more outreach within EDPS 285 to better include secondary
- K. Vaughan wants to make sure we are including edTPA throughout program & coursework. How can we best increase communication to our candidates?
- L. Taylor notes diversity of content areas (vs single content area in elementary). How do we make them feel less alone?

Elementary November 16th

Attendance: Geoff Schultz, Danielle Starks, Patrick Keegan, Katie Bowers, Dave Pratt, Anne Gregory, Pam Ayala, Sheila Stephenson, and Michelle Gilhooly
 Via Zoom – Amanda Passmore, Debra Pratt, Nicole Baker, Kelly Vaughan, Rachel Meyers, and Grace Hartzell Pigozzi

Praxis Core Entrance Exam Cut Score

Geoff will recommend to SoEC Leadership that Elem Ed is proposing that we will use CASE/Praxis 1 to establish 1 year of baseline data collection only, that it is not a gatekeeping tool, to establish baseline, and make sure the intervals for Probation are appropriate. Then the committee can take a look at the data and that at the end of Spring '23 we will have a final recommendation to make a final decision.
Use this baseline data to then review and possibly make changes to the Interview process, and then use to see how they do on the Licensure exam.

Elementary edTPA STOT Data

Data was shared with the committee on GPA/edTPA/STOT from academic year 2020-2021. There were eight (8) candidates whose STOT scores were never entered. Gaps in Dual SpEd due to miscommunication. Mid-term STOT's would be final scores for Elementary/SpEd candidates since their second eight weeks are in special education and STOT is not required for SpEd. Hadassah has missing scores and Sheila will send an updated document to the committee. (Sheila sent on 11/17/21)
.

Counseling DDD

Counseling is in the process of revising and reducing the number of assessments. New assessments will be evaluated in Brightspace instead of TaskStream.

PARTNERSHIP ADVISORY MEETINGS

EPP Forums

Instead of a fall EPP forum, a newsletter was sent out to our partners in October informing them of updates and projects including a message from the director, Passport PNW, Student Teaching Addendum, faculty spotlights, smart lunches, introduction to new faculty, Community Counseling Center, Shepherd Community Tutoring grant, and request for partners needs.

SPRING 2022

EPP April 1st

In attendance: Sheila Stephenson, Anne Gregory, Hadassah Moore, Patrick Keegan, Amanda Passmore, Geoff Schultz, LaVada Taylor, Deb Pratt, Michelle Gilhooly

Via Zoom: Grace Piagozzi, Danielle Starks, Nicole Baker and Russell Mayo

DISPOSITIONS

EPP disposition data was shared from Fall 2021. The top three areas of concern were **preparedness, punctuality,** and **responsibility**. How are expectations being managed? Candidates are at different levels, teachers expected base on previous experience. Faculty can set expectations for their own classes. Dispositions address Social Emotional Learning (SEL). **Teaching SEL skills to address dispositions**. **Establish minimal expectations of candidates**. Set up meeting to address field expectations through **OPO Orientation** including supervisors, candidates, faculty. **Faculty to send email to cooperating teachers with their expectations**. Create a **Brightspace page** for Field Experience.

 ACTION:

Changes to Field Guide

- Index page
- One-page communication hand-out; assignments to cooperating teachers and schools
- Contract sign-off sheet
- Orientation by OPO (field supervisors and candidates)
- Brightspace page (e-learning/field experience information

PRAXIS Fall 2021

The first set of Praxis II data was shared. This data will serve as a benchmark since this was the first set of candidates taking the new licensure exam. Sheila sent out Praxis study guides to Elementary committee in February. New Praxis tests are pedagogy focused. Take one content area at a time to focus our efforts so that we can increase scores. Basic skills vs. higher order thinking skills (PRAXIS) format. Weekly quiz to tie pedagogy and content area together. Sheila to send Hadassah Secondary study guide to be shared with committee.

ACTION:

Fall 2022 meeting: provide data of how we compare to other universities (PFW, IUN)

Visual simulation (Bowling Green University)

Identify areas and create questions for Math and Social Studies

Disaggregate Data: Content, Coursework Grades, Evaluations, CASA, Praxis Performance

BRIGHTSPACE FACULTY TRAINING

Brightspace will be used to evaluate key assessments.

Training plan will be developed this summer and shared with faculty in the fall

In attendance via Zoom: PNW SoEC staff - Anne Gregory, Mary Ann Cahill, Sheila Stephenson, and Michelle Gilhooly. School Partners - **Terry Kolopanis**, Principal - Virgil Bailey Elementary in Lake Station, **Eric Kurtz**, CFO - Lake Station Community Schools, as of 7/2022 - Assistant Superintendent for School City of Hammond, **Veronica Tobon** - Principal at Valparaiso HS, **Theodore Stevens** - Supt. South Central Community School Corp., **Lisa Gutierrez**, Principal, Aquinas Catholic Community School of Merrillville, **Holly Wireman** - Principal, Lincoln Elementary, **Christine Pepa** - Principal, Thomas Edison in Lake Station, **Kim Gondeck** - Queen of All Saints School in Michigan City, **Reed Amones**, Director of Personnel for Merrillville Community Schools, **Elizabeth Krutz**, Principal, LaPorte Middle School , **Lorri Vovaiu**, Assistant Superintendent School City of Whiting; **Jonathan Mock**, Director of Human Resources & Compliance City School of Hobart; **Cynthia Mose-Trevino**, Assistant Superintendent of Lake Ridge New Tech; **Stacey Schmidt**, Superintendent, Porter Township School Corporation.

Big News Highlights
New Director
Introducing Dr. Mary Ann Cahill, background - Literary Education, School teacher for 18 years before starting in higher education in 2005 has taught at Boise State University and Bellarmine University where she was chair of Undergraduate Education and the MAT program.
Dr. Anne Gregory became Dean of the College of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences in January 2022.

Accreditation
PNW - SoEC is fully accredited through CAEP. State of IN has approved AAQEP as an accreditation body. Will share more in the future and would love to get your feedback . .
Do we stay with CAEP or switch to AAQEP?

Student Teaching Addendum
After 10 weeks of Student Teaching, schools are able to hire candidates as long-term substitute teachers or on an emergency permit.

Transition to Teach (T2T) Program
Current program for Secondary Education candidates - 18 credit program of study, approx. 1 to 1 ½ year program. Candidates with a Bachelor degree in content or discipline area, PNW can work with the state to get a T2T permit and start a program of study. Classes are offered in the evenings and on-line. If interested in hosting a candidate in the T2T program on a T2T permit, they can be the classroom teacher on record.
Future program for Elementary Education - 24 credits, PNW can work with the state to get a T2T permit, have candidates start a program of study and they can be the classroom teacher on record.
Licensure option - Special Education @ Graduate level - 24 credits. Working with School City of Hammond to develop a consortium. Bring classes to school. Will start this fall, 8 week courses, 2 courses per semester. If interested in joining, please contact Dean Gregory.

Annual Data Share

Dispositions - info from handout from Fall 2021

Areas of Concern: Data being shared is based on the top five areas of concern…

- Preparedness: n=12
- Punctuality n=11
- Responsibility n=7
- Appearance n=5
- Reflective n=5

These numbers are based on all of the candidates throughout the entire EPP who received either a (1) Strongly Disagree or (2) Somewhat Disagree.

Faculty at school level noticed that these areas all involved SEL areas.

Faculty will work these areas into their classes.

Preparedness - what would you like to see?

Christine - biggest challenge - Classroom Management Strategies - dealing with challenging students how to balance Professionalism vs. Friend, ability to handle disrespectful students in a professional manner.

Cynthia - Technology - Project Based Learning - Lesson plan, Classroom Management - high rate of trauma, SEL, Secondary trauma, Engagement - how to differentiate instruction for different levels of learners.

In PNW's low enrolled programs - we are offering a 4 + 1 program - complete Bachelor degree in area of study and then join T2T program to learn how to teach content.

Responsibility - What are the expectations in the schools and classrooms?

Taking the time to review Teacher Handbook policies, Grade book updates, Lesson plan format. Knowing your job responsibilities and not being afraid to ask questions. Timeliness of completing tasks.

Task - Sheila - provide Mary Ann with total "n" of students.

Praxis Areas of Support - information reviewed from handout

Fall '21 completers who took new Praxis - areas of concern, Science, SocialStudies and Math. PNW is offering 240 Tutoring program which is helping.

Candidates say that Social Studies & Science are not being observed during their time in the classroom.

PNW candidates - Build their general education courses - Hope that this fall they will be taking (3) Math courses in addition to Math Methods, added Indiana History class, have US & World History and Government. PNW Science courses are being reevaluated.

Thoughts of how our students can see teaching in these content areas?

Terry - Communication on what teachers need to focus on, STEM nights, Coordination of when lessons are happening.

PNW candidates are now taking an Engineering course.

Holly - Better communication of when students are coming and what their focus should be on would help. PNW's Office of Partnerships & Outreach have completed fall placements and PNW will share with administrators soon.

Student Teaching - will start right away when school starts.

Field Experience - will start Mon/Tues 3 week after classes begin at PNW.

Impact on Student Learning
● Completer Advisory Group - handout shared. CAEP requires PNW to track our completers. New process explained.

Partners Needs Assessment
Theodore - Students learn bad habits from older teachers. Encourage candidates to do the right thing throughout their career.

If you have any openings that you would like us to share with our candidates and recent grads, feel free to reach out to us and we can share.

Meeting adjourned at 8:48 am
Next EPP Forum Meeting: TBD
Minutes prepared by Michelle Gilhooly

Secondary

There was not a program data dialogue day during the spring semester since changes are being made to the program key assessments to align with new standards. Revised assessments will be placed in Brightspace for Fall 2022.

Elementary

There was not a program data dialogue day during the spring semester since changes are being made to the program key assessments to align with the CAEP Elementary standards. Revised assessments will be placed in Brightspace for Fall 2022.

Counseling

There were no data dialogue days during the spring semester for the counseling programs (CMHC/SC) since changes are being made to the program key assessments. Revised assessments will be placed in Brightspace for Fall 2022.

Accreditation Updates

CACREP

An Interim Report is due on October 1, 2022. A favorable review on the interim report will lead to an 8-year accreditation cycle ending March 31, 2029.

CAEP

Continuous improvement continues. Next visit Fall 2026

Program Updates

Fall 2020

Continuous improvement continues

Spring 2021

Transition to Teach program was revised based on state feedback and will be resubmitted as an initial program review to IDOE by Fall 2023 **(September 15, 2023)**. Two cycles of data are required and would include F22, Sp23.

Elementary T2T: Final draft of the new Elementary T2T plan of study was completed. A state program review will need to be submitted by Aug 1, 2022 with an effective program start date of Spring 2023.

State Reviews:
- Elementary (CAEP Elementary Standards 2018)*
- T2T (Secondary and Elementary)

SPA Reviews:

- English (NCTE Std. 2021)*
- Math (NCTM Std. 2020)*
- Social Studies (NCSS Std. 2017)
- Special Ed Grad Mild (CEC 2020)*
- Special Ed Elementary (CEC 2020)*
- Special Ed Early Childhood (CEC Std. 2020)*

* New standards since last submission

PROGRAM CLOSURES FOR FALL 2022: Teach out plans will be developed for currently enrolled candidates.

Biology Teaching: April 25, 2022 Per Barbara Mania-Farnell: *"The Biology department has voted to discontinue the Bio. Teaching Concentration. I have filled out an APCC form to suspend the concentration for Fall 2022, to discontinue we will need to go through the curriculum proves in the Fall. Please let me know what you need from us for the teach out plan."*

Chemistry/Physics Teaching: May 5, 2022 per Adam Rengstorf: My faculty have voted and are in favor of suspending our secondary ed concentrations. I'll begin the paperwork and let's plan a meeting soon to hash out the details of our '4+cert' for physics and chemistry high school teaching.

World Language Spanish: Apr 25, 2022 Per Mike Lynn: *"After consulting with the World Language faculty in Spanish, we have decided to teach out the existing students and eliminate the Spanish Teaching concentration. I believe we've already eliminated the French Teaching program (along with the French program), didn't we? We are interested in having students participate in the **Transition to Teaching program**. And we would be interested in learning more about the **English as a New Language (ENL) degree** and how we could participate. Please let me know what our next steps are."*

Special Education Intense: It was decided to close this program due to low enrollment.

NOTE: These programs have been archived within the CAEP AIMS system.

Initiatives/Accomplishments

New Elementary program with concentrations in EC/Special Ed and Elementary/SpEd - first cohort begins AY21-22

T2T Recruitment Efforts: Based on data from the IDOE emergency license report, there are several districts that employ teachers on emergency permits. Efforts are being put into place to recruit teacher candidates into the T2T program to help these teachers become fully licensed.

Engineering Course: ENG 19000/19500 Elementary Engineering Design/Engineering Project course introduced for education candidates. This course will take place during semester 4.

Urban Studies: New Master's in Education with a concentration in Urban Studies is being created with an effective date of ?

Back to School Social - September 29 2:00 - 5:00 CLO 3rd Floor Hammond Campus and November 3rd 11:00 - 1:00 at Westville Campus. This event welcomed students back. There was food, crafts, scavenger hunt, giveaways (faculty favorite children's books). Students were able to meet faculty and staff and explore the student resources.

Newsletter: An EPP newsletter was created and sent out in October to EPP community partners, secondary committee members, faculty, and staff. Topics include: Message from the Director, Passport PNW, Community Counseling Center Begins a Year of Growth, Accelerated Student Teaching, SoEC new team members (Nicole Baker, Amanda Passmore, Danielle Starks, Grace Pigozzi, Lisa Lyons), supporting our community and school partners, Spotlight SEL in Higher Education (Deb Pratt), Smart Lunch Using Google Jamboard (David Pratt).

Student Teaching Addendum: Student teaching candidates now have the opportunity to begin employment with their placement district after successful completion of 10 weeks in the classroom. This is an agreement initiated by the District. The Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher, and Candidate must all be willing to agree to the terms of the agreement and is not open for all candidates.

Shepherd Community Tutoring Grant: Patrick Keegan, Deb Pratt, and Kelly Vaughn provided SEL professional development and tutoring. This grant was renewed for next academic year.

Candidate Progression: During our CAEP review, we only had one AFI which was on standard 3.2 and had to do with CORE assessments. This particular standard has now been replaced with ***Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression.*** A committee was charged with taking a closer look at this new standard and putting some plans and processes in place.

- **Transition Points** that are transparent to candidates
    - Identify transition point at any point(s) in the program when cohort GPA of 3.00 GPA is achieved

- **Candidate Support**: The provider plans and documents the need for candidate support, as identified in disaggregated data by race and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission, so candidates meet milestones
- **Candidate Complaints**: The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of candidate complaints, including complaints made to CAEP, and documents the resolution.

Seizure Recognition First Aid Training: Kelly Vaughan organized this event on Nov 16, 2021 3:30 - 5:30 partnering with the Epilepsy Foundation. PGPs were offered. Fifty spots were available.

Integrating Social Emotional Learning and The Social Studies Patrick Keegan organized this event on December 2nd 4:00 - 6:00 p.m. at the Hammond campus. The training focused on social studies and literacy, teaching hard history, social emotional learning and primary sources. Professional development for K-12 educators included a $50 stipend and free collection of children's books. This training was made possible by an Indiana Campus Compact grant.

Spring 2022

Fostering Diversity, Equity, Inclusion in the Classroom: The PNW Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program and SOEC is teaming up with parents, faculty, staff, and concerned citizens across the region to remedy problems in Northwest Indiana schools that have been highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The group's focus is fostering diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging in the schools. The coordinating team currently includes Colette Morrow, Professor of English, PNW student Alex Watkins, Jessica Rae Szabo, Chair of the Parent Council at Geminus Head Start, and PNW alumna Lorrell Kilpatrick, who is on the faculty in Sociology at Indiana University Northwest and Director of Advocacy Services at Everybody Counts. Please contact Colette Morrow for more information and to join this initiative. cmmorrow@pnw.edu.

Science Olympiad - SoEC candidates volunteered at the Science Olympiad hosted at the Westville campus.

T2T Elementary Program: Curriculum documents are being prepared for the new T2T Elementary program. This new program will need to go through a state approval process with an anticipated start date of Spring 2023?

Summer

CHESS Summer Scholarship Recipients

We are excited to announce the winners of the CHESS Summer Scholarship! Congratulations to the following SoEC faculty who have received the summer award of $7,500:

Patrick Keegan, School of Education and Counseling: Conducting a content analysis of SEL standards in 17 U.S. states in order to understand how they aim to prepare youth as effective citizens.

Amanda Passmore, School of Education and Counseling: Contributing to a better understanding of early intervention and early childhood special education (EI/ECSE) teacher leadership and directions for future research by supporting two unique studies which include conducting a systematic literature review and a qualitative interview study that aims to complete data collection over the summer.

SEED Grant

The SEED program (Department of Education) will award $65 million to support the implementation of evidence-based practices that prepare, develop, or enhance the skills of educators. Letter of Intent was e-mailed on May 3rd. Application is due June 3rd.   It was decided not to proceed with this grant at this time.

Future Ideas to Think About…

Building better relationships with our students

Establishing student organizations

Re-imagining our programs (8 week courses, Saturday classes, 3 year completion)

Appendix

NExT Program Exit Survey AY 21-22

Common Metrics
Fall 2021-Summer 2022 Exit Survey

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT)

Purdue University Northwest Report

August 2022

Prepared by
Stacy Duffield, Ph.D.
Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, M.Sc.
Network for Excellence in Teaching

Introduction

The [Network for Excellence in Teaching](#) (NExT) was founded in 2010 as a partnership of 14 institutions of higher education (IHEs) and the Bush Foundation. NExT collaborated to develop a set of common surveys to support teacher preparation programs in measuring the effectiveness of their programs. In 2016, NExT began sharing the instruments with other teacher preparation programs, inviting them to contribute their data to an aggregate data set that will be used in future instrument analyses to strengthen the instruments and ensure their validity and reliability across diverse respondent pools. The surveys include the following:

> 1.) **Exit Survey**—administered to teacher candidates near the completion of student teaching
> 2.) **Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS)**—administered to program completers in the spring following the academic year of graduation
> 3.) **Supervisor Survey**—administered in the spring following the academic year of graduation to employers of program completers who are teaching

This report presents the findings from the Exit Surveys administered to student teachers during fall 2021 and spring 2022. The Exit Survey collects information on student teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs and student teaching experiences as well as their backgrounds and future plans. Quantitative data for the institution are presented in tabular format below. Each of the surveys has been found to be highly valid and reliable; the results of the exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis for the Exit Survey can be found in Appendix A. Confirmatory factor analyses are performed annually to verify continued validity and reliability of the survey. Guidelines for writing about the surveys can be found in Appendix B, and responses to the open-ended survey item can be found in Appendix C.

Survey Administration

IHEs are responsible for administering the Exit Survey to all candidates who completed an initial teacher licensure program. IHEs administered the survey to candidates toward the end of the candidates' final semester in their teacher licensure programs.

Response Rate

The 2021-22 Exit Survey response rate for the institution was 59% (52 out of 88) rate is calculated by dividing the number of respondents who completed the survey through at least Section A by the population of student teachers who could have completed the survey.

Using this Report

Findings from this Exit Survey can be compared to past and future cohorts in order to understand how shifts in IHE programs' coursework and clinical experiences affect candidates' perceptions of and satisfaction with their teacher education programs. Findings from the Transition to Teaching Survey, administered one year after graduation, may also shed light on whether completers' perceptions of and satisfaction with their preparedness at graduation align with perceptions of their instructional practice as student teachers.

Accreditation and Program Approval

NExT surveys support accreditation and program approval at both the state and national level through their alignment with both the InTASC and CAEP accreditation standards. The items in the surveys are aligned with InTASC standards, and therefore, support ND state program approval and CAEP standard 1.1. Additionally, the Exit Survey, Section C, focuses on the candidate's experience with student teaching and includes several items that allow the candidate to provide feedback about the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. These items can be used as evidence for CAEP standard 2.2. The Supervisor Survey is strong evidence for CAEP standard 4.3, and the Transition to Teaching Survey can be used as evidence for CAEP standard 4.4. Appendix B presents guidelines for writing about the surveys and data.

Findings

Tables 1-3 provide contextual information.

Survey Section A

Section A of the survey asks candidates to rate their levels satisfaction with various aspects of their teacher preparation program. Candidates responded using the following scale: very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; satisfied; very satisfied. The final item in this section asks the candidates if they would recommend their teacher preparation program to others using a 4-point scale with the following descriptors: definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no.

Survey Section B

Section B of the survey asks candidates to rate their satisfaction with four areas of their teacher preparation: instructional practices, diverse learners, learning environment, and professional practices. Candidates responded using the following scale: does not apply; disagree; Tend to disagree; Tend to agree; and agree.

Survey Section C

Section C of the survey asks candidates to rate their quality of supervision by both the university supervisor and school-based cooperating teacher. Candidates responded using the following scale: does not apply; disagree; Tend to disagree; Tend to agree; and agree. Candidates were also asked to describe their supervision such as frequency of observations and who visited from the university.

Survey Section D

Section D of the survey asks candidates about their future plans including how long they plan to teach and where.

Survey Section E

Section E collects candidate demographics such as gender, age, and languages spoken.

Notes:
- For any "mark all that apply" items, the total percentage may exceed 100 and the total # may exceed the number of Respondents.
- In some instances, the number of descriptions of "other" may not match the number of Respondents that selected "other."
- Due to rounding to the nearest hundredth, the percent column may not add up to 100.

SECTION A. YOUR PROGRAM

Table 1.   For what licensure area did you prepare to teach? (Check all that apply.)

	n = 52	
	#	Percent of Cases
Early Childhood Education	3	5.77
Elementary Education	30	57.69
Special Education	22	42.31
Secondary Education (5-12, 7-12, or 9-12)	12	23.08

Note. Data from item A1.

Table 2.   If you completed a secondary education licensure program, indicate your subject area. (Check all that apply.)

	n = 12	
	#	Percent of Cases
English	4	33.33
Mathematics	1	8.33
Science	1	8.33
Social Studies	4	33.33
Other[a]	2	16.67

Note. Data from item A1.
[a]Other responses included:
• *Health, Physical Education, and Family and Consumer Sciences*
• *sociology*

Table 3.   **Teacher Education Program Satisfaction: Program Structure/Quality. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of your teacher preparation program?**

	Total Respondents	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
	n	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advising on professional education program requirements.	50	5	10%	11	22%	21	42.00	13	26.00
Advising on content course requirements.	50	3	6%	9	18%	24	48.00	14	28.00
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	50	2	4%	4	8%	27	54.00	17	34.00
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	50	4	8%	5	10%	25	50.00	16	32.00
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	50	1	2%	8	16%	20	40.00	21	42.00
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	50	2	4%	8	16%	25	50.00	15	30.00
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	50	0	0%	5	10%	28	56.00	17	34.00
Your student teaching placement site.	50	0	0%	2	4%	15	30.00	33	66.00

Note. Data from items A2a-h.

Table 4.   Teacher Education Program Satisfaction: Program Structure/Quality. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of your teacher preparation program?

	#	Mean	SD
Advising on professional education program requirements.	50	2.84	0.92
Advising on content course requirements.	50	2.98	0.84
Quality of instruction in your teacher preparation courses.	50	3.18	0.74
Balance between theory and practice in your teacher preparation courses.	50	3.06	0.86
Integration of technology throughout your teacher preparation program.	50	3.22	0.78
Coherence between your coursework and field experiences prior to student teaching.	50	3.06	0.79
Quality of field experiences prior to student teaching.	50	3.24	0.62
Your student teaching placement site.	50	3.62	0.56

Note. Data from items A2a-h. Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied.

Table 5.   Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?

	n = 51	
	#	Percent
Definitely yes	4	7.84
Probably yes	7	13.73
Probably no	20	39.22
Definitely no	20	39.22

Note. Data from item A3. Respondents' reasons for recommending or not recommending their teacher education program are included in Appendix D.

SECTION B. PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

Table 6.   Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	50	2	4.00	7	14.00	17	34.00	24	48.00
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	50	1	2.00	4	8.00	15	30.00	30	60.00
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	50	1	2.00	5	10.00	17	34.00	27	54.00
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	50	1	2.00	5	10.00	17	34.00	27	54.00
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	50	2	4.00	5	10.00	18	36.00	25	50.00
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	50	2	4.00	5	10.00	16	32.00	27	54.00

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	50	2	4.00	1	2.00	15	30.00	32	64.00
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	50	1	2.00	4	8.00	15	30.00	30	60.00
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	50	1	2.00	5	10.00	16	32.00	28	56.00
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	50	1	2.00	4	8.00	19	38.00	26	52.00
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	50	1	2.00	2	4.00	20	40.00	27	54.00
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	50	1	2.00	3	6.00	18	36.00	28	56.00
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	50	1	2.00	4	8.00	17	34.00	28	56.00
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	50	1	2.00	3	6.00	20	40.00	26	52.00

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent

Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	50	2	4.00	4	8.00	18	36.00	26	52.00
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	50	2	4.00	5	10.00	17	34.00	26	52.00
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	50	2	4.00	4	8.00	18	36.00	26	52.00
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	50	2	4.00	5	10.00	15	30.00	28	56.00
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	50	1	2.00	5	10.00	21	42.00	23	46.00
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	50	3	6.00	5	10.00	19	38.00	23	46.00
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	50	3	6.00	5	10.00	18	36.00	24	48.00

Note. Data from items B1a-t

Table 7. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	50	3.26	0.84
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	50	3.48	0.73
Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	50	3.40	0.75
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	50	3.40	0.75
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	50	3.32	0.81
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	50	3.36	0.82
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	50	3.54	0.73
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	50	3.48	0.73
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	50	3.42	0.75
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	50	3.40	0.72
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	50	3.46	0.67
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	50	3.46	0.70
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	50	3.44	0.73
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	50	3.42	0.70

	#	Mean	SD
Use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals.	50	3.36	0.79
Engage students in using a range of technology tools to achieve learning goals.	50	3.34	0.82
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	50	3.36	0.79

Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	50	3.38	0.82
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	50	3.32	0.73
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	50	3.24	0.86
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	50	3.26	0.87

Note. Data from items B1a-t. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 8.   Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	48	27	56.25	16	33.33	3	6.25	2	4.17
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	48	27	56.25	16	33.33	4	8.33	1	2.08
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	48	28	58.33	15	31.25	4	8.33	1	2.08
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	48	25	52.08	16	33.33	6	12.50	1	2.08
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	48	27	56.25	13	27.08	7	14.58	1	2.08
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	48	20	41.67	16	33.33	7	14.58	5	10.42
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	48	25	52.08	16	33.33	4	8.33	3	6.25
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	48	25	52.08	14	29.17	5	10.42	4	8.33
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	48	25	52.08	17	35.42	3	6.25	3	6.25

Note. Data from items B2a-j.

Table 9.   Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities.	48	1.58	0.79
Differentiate instruction for a variety of learning needs.	48	1.56	0.73
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	48	1.54	0.73
Differentiate to meet the needs of students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.	48	1.65	0.78
Differentiate instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans.	48	1.63	0.81
Differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs.	48	1.94	0.99
Differentiate instruction for gifted and talented students.	48	1.69	0.87
Differentiate instruction for English-language learners.	48	1.75	0.95
Access resources to foster learning for students with diverse needs.	48	1.67	0.85

Note. Data from items B2a-j. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 10. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	47	0	0.00	4	8.51	18	38.30	25	53.19
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	47	1	2.13	3	6.38	19	40.43	24	51.06
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	47	1	2.13	6	12.77	15	31.91	25	53.19
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	47	1	2.13	4	8.51	14	29.79	28	59.57
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	47	2	4.26	3	6.38	16	34.04	26	55.32
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	47	3	6.38	6	12.77	16	34.04	26	46.81
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	47	2	4.26	4	8.51	15	31.91	26	55.32
Help students regulate their own behavior.	47	3	6.38	7	14.89	13	27.66	24	51.06
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	47	2	4.26	5	10.64	15	31.91	25	53.19

Note. Data from items B3a-i.

Table 11. Preparation for Teaching: Learning Environment. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Clearly communicate expectations for appropriate student behavior.	47	3.45	0.65
Use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students.	47	3.40	0.70
Connect core content to real-life experiences for students.	47	3.36	0.78
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	47	3.47	0.74
Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement.	47	3.40	0.79
Respond appropriately to student behavior.	47	3.21	0.90
Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected.	47	3.38	0.81
Help students regulate their own behavior.	47	3.23	0.93
Effectively organize the physical environment of the classroom for instruction.	47	3.34	0.83

Note. Data from items B3a-i. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 12. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	47	3	6.38	4	8.51	17	36.17	23	48.94
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	47	4	8.51	3	6.38	16	34.04	24	51.06
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	47	4	8.51	5	10.64	13	27.66	25	53.19
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	47	2	4.26	3	6.38	11	23.40	31	65.96
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	47	2	4.26	1	2.13	13	27.66	31	65.96
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	47	1	2.13	4	8.51	16	34.04	26	55.32
Act as an advocate for all students.	47	1	2.13	3	6.38	10	21.28	33	70.21

Note. Data from items B4a-f.

Table 13. Preparation for Teaching: Professionalism. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

	#	Mean	SD
Seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals.	47	3.28	0.87
Access the professional literature to expand my knowledge about teaching and learning.	47	3.28	0.92
Collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning.	47	3.26	0.96
Collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance.	47	3.51	0.80
Use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher.	47	3.55	0.74
Uphold laws related to student rights and teacher responsibility.	47	3.43	0.74
Act as an advocate for all students.	47	3.60	0.70

Note. Data from items B4a-f. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION C. STUDENT TEACHING

Table 14.   University or College Supervisor. (*A university or college supervisor is the faculty member who is in charge of guiding, helping, and directing the teacher candidate*.) My university or college supervisor…

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Was available when I needed help.	47	2	4.26	2	4.26	7	14.89	36	76.60
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	47	3	6.38	4	8.51	8	17.02	32	68.09
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	47	3	6.38	1	2.13	9	19.15	34	72.34
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	47	2	4.26	2	4.26	8	17.02	35	74.47
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	47	3	6.38	0	0.00	8	17.02	36	76.60

Note. Data from items C1a-e.

Table 15. University or College Supervisor. (*A university or college supervisor is the faculty member who is in charge of guiding, helping, and directing the teacher candidate*.)
My university or college supervisor…

	#	Mean	SD
Was available when I needed help.	47	3.64	0.76
Acted as a liaison between me and the school.	47	3.47	0.90
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	47	3.57	0.82
Helped me understand my roles and responsibilities as a student teacher.	47	3.62	0.76
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	47	3.64	0.78

Note. Data from items C1a-e. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

Table 16. To the best of your knowledge, how many times did your university or college supervisor visit your student teaching classroom when you were actively teaching?

	n = 48	
	#	Percent
0	7	14.58
1-2	9	18.75
3-4	13	27.08
5-6	14	29.17
7-8	2	4.17
9-10	2	4.17
More than 10	1	2.08

Note. Data from item C2.

Table 17. To the best of your knowledge, how many times did you discuss your student teaching in face-to-face conferences with your university or college supervisor? Include/count conversations longer than 10 minutes.

	n = 48	
	#	Percent

0	7	14.58
1-2	9	18.75
3-4	13	27.08
5-6	14	29.17
7-8	2	4.17
9-10	2	4.17
More than 10	1	2.08

Note. Data from item C3.

Table 18.   Besides your university or college supervisor, did anyone else from your university or college visit you at your student teaching site?

	n = 48	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	0	0.00
No	48	100.00

Note. Data from item C4.

Table 19.   If yes, check all that apply.

	n = 0	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
Other university or college supervisor	0	0.00
University or college's field experience coordinator/supervisor	0	0.00
Teacher education faculty	0	0.00
Content faculty	0	0.00
Other faculty	0	0.00
Graduate student	0	0.00

Peer teacher candidate	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C4. Includes respondents who answered "yes" to the item in Table 21.

Table 20. If you experienced significant challenges during your student teaching, did you receive the help you needed?

	n = 23	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	17	73.91
No	6	26.09
Does not apply	0	0.00

Note. Data from item C5.

Table 21. Cooperating Teacher/Co-Teacher. (*A cooperating teacher is the teacher in an educational setting who works with, helps, and advises the teacher candidate.*) **Please respond based on your most recent student teaching placement. My cooperating teacher/co-teacher…**

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	46	0	0.00	1	2.17	3	6.52	42	91.30
Provided adequate time for planning.	46	0	0.00	1	2.17	4	8.70	41	89.13
Helped me with classroom management.	46	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	13.04	40	86.96
Made me feel welcome.	46	1	2.17	1	2.17	4	8.70	40	86.96
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	46	0	0.00	2	4.35	6	13.04	38	82.61
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	46	1	2.17	0	0.00	4	8.70	41	89.13

	Total Respondents	Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Agree	
	n	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	46	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	8.70	42	91.30
Shared ideas and materials.	46	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	8.70	42	91.30
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	45	0	0.00	2	4.44	5	11.11	38	84.44
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	46	0	0.00	3	6.52	3	6.52	40	86.96
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	46	0	0.00	2	4.35	5	10.87	39	84.78

Note. Data from items C6a-k.

Table 22. Cooperating Teacher/Co-Teacher. (*A cooperating teacher is the teacher in an educational setting who works with, helps, and advises the teacher candidate.*) Please respond based on your most recent student teaching placement.
My cooperating teacher/co-teacher…

	#	Mean	SD
Provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom.	46	3.89	0.37
Provided adequate time for planning.	46	3.87	0.40
Helped me with classroom management.	46	3.87	0.34
Made me feel welcome.	46	3.80	0.58
Gave me constructive feedback on my teaching.	46	3.78	0.51
Let me experiment with my own teaching ideas.	46	3.85	0.51
Included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional experiences.	46	3.91	0.28
Shared ideas and materials.	46	3.91	0.28
Helped me develop as a reflective practitioner.	45	3.80	0.50
Helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of learning needs.	46	3.80	0.54
Helped me use student data to inform instruction.	46	3.80	0.49

Note. Data from items C6a-k. Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree.

SECTION D. FUTURE PLANS

Table 23. How long do you plan to teach?

	n = 48	
	#	**Percent**
1-2 years	0	0.00
3-5 years	5	10.42
6-10 years	6	12.50
11 or more years	36	75.00
I do not plan to teach	1	2.08

Note. Data from item D1.

Table 24. Where would you consider teaching? Mark all that apply.

	n = 52	
	#	Percent of Cases
Other city in NW Indiana (20,000+)	25	48.08
Suburban area in NW Indiana	34	65.38
Rural area in NW Indiana	29	55.77
Michigan	6	11.54
Illinois	12	23.08
Other urban area in the U.S.	9	17.31
Other suburban area in the U.S.	11	21.15
Other rural area in the U.S.	7	13.46
Outside the U.S.	0	0.00
American Indian Reservation	0	0.00
Other[a]	6	11.54

Note. Data from item D2.

[a]Other responses provided by included:

• *Suburban area in wisconsin*

• *I have been teaching in this district since 2003. I was in the general education classroom and wanted my SPED certification. I plan to teach in this district for years to come.*

• *Kentucky, TN, West Virginia*

• *Other Countries as well*

• *Where I am currently teaching - New Prairie High School*

SECTION E. YOUR BACKGROUND

Table 25. What is your gender?

	n = 48	
	#	**Percent**
Male	8	16.67
Female	40	83.33

Note. Data from item E1.

Table 26. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n = 52	
	#	**Percent of Cases**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1.92
Asian	0	0.00
Black or African American	3	5.77
Hispanic or Latino	10	19.23
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	38	73.08
Other	0	0.00

Note. Data from item E3.

Table 27. Is English your native language?

	n = 48	
	#	**Percent**
Yes	48	100.00
No	0	0.00

Table 28. Do you fluently speak a language other than English?

	n = 48	
	#	Percent
Yes	48	100.00
No	0	0.00

Table 29. Are you willing to be included in the pool of graduates for consideration in the continuous improvement plan?

	n = 48	
	#	Percent
Yes	33	68.75
No	15	31.25

Table 29. Have you secured a teaching position for after graduation?

	n = 9	
	#	Percent
Yes	3	33.33
No	6	66.67

Table 29. Would you like to be included on messages about current openings in our partner schools?

	n = 6	
	#	Percent
Yes	4	66.67
No	2	33.33

Appendix A
Exit Survey 2020 Validity and Reliability

The Network for Excellence in Teaching, formed in 2010, is a collaborative of higher education teacher preparation programs who aim to support continuous improvement of teacher education through research-based best practice and the use of valid and reliable measures. The Exit Survey is administered to student teachers at the end of their program to determine how prepared these student teachers were for clinical practice. First created in 2010, the Exit Survey has undergone rigorous design and testing, with several major revisions based upon internal validity and reliability testing, expert review, and respondent feedback. This report presents the most recent internal validity and reliability analysis.

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity and reliability of the Exit Survey data, which includes Part A, Your Program; Part B, Preparation for Teaching; and Part C, Student Teaching. Other sections of the survey were not included because they do not contain scale-level data. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) helps to make decisions on which survey items should be retained, revised or eliminated from each section based on how well they contribute to the overall understanding of the construct.

Methodology

The correlation, reliability matrix, and exploratory factor analysis were conducted using SAS 9.4, PRCO CORR and PROC FACTOR procedures. To compute the factors and evaluate the latent structure of the items for each part of the survey, the principal axis method with varimax rotation was utilized. The determinant, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), and Bartlett test were conducted to test the assumptions before performing the factor analysis. The determinant suggests whether items are too close to run the analysis; KMO ensures enough survey items are predicted by each factor; the Bartlett tests whether the items have sufficient correlations to perform the factor analysis.

Results Summary

Test of Assumptions

Assumptions of sampling adequacy (KMO) and normal distribution across samples (Bartlett's Test) were both met for all parts of the Exit Survey. However, the determinant was lower than ideal for Parts B (1.48E-17) and C (4.08E-06), an indication of potential problems with collinearity, indicating that some variables are highly correlated and are likely redundant.

Part A

Correlations were calculated to determine relationships among items. According to Cohen (1988), correlation coefficients between 0.1 and 0.29 represent a weak correlation between two variables, 0.3 and 0.49 suggest a moderate correlation, and coefficients from 0.5 to 1.0 are strong correlations. Based on these guidelines, the bivariate correlations among items in Part A, consisting of 46.43% of item pairs were moderate, ranging from weak (.203) to strong (.732). Item a2h_site had weak correlations with all other items in Section A2 except a2g_prior, indicating this item might represent a separate construct from others in Section A2. Using the scree plot, two factors, explaining 63.53% of the variance, were retained. Items a2c_inst, a2d_bal, a2e_tech, a2f_cohe, a2g_prior, and a2h_site loaded heavily onto Factor 1 (related to Program Quality) and items a2a_educ and a2b_cont loaded onto Factor 2 (related to Advising). These factor loadings range from .60 to .88. See Appendix A for the factor loadings.

Part B: Preparation for Teaching

An EFA was completed for Part B, which contains four sections: Section B1, Instructional Practice; Section B2, Diverse Learners; Section B3, Learning Environment; and Section B4, Professionalism. All 46 items in Part B were included in this analysis. Five factors were retained in the factor analysis, in total accounting 66.45% of the variance using the minimum eigenvalue of 1. The factor loadings were good for all retained items, ranging from .400 to .735. Items a2c_inst and a2e_tech cross loaded. See Appendix A for the factor loadings.

Table 1. Section B: "Preparation for Teaching" Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	b1e_goals, b1j_self, b1l_rel, b1m_approp, b1mm_diff, b1n_digi, b1o_range, b1p_criti, b1q_complx, b1r_itdsp, b1s_glbl and b1t_conc	Instructional Practice	53.19%
2	b2a_ethn, b2b_diff, b2c_dev, b2d_socio, b2e_IEP, b2f_mntl, b2g_gift, b2h_ELL, and b2i_resour	Diverse Learners	4.22%
3	b1a_subj, b1b_strat, b1c_pers, b1d_prior, b1f_adj, b1g_plan, b1h_match, b1i_fdbk, and b1k_assess	Instructional Planning	2.66%
4	b3a_expec, b3b_comm, b3c_real, b3d_work, b3e_envi, b3f_behav, b3g_diff, b3h_reg, and b3i_phys	Learning Environment	4.10%
5	b4a_opp, b4b_lite, b4c_pare, b4d_coll, b4e_dev, b4f_legal, and b4g_advo	Professionalism	2.66%

Section B1: Instructional Practice

Twelve items from Section B1, Instructional Practice, loaded onto Factor 1, as shown in Table 1. These items are related to both instructional practice and technology and resources. Items b1e_goals, b1h_match, b1i_fdbk, b1k_assess, b1m_approp and b1p_criti cross loaded with Factor 3, while b1mm_diff cross loaded with Factor 2, diverse learning. These cross-loaded items in Factor 1 may contribute to the ambiguous loading.

Nine items; b1a_subj, b1b_strat, b1c_pers, b1d_prior, b1f_adj, b1g_plan, b1h_match, b1i_fdbk, and b1k_assess, loaded onto Factor 3. This is a new finding for this year's data. Eight of the nine items are related in planning for instruction; therefore, this new factor was labeled instructional planning.

Section B2: Diverse Learners

All items in Section B2 loaded highest onto Factor 2 indicating that Section B2 represents one scale related to diverse learners. In addition, there is no items cross loaded with other factors in Section B2.

Section B3: Learning Environment

All items from Section B3 loaded strongly onto Factor 4. This suggests that these items represent one scale related to learning environment. Item b3_work cross loaded with Factor 3.

Section B4: Professionalism

All items in Section 4 loaded onto Factor 5, Professionalism with b4a_opp and b4b_lite cross loading onto Factor 1. This suggests that these items can be used to measure one Professionalism scale for future analysis.

Part C

All items in Section C1 had strong bivariate correlations ranging from .642 to .810, potentially indicating student teachers who perceived their supervisors to be strong in one area also perceived them to be strong in other areas. Section C6 items all had moderate to strong bivariate correlations ranging from .446 to .820. Correlations between the two sections (C1 and C6) are weak, suggesting student teachers' perceptions of their faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher do not correlate with each other. Two factors were retained using the minimum eigenvalue criteria in the factor analysis. Factor 1 accounted 46.48% of the variance and Factor 2 accounted 22.22% of the variance. Retained factor loadings range from .688 to .913.

Table 2. Part C: "Student Teaching" Factors

Factor	Items	Primary Topic	Variance Explained
1	c6a_opp, c6b_time, c6c_clas, c6d_welc, c6e_fdbk, c6f_exp, c6g_incl, c6h_shar, c6i_dev, c6j_plan, and c6k_data	Cooperating Teaching	46.48%

2	c1a_avail, c1b_liais, c1c_fdbk, c1d_role, and c1e_refl	University/College Supervisor	22.22%

Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the scales suggested by the factor loadings was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. All reliability estimates are included in Table 7.

Table 3. Reliability Analysis

Part	Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
	Section A2: Program Structure/Quality—Overall	0.858
A	Advising	0.846
	Program Quality	0.829
B	Part B: Preparation for Teaching—Overall	0.980
	Instructional Practice (Factor 1)	0.946
	Learning Environment	0.937
	Diverse Learners	0.937
	Professionalism	0.913
	Instructional Planning (Factor 3)	0.930
C	Sections C1: University/College Supervisor and C6: Cooperating Teacher/Co-teacher—Overall	0.917
	Cooperating Teacher	0.944
	University/College Supervisor	0.931

The alpha coefficients are all greater than .70, indicating good internal consistency for these constructs.

The factor analysis conducted suggests that the scales identified by the 2019-2020 Exit Survey data have relatively good reliability as a measure of these constructs.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zhang, A., Baron, M., & Duffield, S. (2017). *Exit Survey 2017 validity and reliability*. Retrieved from Network for Excellence in Teaching https://www.nexteachers.org/services

Prepared by
Jerry Dogbey-Gakpetor, M.Sc., North Dakota State University
Stacy Duffield, Ph.D., North Dakota State University
January 2021

Appendix B:
Guidelines for Writing about Common Metrics Data and Surveys

The NExT Common Metrics group supports excellence in teacher preparation through research and use of valid and reliable instruments for program improvement. The Common Metrics data offers numerous opportunities to researchers, and we are excited to promote this work. The following list provides guidelines for appropriate reference and citations when referring to the data and surveys. These guidelines apply to both formal and informal writing about Common Metrics data and surveys.

- The surveys may not be presented in full or part. (eg. The survey may not be provided in the appendices or a list of survey items in a results table.)

- Survey items may not be presented word-for-word; rather, the topic of the item can be presented (eg. instructing English learners or providing feedback). Sharing of specific items is a violation of copyright.

- If reporting about single items, it needs to be made clear that the items are being extracted from an instrument that is meant to be used in whole and that the items are part of factors that include multiple items.

- Reporting should be about outcomes. We recommend that results are presented by factor. (See factor analysis reports)

- Please note that while the data belongs to the institution, the surveys are owned by NExT. NExT surveys should be cited in formal and informal writing and presentations. This is the citation format recommended by NExT complying with APA guidelines:

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Entry Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Exit Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Transition to Teaching Survey*. NExT: Author.

Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT, 2016). *NExT Common Metrics Supervisor Survey*. NExT: Author.

Praxis/240 Tutoring

School of Education and Counseling

Indiana has made changes to licensure testing that went into effect September 1, 2021. As of this date, Indiana will use Praxis Content and Pedagogy licensure exams. The following table indicates the exams necessary for specific education majors. Each Praxis Test code in the table is linked to the ETS site where more information and study guides can be found related to the specific assessment.

Licensure Area	Pedagogy Assessment	Content Assessment	
Early Childhood Generalist (PreK-3)	**Principles of Learning and Teaching: Early Childhood** Praxis Test code 5621 Score needed: **157+**	**Early Childhood Assessment:** Praxis Test code 5026 Two scores needed: **161+** (Humanities subtest:5027) **& 160+** (STEM subtest: 5028)	
Elementary Education Generalist (K-6)	**Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6** Praxis Test code 5622 Score needed: **160+**	**Elementary Education Assessment:** Praxis Test code 5006 Two scores needed: **160+** (Humanities subtest:5007) **& 158+** (STEM subtest: 5008)	
Exceptional Needs	**Principles of Learning and Teaching: PreK-12** Praxis Test code 5625 Score needed: **157+**	**Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications:** Praxis Test code 5543 Score needed: **155+**	**Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications:** Praxis Test code 5545 Score needed: **158+**
Secondary Education	**Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12** Praxis Test code 5624 Score needed: **157+**	**Chemistry** Praxis Test code 5245 Score needed: **155+** **Economics:** Praxis Test code 5911 Score needed: **144+** **Geographical Perspectives** Praxis Test code 5921 Score needed: **156+** **Government and Citizenship** Praxis Test code 5931 Score needed: **149+** **Historical Perspectives** Praxis Test code 5941 Score needed: **148+** **Language Arts** Praxis Test code 5038 Score needed: **167+**	**Mathematics** Praxis Test code 5165 Score needed: **159+** **Physical Science** Praxis Test code 5485 Score needed: **157+** **Physics** Praxis Test code 5265 Score needed: **140+** **Life Science** Praxis Test code 5235 Score needed: **150+** **Psychology** Praxis Test code 5391 Score needed: **154+** **Sociology** Praxis Test code 5952 Score needed: **154+**

In addition to the information and resources for students found on the ETS site, candidates are able to use 240tutoring at a reduced rate using the code shared with them at the point of assessment registration. 240tutoring provides interactive study materials that align with the specific Praxis assessments required for licensure. Information for 240tutoring and Praxis vouchers are shared with candidates in the semester where the exam is recommended to be completed.